HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

SECOND SESSION—THIRTY-THIRD PARLIAMENT

37 Elizabeth II

VOLUME XIV, 1988

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTH DAY OF JULY, 1988
TO THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF AUGUST, 1988

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

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

Available from Canadian Government Publishing Centre, Supply and Services Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, July 6, 1988

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

PROSPECTIVE WITNESS REFUSED CHILD TRAVEL EXPENSES

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, the Government claims to be very proud of its record in dealing with the plight of victims of crime, yet it is obvious that there is still a long way to go. A case brought to my attention by the Sexual Assault Support Centre in Ottawa reveals a real scandal. A woman, who is the victim of an assault charge being tried in Vancouver, has been offered her plane fare to go to Vancouver to testify in the case, but she has been refused assistance to bring her two and a half-year old child with her. How can she go to Vancouver to testify in this case if she cannot bring her child with her?

If justice requires that she be there and the provincial Government, with the assistance of a federal cost-sharing program, is prepared to bring the woman to testify, to see that justice is done in that case, it is only fair that her child should also be brought out with money from the same coffer. I condemn the Government for not having brought in a program large enough in order to prevent scandals like this from taking place.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TRADE

QUÉBEC'S ATTITUDE TO CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, we have been talking about free trade for a year and a very large majority of companies in Longueuil, such as Pratt & Whitney, Héroux, Desmarais et Frères and many others, the Chamber of Commerce of the South Shore of Montreal, the Premier of Quebec, Mr. Bourassa, and the Leader of the Opposition of Quebec, Mr. Parizeau, have all spoken in favour of free trade. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because these people believe in our ability and our know-how, unlike the Liberals and the NDP who still believe that Quebecers are drawers of water. No, Mr. Speaker, Quebecers can do it! They are strong and they want to continue to develop with the 75 million people around them. The potential is there and we will have it with the Progressive Conservative Party.

* * *

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SHELLING OF HAWAIIAN ISLAND BY CANADIAN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, considerable concern has been expressed about the continued participation of Canadian naval vessels in the shelling of the Hawaiian island of Kaho'olawe as part of the annual RIMPAC naval exercise.

Kaho'olawe is of immense historical, cultural, archaeological and religious importance to the Hawaiian people. The island has been placed on the U.S. Registry of Historic Sites. Despite this fact, the Government continues to allow Canadian naval vessels to shell Kaho'olawe in defiance of local and international pressure to stop, and despite the decision by other friendly countries like Australia, New Zealand, and Japan to cease shelling Kaho'olawe.

Now the City and County Council of Honolulu have raised the stakes by passing a resolution which states that continued Canadian shelling of Kaho'olawe could adversely affect efforts by a Canadian company, Lavelin Corporation of Montreal, to secure a $1 billion contract to build the Honolulu rapid transit system. Such an outcome could have a serious impact on Canada's efforts to carve a niche for itself in the global rapid transit market.

Mr. Speaker, if the Government is not prepared to do what is morally right, I hope it will at least do what is financially smart. I call on the Government to end Canadian participation immediately in the shelling of Kaho'olawe.

S. O. 21

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

INITIATIVE TAKEN BY METROPOLITAN QUÉBEC CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec-Est): Mr. Speaker, among the constant, fundamental challenges that Canada must meet, one of the most urgent and complex is regional economic development. This challenge can only be met with a new synergistic relationship between all levels of government and the private sector.

In this regard, I would like to point out the important initiative that the *Chambre de commerce et d'industrie du Québec métropolitain* just took by setting up a venture capital corporation to support entrepreneurship and underwriting $50,000 to $500,000 of shares for the initial stage of business development.

Since our Government has just concluded agreements worth several hundreds of millions of dollars to stimulate regional economic development, we must be glad about the recent initiative of the *Chambre de commerce et d'industrie du Québec métropolitain* and hope that it spreads to other regions.

* * *

• (1410)

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF QUÉBECERS AND FRANCOPHONES OUTSIDE QUÉBEC

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, since Thursday, Canada and especially the House of Commons and the Conservative Government is experiencing a language crisis. We all know that the Secretary of State (Mr. Bouchard) is the Minister responsible for Official Languages. The House will recall that the new Secretary of State, the Hon. Member for Lac-Saint-Jean, said during his election campaign that he was going to Ottawa to defend the interests of Quebecers and Francophones. We all remember that. We saw it on television when this gentleman was sworn in as a Member of this House. On that occasion he again stated that his priority would be to defend Francophones.

However, Quebecers now wonder where the defender of Quebecers and Francophones is now, when the Tories are experiencing a crisis. Where is the Secretary of State? Where is the Hon. Member for Lac-Saint-Jean? Where is the man who was supposed to defend the interests of Quebecers and Francophones? We got shafted on the research contracts and we are now being shafted on official languages. Where is he, that reknowned defender of Canada's Francophones?

[*English*]

MULTICULTURALISM

FESTIVAL 88—UKRAINIAN CULTURE CELEBRATION

Mr. William G. Lesick (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, Festival 88 which was held in Edmonton and Vegreville, Alberta, from June 30 to July 3, was a resounding success. It was a remarkable and dynamic showcase of Ukrainian culture. Huge crowds came from across Canada to the town of Vegreville to experience the Pysanka Festival. Vegreville is renowned for its rich heritage of Ukrainian culture and hospitality.

Opening night in Edmonton featured two of Canada's finest dance groups, the Shumka and Cheremosh dancers, together with dozens of other dance groups. The finale included over 2,700 costumed young Albertans dancing to a 36-piece symphony orchestra. There was also a showcase of Ukrainian weaving, ceramics, and crafts. The greatest celebration was for the 1,000 years of Christianity of the Ukrainian people, the millennium.

Festival 88 was multiculturalism at its finest, one that other Canadians might emulate. Ukrainian culture is an integral and dynamic part of Canada. It is what makes me proud to be a Canadian of Ukrainian heritage.

* * *

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

BILL C-72—NATIONAL RECONCILIATION

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Beauce): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Members from Quebec defend the interests of their province with pride and enthusiasm. They sincerely believe that the philosophy and objectives of the Conservative Party are aimed at protecting the interests of all Canadians across this country, whatever the colour of their skin or the language they speak.

Thanks to our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and Meech Lake, Quebecers are even prouder now they are truly citizens of this country. National reconciliation has given our policies new meaning. Harmony can exist in this country, provided we are generous and tolerant. The Prime Minister and this Government had the courage to introduce Bill C-72 on official languages. During the 16 years or more they were in power, the federal Liberals never had the nerve to introduce this kind of legislation, and furthermore, a quarter of the federal Liberal Members in this House voted against Meech Lake.

National reconciliation and recognition of bilingualism in Canada was accomplished by the Conservative Government, under the leadership of a great Canadian, Brian Mulroney!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

WAGE GAP BETWEEN UNIONIZED AND NON-UNIONIZED WOMEN WORKERS

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, to no one's real surprise we learned last week that the Government's ineffective pay equity measures have done nothing to eliminate wage discrimination in the Public Service. The wage gap between men and women persists and even grows wider as women continue to be denied entry into high level public service jobs. From their first entry into the paid labour force, women have had to struggle against this kind of discrimination.

Today I would like to comment on another wage gap, one equally detrimental to the aspirations and achievements of women in the labour force. I refer to the gap between the salaries of unionized women and non-unionized women. Statistics Canada data reveal that women who work under a collective agreement earn substantially more than their sisters without a contract. In the teaching profession, for example, unionized women earned $15.57 an hour while their non-unionized sisters earned $9.73 per hour. Not only must women face the barrier of wage inequities with their male colleagues but they must also face the obstacle of opposition to union certification.

The lesson is clear. The union keeps Canadian women strong.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FREE TRADE

SOCIALIST PROSPECT AND THE REALITY

Mr. Gabriel Fontaine (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, a survey of 300 major Canadian companies carried out by the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion last week shows that those companies expect to increase their investments by 27 per cent this year. Those plans are due to the fact that Canadian businesses are preparing for free trade, which comes into effect January 1, 1989.

When the liberal-socialist coalition says that free trade will demolish Canada, it displays its colossal ignorance of what is really happening in Canada's vigorous economy.

Peter Cook, in today's *Globe and Mail*, states that what is happening is the exact opposite of what the socialists predicted.

Just as free trade was the catalyst for Europe's economic development in the 60's, free trade will act as a catalyst for Canadian and American businesses in the 1980-1990's.

Read Peter Cook's column today and appreciate his conclusion. He feels free trade is the best thing that could happen to Canada.

* * *

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

SASKATCHEWAN STORAGE AND IRRIGATION PROJECTS—PLANNED TRANSFER OF CONTROL

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt—Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, Agriculture Canada plans to transfer 35 storage and irrigation projects in southwestern Saskatchewan from the control of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration to the Saskatchewan Water Corporation.

The corporation is primarily concerned with municipal, urban and recreational use of water and only dabbles in agricultural water usage with its few mega irrigation projects.

PFRA patrons are concerned that these transfers will hurt farmers. The cattleman who was denied Sask Water Corporation's permission to water his thirsty cattle because boaters on the Duncairn Dam didn't like it will need strong reassurances from Agriculture Canada that his traditional use is guaranteed. Furthermore, there is fear that these planned transfers are part of a larger plan to privatize all of PFRA's projects.

The ghost of the Nielsen Report which recommended selling off PFRA pastures and dams still haunts prairie farmers.

* * *

AIR CANADA

CHOICE OF REPLACEMENT AIRCRAFT FOR PRESENT 727 FLEET

Mr. John Oostrom (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, Air Canada will soon announce the replacement for its Boeing 727 fleet. There are strong indications that the Airbus A320 will be Air Canada's choice.

The A320 is made in Europe and its development and construction was heavily subsidized by the European Governments whereas the the North American aircraft industry does not receive government subsidies. I believe that the selection of the replacement aircraft must take into account the Canadian aircraft industry and its workers. Presently all major North American aircraft manufacturers have plants operating in Canada.

Boeing, which recently bought de Havilland, for example, has been instrumental in strengthening Canada's aircraft manufacturing base through increased sales and employment. Since the bids from the North American competitors and the Airbus are similar, the deciding factor then must be the benefits to Canada's aircraft workers and manufacturers who

operate, develop, and manufacture their products without government money.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

STATEMENTS BY PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE MEMBERS

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Government. I take it that the Minister of Justice is well informed on languages and I would like to ask it of him.

There are two tragedies in this language dossier. First, a large number of Tory back-benchers should not have been allowed to spew anti-French statements. Second, the Prime Minister has allowed this to happen over the last weeks and months. We were told yesterday by the Government to wait for the vote before any action would be taken to discipline the reactionaries. What nonsense.

• (1420)

Are Tory Members allowed to make racist comments as long as they—

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member will put his question.

Mr. Gauthier: We were told yesterday "wait until the vote, you'll see who is gong to be disciplined". I am asking the Tories and the Government, is the theory that Tory Members can make racist statements as long as they don't vote on the multicultural Bill—

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the Hon. Member to put his question.

Mr. Gauthier: Are they allowed to insult women as long as they do not vote on affirmative action? When is the Government going to stop this nonsense and take action against those members of the Tory Caucus who are destroying bilingualism across Canada? Can they do that and get away with it by being silent in this House?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the comments coming from that Hon. Member. He was here during the 1970s, as I was, when we saw national unity torn asunder, when we saw province set against province, when we saw region set against region.

When the Right Hon. Prime Minister assumed the leadership of this Party he made it clear from the outset that his primary goal was national reconciliation. From day one, he has worked toward that goal. He has worked toward it with regard to Meech Lake, he has worked toward it with regard to the official languages policy.

When dissidents in the Hon. Member's Party voted against the Meech Lake Accord we did not get up and call them racists because we do not believe in using that kind of wording in the House of Commons. We do not believe that this should be a partisan issue.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

POLITICAL COURAGE

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State and Member for Lac-Saint-Jean has said nothing in the language debate, either as a Minister or Member of Parliament or as a Quebecer or Canadian.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has told the Conservative Members that they can work to destroy bilingualism throughout Canada as long as they keep quiet in the House of Commons during the vote on the Official Languages Act. That is what they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, it is like saying that a liar is only a liar if he is caught or a thief is only a thief if he is caught. What nonsense! The Government must stand up today and tell Canadians, "Enough nonsense." The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources too. Out with the Parliamentary Secretaries and Members who cannot bear the responsibility to sell a national policy.

When will the Government take its courage in hand and do what it must do?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, the Government's position on bilingualism is very clear. It is a fundamental policy for the Prime Minister and all members of the Cabinet. I repeat that the Official Languages Bill will be passed tomorrow, with no amendment affecting the fundamental principle of bilingualism in Canada. This is not a partisan issue; this is a substantive matter. And that is the Conservative Party's position.

[*English*]

QUERY CONCERNING COURT CHALLENGE PROGRAM

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Calgary North, with the support of the Hon. Member for Athabasca, is planning to launch a court challenge against the Minister of Energy—

Mr. Shields: Not true!

Mr. Gauthier: —and his plans to hire French-speaking Canadians in his Department.

Mr. Shields: That's a lie.

Mr. Gauthier: I want to ask the Minister of Energy, the Secretary of State, the Minister of Justice or the President of the Treasury Board—

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Athabasca will withdraw.

Mr. Andre: He should be asking questions, not making speeches.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: I know that the Hon. Member for Athabasca would want to withdraw what clearly he was saying, and it was unparliamentary. I understand that there is a certain amount of agitation on this issue on both sides of the Chamber, but I think that we can all approach it in a civilized manner.

[*Translation*]

I will listen to the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier and hope that he will put his question in an appropriate manner.

[*English*]

Mr. Gauthier: I think it would be quite appropriate, and I would like him to withdraw, but I will not bother with that.

My question is directed to any responsible Minister. In the question of the court challenge against the Minister of Energy for hiring Francophones in his Department, will the Government, any responsible Minister, explain to the House how public funds could be used to attack and destroy the Government's own fundamental law? Why should Canadians pay for such a vindictive exercise? Explain that to the Canadian people.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member, I am sure, does not want to leave the impression that somehow the Government is paying for a lawsuit initiated by a Member of Parliament.

Mr. Gauthier: The Court Challenge Program.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I am not aware of the Court Challenge Program being utilized in any respect in this particular matter. There is an application obviously being made by a citizen of Canada who happens to be a Member of Parliament. That is not to say that the matter will be entertained.

With respect to any action taken, I can only say that the taxpayers' money will be used to defend the Government's policy and position in this matter which is one that—

Mr. Gauthier: Why should it, it's one of your own Members?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The fact is that we are putting forward a Bill which is fair and equitable and which has the support of the overwhelming majority of Canadians. The fact is that we will defend the legislation and the operations of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources which have also been fair.

[*Translation*]

SITUATION OF FRANCOPHONES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, thirty Tory Members have insulted Francophones, and yesterday three more asked to be added to the anti-francophone list. The Acting Prime Minister's answer is that the Prime Minister has been an agent of reconciliation. My question for the Acting Prime Minister is this: Is it the Tory Government's definition of national reconciliation that Francophones will have to wait, and wait patiently, because your Government has accepted 52 amendments? You used a Francophone to . . .

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Malépart: . . . There are thirty Members in this group. Does national reconciliation mean that we as Francophones from Quebec and across Canada have to be patient and wait a little longer? We have waited long enough!

• (1430)

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has provided the necessary leadership to improve some very bad conditions we had in this country when the previous Government was in power.

[*English*]

The Prime Minister of this country has provided the leadership on the question of reconciliation between French-speaking Canadians and English-speaking Canadians which was so badly needed in this country. Any of us who are here in this House saw that time and time again.

I would ask the Member to honour the work that is being done in this House jointly by all Parties to further the cause of official languages.

[*Translation*]

WHEREABOUTS OF SECRETARY OF STATE OF CANADA

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, Francophones will not tolerate national reconciliation on the cheap. We have waited long enough for orders to come from the Conservative Party. Do you think we are going to let thirty Conservatives insult us? We won't stand for it!

Could the Acting Prime Minister explain to the House why this morning, the Prime Minister did not throw out the two parliamentary secretaries and the Tory Joint Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Official Languages?

And, why is the Secretary of State, the defender of Quebecers, not in the House to defend official languages?

And why haven't these Members apologized to the Francophones of this country? Why do you insist on insulting

Francophones still further by defending your thirty anti-Francophones?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I am not impressed by the sound and fury of the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie. As I said yesterday, there are limitations on what parliamentary secretaries may do. They know that when they take on their duties. They must abide by their obligations or take one of the options open to them. The Official Languages Bill will be voted on tomorrow, and it has the Government's unqualified support. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that each and everyone of us has a duty to act responsibly. That is the Government's position.

QUERY CONCERNING WHO SPEAKS FOR GOVERNMENT

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa-Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Acting Prime Minister concerns precisely that issue; everyone must shoulder their responsibilities. Has the Prime Minister asked for the resignation of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, in the light of his public opposition to a basic element of the Government's policy, that is to say bilingualism? If not, can the Acting Prime Minister explain how the Government is going to operate in future with regard to Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries? Will these two groups who express Government policy be forced to express only Government policy in the future? Will the Government speak with one voice?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate that the Official Languages Bill will be passed tomorrow, without amendments that would affect the fundamental principle of bilingualism in Canada. That is the position of the our Government. We are united in that approach.

[*English*]

PRIME MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. Canadians believe that the credibility of the Government is at stake because of scandals and broken promises—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cassidy: —and now because the Government is not speaking with one voice.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am sure the Hon. Member would want to confine his preamble to the question he wishes to ask.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, how can Canadians in Quebec or anywhere else trust the Government when the Prime Minister is tolerating official spokesmen for the Government at the level of Parliamentary Secretary, like the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, taking public issue with the Government over an issue as fundamental as bilingualism, without any disciplinary action being taken?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, it ill behooves the Member for Ottawa Centre to stand and talk about credibility when, time and again, he has come into this House and levelled charges which he has then had to withdraw because they have been without foundation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss MacDonald: The Prime Minister has provided leadership in a way unknown before in this House on the matter of official languages.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. de Jong: At least blush when you say that, Flora.

Miss MacDonald: I can see Members from the NDP laughing. Where were they when the Prime Minister went to Manitoba and challenged even the Government of the day on the question of bilingualism in the Province of Manitoba?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss MacDonald: I say to the Hon. Member and all Members of this House that the question of official languages in this country is not and should not be a partisan issue. This is an issue which is one of unity for the country and one of leadership for the country. I hope that this Member and all Members in the House would recognize their responsibility to carry out that leadership, individually and collectively.

[*Translation*]

QUERY CONCERNING WHO SPEAKS FOR GOVERNMENT

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa-Centre): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I recall that it was the NPD Government of Manitoba that advocated the rights of Francophones in that province. The Conservatives were the ones who opposed them.

My question is the following: How can Canadian men and women trust this Government? When a Government allows the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs to take a position which differs from that of the Government on a question as fundamental as bilingualism, the credibility of that Government is at stake. How can we tolerate a situation in which Parliamentary Secretaries, Government spokespersons, are issuing different messages on behalf of the Government?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, as I have already said, there are limits to the actions and functions of Parliamentary Secretaries . . .

Mr. Malépart: In this case they have gone beyond the limits!

Miss MacDonald: That was another very strong voice, but it makes no sense.

Parliamentary Secretaries know what the situation is when they accept their position Mr. Speaker. They know their

responsibilities very well. And I think that the Member will see the results when the vote is held tomorrow.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD

DECISION ON NATURAL GAS EXPORTS TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Yesterday the National Energy Board granted Pan- Alberta Gas Ltd. permission to sell over two trillion cubic feet of natural gas to southern California, even though Pan-Alberta does not have enough natural gas under contract to supply its own contractual needs.

This brings to 17 trillion cubic feet the amount of Canadian natural gas that is under contract to the United States. With the six trillion feet pending approval before the National Energy Board, one-third of all western natural gas is contracted to the United States.

• (1440)

How long will it be before the Government allows the United States to have all Canadian natural gas under its trade agreement with the United States? Even before the agreement comes into effect it has one-third of it.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, it is true that yesterday, the National Energy Board approved Pan-Alberta's application, and in a matter of days or weeks, at the most, the Government will be asked to ratify the NEB's decision.

I would like to point out to Hon. Members that this procedure, both with respect to the number of years and the quantity involved, is not unusual for the NEB. Contracts of this kind have been approved many times in previous years. In fact, the twenty-five year period is part of the National Energy Board Act.

Second, section 83.4 provides that the NEB may consider discovery trends when approving contracts, so that the NEB's decision was well within the limits of this legislation. The Government will make a decision within a few days.

[*English*]

SECURITY OF SUPPLY FOR CANADIAN CONSUMERS

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, that is not true. Before the Government came to power the National Energy Board would never have approved a contract like that which permits the sale of natural gas that the company does not even have. What about the natural gas that is there? What will the Government do to protect the security of Canadians?

The National Energy Board is nothing more than a monitoring agency. It has no power at all. There is no protection for Canadian consumers. What will the Government do to protect Canadian consumers of natural gas? When will it put some teeth back in the National Energy Board?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I should be glad to check whether, in years previous to 1984, the NEB granted contracts for twenty-five years, and I will advise the Hon. Member accordingly.

Second, according to this Government's philosphy, the best way to ensure security of supply for Canadians is, first of all, to provide for a market that favours investment and thus production, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

[*English*]

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

FORMER COMMISSIONER'S ROLE IN AWARDING CONTRACTS

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. It concerns one of the Prime Minister's classmates, Mr. Rhéal Leblanc, who was appointed Commissioner of Correctional Institutions.

Mr. Crosbie: What class? Kindergarten?

Mr. Rodriguez: In light of information that was finally squeezed out of the Government concerning the behaviour of Mr. Leblanc, the former Commissioner of Corrections, and Mr. Anderson, and contracts totalling some $628,000, and in view of the fact that the Minister was informed as far back as November, 1986, why did the Minister not order an audit at that time?

Hon. James Kelleher (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member would review the article in question carefully, he would note that in 1986 I was advised that all actions to date were quite proper and in conformity with the rules and regulations.

However, when I was first advised subsequently of this matter in the early fall, 1987, I immediately commissioned an independent audit of the commissioner's actions, which was done by the Comptroller General's office. I received that report at the end of February, 1988. An action plan was put into place, which was approved by both the Treasury Board and the Comptroller General's office. This plan will ensure that such actions will not take place again.

Oral Questions

ACCESS TO INFORMATION—MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, in November, 1987, the Member for Burnaby put on the Order Paper questions concerning the contracts, the role of Mr. Anderson and the role of Mr. Leblanc. The answer which came last Thursday, June 30, 1988, said that the information could be obtained through Access to Information.

In light of the fact that when the Conservatives were in the opposition they said that the Liberals believed that Canadians did not have a right to know, but the Conservatives believed they had every right to know, why did the Minister then engage in a cover-up in providing that information to the public? In fact, Inger Hansen had to take legal action to try to get the information from Access to Information.

Mr. Jelinek: What absolute nonsense!

Hon. James Kelleher (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect, the Hon. Member's suggestions are utterly without foundation. They are not correct.

Mr. Rodriguez: Ask Inger Hansen.

Mr. Kelleher: When I first learned of this, I asked the Comptroller General's office to conduct an audit. I received that report at the end of February this year and we immediately took action.

Mr. Rodriguez: Why did Robinson not get it?

Mr. Kelleher: All the information has been released to Mr. Robinson and the information was released to the media which asked for it. The reasons for the delay and the deletions concerned the Privacy Act and the third party rule.

AWARDING OF UNTENDERED CONTRACTS

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. It also concerns the awarding of over $600,000 of untendered government contracts to CACI Canada Limited, a computer consulting firm.

As the Solicitor General knows, there was a deliberate, not inadvertent, breach of the conflict of interest guidelines and the Treasury Board guidelines. The Solicitor General knew about problems with this particular company in November, 1986, yet allowed the relationship to continue between CACI Canada Limited and Correctional Service of Canada.

Will the Solicitor General indicate to the House why he has refused to allow information about these improper practices to become public? Why did it take a Federal Court application by *The Globe and Mail* before the Solicitor General was prepared to release this information to the public? What was he hiding? Was it his own incompetence and negligence?

Hon. James Kelleher (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I have already advised the other Hon. Member and again I advise this Hon. Member that when these facts came to my attention in the fall of 1987 I immediately went to the Comptroller General and commissioned an independent audit. I received the report at the end of February. An action plan was implemented. This action plan was approved both by the Comptroller General's office and the Treasury Board.

I can also advise the Hon. Member that one of the first instructions I gave to the new Commissioner of Corrections was to ensure that nothing of this nature ever happens again, to refer him to the action plan, and to ensure that fiscal control was observed at all times.

PUNITIVE ACTION QUERY

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about an inadvertent breach of federal guidelines, we are talking about a deliberate breach. For example, in one case a contract was doubled by the commissioner to over $48,000. The contract was for $24,000 and was doubled by the commissioner after the work was completed and when no additional work was done.

The Solicitor General indicates that remedial action was taken. I and the people of Canada would like to know specifically what punitive action was taken? Can he indicate whether the RCMP were called in to investigate the propriety of these practices as conducted by the former Commissioner of Corrections?

Hon. James Kelleher (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I will be most happy to answer the Hon. Member's question. After receiving the report, I instructed my Deputy Minister to deliver the report to Justice and ask for an opinion from them. Justice reviewed the report. I was advised by Justice that on the facts disclosed there were no criminal offences. As a result of that written opinion from Justice, no further charges were laid with respect to this matter.

* * *

• (1450)

IMMIGRATION

TREATMENT OF ENTREPRENEUR-CLASS IMMIGRANTS

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. Recently *The Globe and Mail* reported that many wealthy people have paid as much as $30,000 and more to get Canadian landing and citizenship through loopholes in the Government's entrepreneurial immigration law, without even having lived in or paid taxes in Canada, and that 14 members of a Toronto law firm are being investigated by the Law Society of Upper Canada in this connection.

The Minister knows how many law abiding low-income Canadians must often wait for years to bring their relatives from overseas to rejoin them in Canada. What action has the Minister taken to stop those abuses that have been reported, to close those loopholes, and to strip citizenship from any who have go it through deceit or abuse?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, clearly I cannot comment on the particular case which is being investigated at this time. When I first took over the Ministry I explained to the reporter in question, among other people, that the monitoring of our programs is very important to me. Entrepreneurs admitted are being monitored by immigration officials so that their business activities can be assessed.

I have expressed the view that I would like to see our monitoring improved. Shortly after taking over the portfolio, I asked that a special advisory committee be set up, and this group will advise us on any need for further monitoring and how it should be done.

MONITORING OF BUSINESS ACTIVITIES

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, the Minister has stated that she has undertaken a review or an evaluation of the monitoring. It has been well known for several years that there is no effective follow up to find out whether these entrepreneurs actually produce the jobs they promised to produce, and for which they received their landing and sometimes their citizenship. It is further known that 70 per cent of those immigrants land and stay in the three largest cities of Canada. Therefore, they make the regional disparities worse rather than improving them, as was the intention of the program.

Will the Minister tell the House what steps she has taken to correct these failures of the program, or is the Minister going to end the program and return the immigration staff to speeding up the family reunification program?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, my Department has established a study of the program, which is nearing completion now, in terms of the follow-up as to what happened to the investors who came to Canada. At some future time I will be in a position to make a report.

As I have said, I have set up an advisory committee in terms of monitoring the program. I have also consulted with my colleague, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, to ensure that the overseas monitoring of the program is meeting its objectives.

We also have an agreement with the provinces which my predecessor, the Minister of Transport, discussed this winter whereby there will be a greater balance among the regions of Canada in terms of this program.

I want to point out to the Hon. Member one final point. Before there was an entrepreneur or business class, people like this could come to Canada as independents without any commitment to make any investment at all. I think it is a positive program that we now have them coming to make investments here.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TRADE

FREE TRADE—MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Gabriel Fontaine (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to our excellent Minister for International trade. The Department of Regional Industrial Expansion has published the results of a survey of three-hundred major businesses in Canada. With respect to free trade, these three-hundred major businesses announced they would increase their spending by 25 per cent in 1988.

Mr. Speaker, considering the scare tactics being used by the Liberal-Socialist Coalition, I think it is important for the Minister to comment on what happened in the European Common Market in 1960, when free trade became a fact for 250 million people. There was no problem. Would the Minister explain to Canadians the benefits that ensued when free trade was implemented in Europe?

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for the first relevant, competent, and reasonable question that has been asked today. Indeed, the Department of Industry, Science and Technology has just released a paper on the effect of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement on the Canadian manufacturing industry. The conclusion is that Canadian industry will enjoy unparalled opportunities for growth and development as a result of the agreement.

In addition, the survey revealed a projected or planned increase of spending and investment by 300 major corporations by 27 per cent this year. It has also been confirmed by OECD that Canada is the industrialized nation where investment will grow fastest in the next few years.

Some Hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Crosbie: Why should I sit down when we have to listen to the rest of the slander, Mr. Speaker, when I am giving some facts about the investment opportunities as a result of the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement?

Mr. Riis: Typical Tory respect for the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: Those last remarks will probably be a triumph of *Hansard* over television. The Hon. Member for Gander—Twillingate.

Oral Questions

ATLANTIC CANADA OPPORTUNITIES AGENCY

VETTING OF APPLICATIONS

Mr. George Baker (Gander—Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, all applications of over $1 million to the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency have to go to a board. Unfortunately the members of that board who decide on the applications over $1 million are, in some cases, the very people who are applying for the money.

Is the Government aware of this? Is the Government aware of the fact that the Minister in charge of ACOA, Senator Lowell Murray, is going about actively encouraging board members to apply to themselves for money, and then rejecting their offers to resign, and that some board members make the ultimate sacrifice and absent themselves temporarily from a board meeting while their applications are being dealt with by their seat-mates?

Is this an ethical manner in which to be distributing government funds?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, you can see the increasing difficulties of getting independent people from the private sector to act on boards or agencies as their public duty when this type of insinuation is made about them.

The Atlantic Canada Opportunities Board has adopted rules for cases of potential conflict of interest. The rule is that any member who has an actual or potential conflict of interest in respect to any matter, issue, application, or project that comes before the board shall immediately declare such conflict of interest and remove himself or herself from discussion, consideration, deliberation or review of the subject matter, issue, application, or matter.

That is what happens with the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and the Atlantic Enterprise Board. There have been no violations of those rules, they are perfectly proper rules, and they have been carried out.

May I also point out to the House that on a region wide basis ACOA is receiving and processing ten times as many applications for aid as were handled by all its predecessors together, and has spent or committed a total of $200 million to date in the four Atlantic provinces. It is becoming the most widely used federal program ever put in place in that region, despite the opposition of the Liberal Opposition, and the Senate, which is also controlled by the Liberal Party.

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT AMEND BILL

Mr. George Baker (Gander—Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, several ACOA board members, such as Dorothy Sutherland from Nova Scotia, Donald Deacon and Francis MacAulay of Prince Edward Island have stated that it is a conflict of interest. Ms. Sutherland stated: "It would never enter my mind to apply to myself for money". Other board members who applied for money and got it said that they did so with the encouragement of the Minister.

Is the Government aware that Mr. David Ganong, part owner of Ganong Brothers of New Brunswick, resigned last month, not because he had received a $75,000 grant for his company to modernize from ACOA, but because he had submitted a further application, to use his words, "for several millions of dollars"? Is this Minister aware that the Senator in charge then phoned him and said that it was not necessary to resign from the board of which he was a member while his application was being processed? Will the Government amend that Bill, sew up that gigantic loophole, and censure that Senator?

• (1500)

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, there are several dozens of private citizens who are on the boards of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and the Atlantic Enterprise Institute. In every case they have followed and are following the conflict of interest directions and rules.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: I am not going to be shouted down, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Tobin: Utter foolishness!

Mr. Crosbie: I am asked this question. I am entitled to answer it. The reputations of these people are at stake.

Miss MacDonald: They just think it is slander.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has allowed the Hon. Member to put a complex question, and to put it in considerable length. I think that Hon. Members ought also to give the Minister a chance to give it an appropriate reply. The Hon. Minister has the floor.

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the case of Mr. Ganong, he wrote a Member of the Upper House, Senator Murray, who is in charge of the agency, and told him that he had a major proposal going before ACAO for consideration and before the AEB, a large project that would involve his active and personal involvement. Under those circumstances he thought that he should submit his resignation.

The Senator wrote back to him in a letter dated April 7 regretting that he was tendering his resignation, pointing out that the rules did not require him to resign but stating that in view of the circumstances and the fact that the primary responsibility for carrying the application would fall to him as President, he thought in all the circumstances he could not disagree with his suggestion that he should resign. That is the record of this transaction, which is perfectly proper.

Might I just finally say that the Atlantic Provinces Chamber of Commerce has called for this Bill to be passed as it is, and

does not want any further delay by the Liberal Senate and the Liberal Opposition who voted against it on third reading in this House. It is the most successful agency ever to crop up in Atlantic Canada from the Government of Canada. The jealousy and determination to gut it by Members opposite are resented by everyone in the region.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

IMMIGRATION

DELAY IN PROCESSING REFUGEE STATUS CLAIMS

Mr. John Oostrom (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration. Some lawyers are claiming that delays in Canada's refugee process are resulting in the arrest and sometimes even the murder of relatives of individuals who are presently in Canada awaiting authorization of their claims. What can the Minister do to prevent more refugees from being hurt?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat sorry to read about the statement that they had made in the paper, for two reasons. First, in many urgent cases we have helped people who have approached our office when we felt there was an urgent case to be made. I would encourage people to continue to do that. In fact, I think some of the people in that group have done that.

We have also said, and I think it is pretty clear from the article, that we are trying to speed up the process through Bill C-55 and Bill C-84 so that we can deal with these things more expeditiously.

Bill C-55 and Bill C-84 are linked in substance. However, we need Bill C-55, which is now in the other place, in order to resolve this sort of problem.

Let me just say finally that I met with a group of immigration lawyers last week, one of whom had signed that letter and was quoted in that article, and it was not raised with me at that time as an urgent matter, which I also find somewhat disappointing.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor. These will be the last questions in Question Period.

* * *

NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD

REQUEST THAT CABINET REVIEW DECISION ON NATURAL GAS EXPORTS

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, if it is possible to draw him back to his seat for a moment.

The Minister said in his answer with respect to Pan-Alberta Gas that this issue would come to Cabinet shortly. In view of the fact that under the trade deal there is a lock-in clause in the event of shortages for the proportion of petroleum and natural gas and other energy products which we ship to the United States, will the Minister see to it that there is a full review by Cabinet of this issue? Will he see to it that there is full security for Canadian consumers guaranteed by the decision in the review by Cabinet when it takes place?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the free trade agreement in no way obligates Canadians to sell natural gas—no one is forced to sell natural gas. Exporters are free to negotiate the best commercial terms they can get. They are free to refuse to sell if they are not satisfied.

The agreement offers assurances that Canadian gas exporters can enjoy enhanced access to the U.S. market, and that when they do they will have equitable treatment by U.S. regulatory bodies.

The only situation in which there is any obligation to continue any supply whatsoever would be in the event that an emergency is declared. That responsibility is not anywhere near as onerous as the responsibility entered into by our Liberal predecessors through the International Energy Authority agreement that applies to oil.

The free trade agreement has no connection with the application that was just approved by the NEB. Therefore, it has no consequences in connection with it.

EFFECT OF CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, that statement is simply not true.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Langdon: I put this to the Minister as a question. If there is a shortage in Canada, is it not the fact that there has to be the same proportion of exports of natural gas maintained to the United States as is the case before such shortage conditions obtain? If that is true, does that not mean higher prices for Canadians and more difficult situations of shortage?

Mr. Rodriguez: Have you read that one, John?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the short answer to it is no, it is not true. As a member of the International Energy Agency we have agreed to the IEA emergency oil sharing system, something which was undertaken by our predecessor.

Mr. Foster: At 7 per cent.

Mr. Crosbie: Just listen. That could result in Canada having to increase its exports during a period of critical oil shortage. However, the free trade agreement only calls, if there is an emergency, for proportion sharing of reductions. So it is completely untrue. It is false. It is not true. There is not an ounce of truth in it. The Hon. Member is completely misled and, what is more, does not want to listen.

Mr. Althouse: You just confirmed it; you should have listened to the question.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

WITHDRAWAL OF COMMENT DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Jack Shields (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have too much respect for this House and the Members sitting in this House to allow an unparliamentary remark that I made during Question Period to stay on the record. I wish to withdraw.

Having said that, I would like to point out to the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) that his accusation about me in this House during his preamble is absolutely not true. I would certainly accept his apology for that accusation.

Some Hon. Members: That is debate.

Some Hon. Members: Withdraw!

Mr. McDermid: You made an accusation that is totally wrong.

Some Hon. Members: Withdraw!

Mr. Speaker: I want to thank the Hon. Member. I also want to say to the Hon. Member for Athabasca that I took it that he had in fact withdrawn some minutes ago. I appreciate very much his comment.

Miss MacDonald: But Gauthier did not withdraw.

• (1510)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

TABLING OF CODE OF ETHICS FOR CANADIAN ENTERPRISES IN SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. Jean-Guy Hudon (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 67(2), I wish to table in both official languages, the code of ethics for Canadian companies in South Africa.

* * *

[*English*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to 21 petitions, Nos. 332-4653, 332-4655 to 332-4664 inclusive, 332-4666, 332-4667, 332-4680 to 332-4686 inclusive and 332-4692.

While I have the floor, I would move:

That this House do now proceed to Orders of the Day.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the motion please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Deputy Government House Leader had in mind presenting a motion with respect to the votes that will be taken at 5.45 p.m. and thereafter today. Has he abandoned that idea or does he intend to proceed?

Mr. Lewis: I have not abandoned the idea. I thought once the Table had called Orders of the Day and immediately prior to the ruling by the Speaker on the acceptability of the motions, I would place this motion so that everybody would know where they stood.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I would like to seek some clarification. We have received communiqués from a number of government Departments today saying that there would be a call for the production of papers during Routine Proceedings. We have been expecting to discuss that and yet it seems that the Government has decided to move directly to Orders of the

Day. Will there be an opportunity to fulfil the requests of various government officials that we discuss this today?

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Hudon) contacted me prior to Question Period and advised me that papers would be produced pursuant to a motion that I have had on the Order Paper since the March 1. The Government seems to have its wires crossed.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, so that the record is clear on that point of order, we have tried for several weeks to find a Member present in the House or have somebody delegated so that we could indeed produce those papers.

An Hon. Member: That is not true.

Mr. Hawkes: I think the record will show that we have tried every Wednesday for several weeks in a row.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, we expected to get to the point where the Government indicates responses to Questions on the Order Paper. We were notified that the Government was going to provide a response to a Question on the Order Paper by the Hon. Member for New Westminster—Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett). The media has already presented me with that information.

In other words, one of the national newspapers of Canada received the information that the Hon. Member for New Westminster—Coquitlam requested prior to it being tabled in the House of Commons. I was going to raise that when we got to it in the normal point in Routine Proceedings.

Since the Government decided not to have Routine Proceedings, I felt that this was the only time to raise this. It is a very serious breach of privilege in that the media apparently is being presented or given material—confidential material—prior to it being tabled in the House of Commons and prior to the Hon. Member requesting the information receiving said information. I wanted to raise that. It is a very serious point of order.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I was apprised earlier this day that this point of order might indeed be raised. I would point out that the Government has not yet responded to the question in the House and that when Members opposite see the Government's response to the question they may choose to raise a point of order at that point or they may choose not to. It is my understanding that perhaps the press does have access to the information, but I am not sure that they have access to the answer to the question which the Member opposite asked. The information available to me says there is some difference in what the press may have. It is a draft possible answer.

Mr. Speaker: I will hear the Hon. Member for Skeena in a moment. I may not have completely understood the position of the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap. The Chair took it that what he is saying is that some information was given out which would have, in the normal course of proceedings, been given here in the Chamber, but was given out by the Government to the media. Is that the accusation, if I can put it that way?

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the situation. It is a very serious breach of traditions of the House when members of the media are receiving confidential information destined for a specific Member prior to it being tabled. This is the first opportunity I have had to raise this. It was in the hands of the media last night when it was supposed to be tabled in the House of Commons today.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify what the Parliamentary Secretary seemed to be alluding to. I have been here in the House every day this week. You could check *Hansard*. I was in the House every day last week except for Tuesday, when I was in Hull the whole of the day with the standing committee dealing with Bill C-31 in its final report.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, the House Leader of the New Democratic Party has raised the issue of the answer to a question. I would indicate that after we are on Orders of the Day, with the unanimous consent of the House, I would be very happy to table the answer to the Member's question. Then he would have a chance to look at that and see whether or not he wants to pursue a question at a later stage.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I assume that the Deputy House Leader for the Government wanted us to force a vote on this move, to go directly to Government Orders so that we could take up time this afternoon so that the Government would not have to listen to the debates by the various back-benchers against the language legislation. Since we have agreed to go directly to Orders of the Day, we are looking forward to hearing some of these Neanderthal points of view put forward by Members of the Conservative Party.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap and the Parliamentary Secretary could assist the Chair. I take it that there was a suggestion made by the Parliamentary Secretary that if there was consent, he would produce the particular matter which has been the subject of discussion. It would seem to the Chair that that might be helpful. If it was agreed, that could be done right now and then we would just carry on as we have been. As I indicated, that would take consent.

• (1520)

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to achieve is to get Orders of the Day called so that report stage of Bill C-72 is called and before the House. Once that takes place we can have unanimous consent if the House wishes. It is key to us that we get on to that debate.

Mr. Speaker: I think the Chair did call Orders of the Day. My position is that we have reached Orders of the Day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-72, an Act respecting the status and use of the official languages of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

Mr. Speaker: It may be that Hon. Members may want to return to the matter that we have been discussing a little later. In the meantime, I think it would be appropriate to proceed.

As Hon. Members will know, there have been a great many amendments proposed and presented to the Table. I think I should say that with the number of amendments proposed this has naturally created a very heavy workload for table officers and the Chair. Hon. Members will know, and I am sure will be co-operative in understanding that every effort has been made to deal with this extensive number of amendments in order to allow the Chair to make a ruling at this time which will assist us in dealing with them.

I want to say to Hon. Members, because there has been a constantly changing situation in this matter in that a number of amendments have been withdrawn, that the Chair is reading from a transcript of material prepared earlier today which has been modified by hand throughout the Question Period. It will take some time to read all of it, and I know Hon. Members will co-operate with the Chair when it is understood that changes have been made right up until a few moments ago.

This ruling is with reference to report stage of Bill C-72, an Act respecting the status and use of the official languages of Canada. As of six o'clock p.m. last night, there were 114 motions in amendment on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-72, an Act respecting the status and use of the official languages of Canada. Since last night, 23 motions in amendment have been withdrawn, but I have asked that the original numbering be left in place so as to avoid confusion. Those withdrawn since the Order Paper was printed last night—I will be setting them out, but before I do I want Hon. Members and the public who may be watching this to understand that it is not the Chair's duty nor authority to reject or accept amendments on the basis of their substance. Those rulings have to be made on a procedural basis only.

Second, when we have an extensive number of amendments and the Chair has to make this ruling, it may seem to some Hon. Members or to the public watching that just a lot of figures are being quoted. There may be a natural curiosity as to what each one of these amendments consists of, but it is important that all Hon. Members and the public watching understand that it is not the place of the Chair in this ruling to comment upon, to explain or to try to explain what the substance of these particular amendments might be. This is a procedural ruling. All Hon. Members will, of course, have access immediately, as these numbers are read out, to what those amendments are and the substance of them. It is important as much as possible that people understand what we are doing in this place at this particular time.

Those motions, or in common parlance, those amendments withdrawn since the Order Paper was printed last night are the following: 1, 4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 16A, 17, 18, 20, 20A, 31, 36—

Some Hon. Members: Hold it.

Mr. Speaker: I invite Hon. Members, if I am moving too fast, to indicate that I am, and I have that indication. I will back up a bit. I will continue with 20A, 31, 36, 38, 53, 65, 73, 102A, 109, 117, 124, 132 and 134.

May I proceed?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: A number of motions in amendment to Bill C-72 propose to delete clauses or parts of clauses. In other words, those amendments do not do other than ask that this House, if it gets to vote on these amendments to take parts of the Bill out. Some of these motions, if adopted, might have the effect of altering the principle of the Bill. However, it is a well established practice that such motions, notwithstanding their impact on the principle of the Bill, are allowable at this stage for this is the only method by which Members can debate these clauses.

Again I want it clearly understood by all Hon. Members and the public that I am dealing in procedural terms. I am not dealing, nor am I sitting in judgment on the substantive effect of any amendment. That is for the House to do at the appropriate time. What I am saying here is that we have had a tradition in this House where at this stage of proceedings the Chair will allow amendments that delete in the interests of allowing debate on a substantive matter at the appropriate time. That principle applies to this Bill just as much as it does to any other Bill. As your Speaker I have an obligation to ensure that that procedural principle applies to all Bills no matter what their substance may be.

• (1530)

Consequently, this ruling will deal with Motions Nos. 1A, 2, 2A, 2B, 5 to 8 inclusive, 11, 12, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24A, 25 to 28 inclusive, 28A 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38A, 39, 41 to 45 inclusive, 45A, 46, 47, 49, 52, 59, 60, 61, 70, 72, 74, 76, 79, 80, 84 to 93 inclusive, 95, 96, 96A, 97 to 102 inclusive, 103, 104, 106, 106A, 107 to 110 inclusive, 112, 114, 115, 115A, 120 to 123 inclusive, 125 to 131 inclusive, 133, 135 and 136.

Motions Nos. 1A, 2, 2A and 2B all deal with the purpose of the Act and will be grouped for debate and voted on separately.

[*Translation*]

Motions numbered 5 and 7, which deal with the Interpretation section of the Bill, will be grouped for debate and will be voted on separately.

[*English*]

Motion No. 8 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Fundy Royal (Mr. Corbett) causes the Chair concern because it is contradictory of an earlier part of Clause 3.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think that is a withdrawn motion according to the information you gave us earlier. You may not have to rule on it, because according to the first list you gave us, No. 8 was withdrawn.

Some Hon. Members: No, it wasn't.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary and I will—

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I apologize.

Mr. Speaker: Just so that we do keep the record straight, the Parliamentary Secretary is now indicating, I think, that the ruling as I have been reading it is correct. The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) is in accord with that?

Mr. Gauthier: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: I will read this again. Motion No. 8 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Fundy—Royal causes the Chair concern because it is contradictory of an earlier part of Clause 3. Again, I say to Hon. Members and to the public watching this that we are dealing here with procedural matters. Hon. Members have in front of them all of these motions. It is not the place of the Speaker, nor could I possibly do so at this time, to try to explain what each one of these motions was or, for that matter, to read them, but they are available and are in front of Hon. Members at this time.

Citation 773(2) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition reads as follows:

> An amendment must not be inconsistent with, or contradictory to, the bill as so far agreed to by the committee, nor must it be inconsistent with a decision which the committee has given upon a former amendment.

For this reason, I must advise the Hon. Member for Fundy—Royal that the Chair has no alternative but to rule Motion No. 8 out of order.

Motion No. 11 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart), Motion No. 12 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington (Mr. Vankoughnet) and Motion No. 39 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Fundy—Royal cause the Chair difficulty because they go against the principle of the Bill as the Bill was adopted at second reading and as set out in the purpose clause of Bill C-72. This is contrary to citation 773(1) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition. In addition, Motion No. 39 is contrary to Clause 34 as that clause was amended in committee. For these reasons, the Chair has no choice but to rule Motions Nos. 11, 12 and 39 out of order.

[*Translation*]

Motion numbered 19 deals with the Administration of Justice part of the Bill. It will be debated and voted on separately.

[*English*]

Motion No. 21 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Fundy—Royal causes problems for the Chair in that it is beyond the scope of the Bill, contrary to citation 773(1) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition. After consideration, I have no choice but to rule Motion No. 21 out of order.

Motions Nos. 22, 23, 24A, 25, 26 and 29 which seek to amend the part of the Bill on communications with and services to the public will be grouped for debate and voted on as follows:

(a) A vote on Motion No. 22 will dispose of Motions Nos. 23 and 29;

(b) Motions Nos. 24A, 25 and 26 will be voted on separately.

Motions Nos. 27, 28, 28A, 30, 32 and 33 all deal with regulations in relation to communications with and service to the public. They will be grouped for debate and voted on as follows:

• (1540)

(a) Motion No. 27 will be voted on separately;

(b) an affirmative vote on Motion No. 28 will obviate the need for a vote on Motion No. 28A. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 28 will necessitate a vote on Motion No. 28A;

(c) Motion No. 30 will be voted on separately; and

(d) an affirmative vote on Motion No. 32 obviates the necessity of a vote on Motion No. 33. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 32 necessitates a vote on Motion No. 33.

[*Translation*]

Motions numbered 34 to 61 deal with the Language of Work. After careful consideration, the Chair is of the opinion that debate on proposed motions to this section of the Bill should be divided in three groups as follows:

(a) motions 34 to 47 on Rights Relating to Language of Work, Duties of the Government and Regions of Canada prescribed; and

(b) motion 49 on Minimum and additional duties in prescribed regions and motions 59, 60 and 61 on Special duties for institutions directing or providing services to others and regulations.

[*English*]

The Chair will now deal with group (a). Motions 34 to 47 will be grouped for debate and voted on as follows:

(a) an affirmative vote on Motion No. 34 obviates the need for a vote on Motions No. 35 and 37. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 34 necessitates a vote on Motion numbered 35;

(b) an affirmative vote on Motion No. 35 obviates the need for a vote on Motion No. 37. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 35 necessitates a vote on Motion No. 37;

(c) an affirmative vote on Motion No. 37 obviates the necessity of a vote on Motion No. 38A. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 37 necessitates a vote on Motion No. 38A;

(d) Motion No. 39 was ruled out of order earlier;

(e) an affirmative vote on Motion No. 41 obviates the necessity of a vote on Motions No. 44 and 45. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 41 necessitates a vote on Motion No. 44;

(f) an affirmative vote on Motion No. 44 obviates the necessity of a vote on Motion No. 45. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 44 necessitates a vote on Motion No. 45;

(g) Motions No;. 42, 43, 45A, 46 and 47 will be voted on separately.

[*Translation*]

The Chair will now deal with group (b).

Motions numberd 49, 52, 59, 60 and 61 will be grouped for debate and voted on separately.

Motions numbered 70, 72 and 74 all deal with the Participation of English-Speaking and French-Speaking Canadians part of the Bill. They will be grouped for debate and voted on separately.

Motions numbered 76, 79 and 80 all deal with the Advancement of English and French part of the Bill. They will be grouped for debate and voted on as follows: (a) motions numbered 76 and 79 will be voted on separately; and (b) motion numbered 80, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington (Mr. Vankoughnet), is identical to motion numbered 79 and will not, therefore, be selected and put to the House.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 96A, 97, 98, 99, 100 and 101 all deal with the Commissioner of Official Languages part of the Bill. They will grouped for debate and voted on as follows:

(a) Motion No. 85 will be voted on separately;

(b) Motion No. 84, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart), is identical to Motion No. 85 and will not, therefore, be selected and put to the House.

(c) Motions No. 86, 87, 88, 90, 91, 92, and 93 will be voted on separately;

(d) Motion No. 89, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, is identical to Motion No. 88 and will not, therefore, be selected and put to the House;

(e) an affirmative vote on Motion No. 95 obviates the necessity of a vote on Motion No. 96. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 95 necessitates a vote on Motion No. 96;

(f) Motion No. 96A, 97 and 100 will be voted on separately;

(g) Motion No. 98, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Simcoe South, and Motion No. 99, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, are identical to Motion No. 97 and will not, therefore, be selected and put to the House; and

(h) Motion No. 101, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, is identical to Motion No. 100 and will not, therefore, be selected and put to the House.

Motions No. 102, 103, 104, 106, 106A, 107 and 108 all deal with the Court Remedy part of the Bill. They will be grouped for debate and voted on separately.

[*Translation*]

Motions numbered 110, 112, 114, 115 and 115a all deal with the General part of the Bill. They will be grouped for debate and voted on as follows: (a) motions numbered 110, 112 and 114 will be voted on separately; and (b) an affirmative vote on motion numbered 115 obviates the necessity of a vote on motion numbered 115a. However, a negative vote on motion numbered 115 necessitates the question being put on motion numbered 115a.

[*English*]

Motion No. 120 deals with the Related Amendments section of the Bill. It will be debated and voted on separately.

Motion No. 121 deals with the Consequential Amendments part of the Bill. It will be debated and voted on separately.

Motion No. 122 deals with the Transitional Provisions, Repeal and Coming Into Force part of the Bill. It will be debated and voted on separately.

Motions No. 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134 and 136 all deal with the Preamble.

• (1550)

They will be grouped for debate and voted on as follows:

(a) Motions No. 123, 125, 126 and 127 will be voted on separately;

(b) An affirmative vote on Motion No. 128 obviates the necessity of a vote on Motion No. 129. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 128 necessitates a vote on Motion No. 129;

(c) Motion No. 130 will be voted on separately;

(d) An affirmative vote on Motion No. 131 obviates the necessity of a vote on Motion No. 133. However, a negative

vote on Motion No. 131 necessitates a vote on Motion No. 133;

(e) Motion No. 136 will be voted on separately.

Motion No. 135, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, causes the Chair procedural difficulty in that it is beyond the scope of the Bill, contrary to citation 773(1) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition. For this reason, the Chair has no choice but to declare the motion out of order.

Before I put the motions to the House, I want to say to Hon. Members that the Table and the officers charged with the obligations of handling a complex matter like this are very appreciative of the co-operation that was extended to all of them by all of the Hon. Members involved. I want to say from the chair that that has made it a lot easier.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I want to emphasize again that in these deliberations in which we have taken some minutes, I am making rulings on the procedural acceptability of certain amendments and I am dealing procedurally with how they will be debated. It is not for the Chair to consider the substance of these amendments, that is for the House to do. The obligation of the Chair is to be sure that this House can deal with amendments put by Hon. Members to Bills in a proper and appropriate way.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I think I would be safe in saying that I speak for all Members of the House when I thank you for the care that you have taken with the judgment and also to the Table for their efforts in this matter.

My hon. friend, the House Leader of the Official Opposition, alluded to a motion which we had discussed earlier. I wish to put it at this time. There have been consultations among the Parties with respect to the votes this evening and I think you would find consent for the following motion:

That at 5.45 p.m., the Speaker shall interrupt any proceedings before the House and proceed to the deferred divisions relating to second reading of Bill C-130.

Immediately after the deferred divisions on Bill C-130, leave having been given, the Speaker shall put all questions necessary to dispose of the report stage of Bill C-72.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the Parties with respect to the tabling of the report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans. I think you would find unanimous consent to move to Committee Reports in order to allow the committee report to be tabled now. I thank the Parties for their co-operation.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

PRESENTATION OF FOURTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Gerald Comeau (South West Nova): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the Fourth Report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, in both official languages.

Pursuant to Standing Order 99(2) of the House of Commons, the committee requests the Government to table a comprehensive response to this report.

A year ago all Members of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans agreed to look into the development of aquaculture in Canada. The committee decided to travel to Norway and Scotland to see recent developments made by those countries in fish farming.

On December 17, 1987, this committee presented to the House a trip report of its overseas findings. This committee then decided to visit the west coast and east coast of Canada to examine the status of the Canadian aquaculture industry. Members of the committee were pleased to learn that from a technological and scientific point of view, the aquaculture industry in Canada does not need to envy other countries.

This industry, however, needs good support in certain areas in order to be able to fully compete on the international markets. Recommendations contained in this report are tailored to make Canadians aware of the opportunities offered by this industry and to facilitate its further development.

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

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of report stage of Bill C-72, an Act respecting the status and use of the official languages of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from a Legislative Committee.

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier) moved:

Motion No. 1A

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out line 40 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"2. The purpose of this Act is to reinforce the present laws of Canada relating the official languages to:"

Official Languages Act

[*English*]

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg—Assiniboine) moved:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out line 45 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"institutions, wherever it is reasonable to do so in the circumstances in particular with respect to".

Motion No. 2A

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out lines 2 to 5 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"administration of justice and in communicating with or providing services to the public;"

Motion No. 2B

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out lines 8 and 9 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"ties and maintain the use of the English and French".

• (1600)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to join all my colleagues in congratulating the Clerks of the House for spending a large part of their weekend studying, working and writing their recommendations on the 136 or so amendments that have been tabled.

During the Committee study, Mr. Speaker, Government Members proposed amending the purpose of the Bill and deleting from it some words that I consider very important. The purpose of my amendment is quite simply to restore the wording of the original Bill tabled in this House on June 25, 1987; that is, the purpose of the Act would read as follows:

The purpose of this Act is to extend the present laws of Canada relating to official languages to ensure respect for English and French as the official languages of Canada and ensure equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all federal institutions, in particular with respect to their use in parliamentary proceedings, in legislative and other instruments, . . .

And it goes on, Mr. Speaker.

The purpose of the Act, Mr. Speaker, is very important. In the debate in Committee, I said that it was perhaps the most important clause in the Bill because according to the preamble, it clearly establishes, both for Canadians and for those who will have to study and, more important, interpret this Act, that the purpose is part of it and is very useful in interpreting it. It adds no substantive rights, I admit. As I said in Committee it has symbolic value for me, but it is also extremely important because experience has shown that the purpose of the 1969 Act, Section 2, was used repeatedly by the courts for interpretation purposes, and we were told then that the purpose clause, as drafted in the 1969 Act was declaratory. It was an admirable declaration of intent, but the law had no teeth, no provisions for enforcement.

So I feel that the purpose of the act is to define and spell out the fact that the main objective of the exercise is to strengthen the Official Languages Act; not another act, but that one in particular. Let us be specific, let us say it plainly! To my mind, this is one way of emphasizing the importance of the Act. I also have a great deal of respect for the Interpretation Act. I am not a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, but I know that the Interpretation Act (Chap. I-23) also recognizes the importance of the purpose of an act. The text reads as follows:

"Every enactment shall be deemed remedial, and shall be given such fair, large and liberal construction and interpretation as best ensures the attainment of its objects."

To understand clearly what the Act wants to accomplish or correct, we cannot ignore its purpose, hence its importance. Thus, the interpretation value of the purpose clause clarifies and may support the other provisions of an act. That is why I have tabled a single amendment, Mr. Speaker: this one. It is because I wanted, in the short time allotted to us, to put as much strength and passion into my arguments as I could, as I wanted to see the Government's own original idea put back into the Bill, and have it state clearly and lucidly, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the purpose of the Act was indeed to strengthen federal legislation on official languages.

There is no doubt whatsoever as far as that is concerned. It is inherently important because it has repercussions on all of the other clauses of the Bill. For instance, if there were some interpretation problem with a given section, a judge could give it a broader reading if the Act contained a purpose that warranted it. That was the case with the purpose of the Official Languages Act before the Conservatives sabotaged it. The effect of such a clause is to prevent overly restrictive interpretations such as the one that was made in the "*Société des Acadiens du Nouveau-Brunswick*" decision, wherein the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that the right to use one of the two official languages before the courts did not include the right to be understood by those courts. In fact, Clause 16 of the Bill we have before us today corrects that flaw by clearly imposing on judges the obligation of understanding the language of the proceedings without the assistance of an interpreter. The purpose of the Act is, then, to strengthen the Official Languages Act.

Mr. Speaker, I have here before me an interpretation method, the grammatical method, the teleological method. I will not read it because I will run out of time, but I want to refer Members to the Interpretation Act of Canada where they will see how important it is that the purpose section of an Act be clear and precise, so that the judiciary and the people are given an absolutely unequivocal statement of the intent of the legislator.

The amendment I have just moved is not revolutionary. Quite the opposite! It simply repeats the wording the Government had in its Bill for almost a year, wording that was removed—as we all know—to please a small group of Conservative Members who did not like the English translation. I

am sorry, but I did not translate the text. They do not like the word "extend". My colleague from Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault) will I hope be introducing an amendment soon to correct the English text that was tabled. My intention was to restore in its entirety the wording the Government had proposed, that is to say that in English one would read:

[*English*]

> 2. The purpose of this Act is to extend the present laws of Canada relating to official languages . . .

That is the original wording in the Bill introduced by the Government in June, 1987. I think that it says—

[*Translation*]

in French clearly that the purpose is to strengthen and

[*English*]

If people do not like the word "extend", and I understand that there was some confusion, because it was even translated in my own office as "reinforce". I do not think that the word "reinforce" is appropriate. My colleague, the Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault), will move an amendment to reinstate the word "extend", which I understand is the correct English expression. Not being a specialist in those terms, Mr. Speaker, I will say nothing further.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the tendency of Canadian jurisprudence at the present time is to use the teleological method I referred to earlier. That is why the purpose of Bill C-72 is important in the initial version and in the amendment moved by the Member for Ottawa—Vanier, myself. I and my colleagues in the Liberal party, including the Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme), want to ensure that the Official Languages Act will be given a broad interpretation by the courts, and, I repeat, a liberal one. Hence the necessity of stating that the purpose of this Act is to strengthen the legislation on Official Languages.

For instance, if someone makes a complaint pursuant to a right granted by Bill C-72, the federal institution concerned might defend itself by saying that the situation at issue is the normal institutional practice. We have always worked that way. What do you want? That is how it works. With the purpose of the bill being to strengthen the legislation, I think that the plaintiff could rightly argue that new procedures will have to be created and that we cannot be satisfied only with what exists.

With the word "reinforce" in the purpose of the Act, it will be clear that it is not the status quo, but rather a big step forward. The original version of clause 2 of Bill C-72, my amendment, represents a quantum leap, an obligation to do more, and that is what we want, Madam Speaker.

The Liberal amendment, as I just said, simply restores the Government's wording. I do not see why the Government, which was deceived by its backbenchers who said that if they were granted some amendments, they would vote for or support the Bill . . . They did not do so, Madam Speaker, and the Government was had in this deal. And I say to the Government that since that is so, since your recalcitrant caucus members do not want to play the game, let us restore the original wording of the Bill and we will vote for it.

• (1610)

[*English*]

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs): Madam Speaker, I gather that I am speaking to my amendment now.

I would like to point out and explain why so many amendments were tabled. We felt because a great number of witnesses who wished to appear before the committee, which was considerable—and they were very important witnesses from very important organizations, legal societies and individuals—were denied an opportunity to appear before that committee, we did not support the committee's decision that it would not travel.

This particular piece of legislation has caused great and serious concern right across the country. I can tell you, Madam Speaker, that it has very little support across Canada, especially western Canada. More time should have been spent hearing witnesses. It was a very serious error to deny all these responsible people a chance to appear. That was one of the main reasons why we had to table a number of amendments.

I would also like to point out that there is a theory among many Members in the House, which has been around a long time, that any time a language Bill comes up or anything to do with language, not one Member of Parliament is to question it. One cannot ask a question or make a statement about it. One cannot propose an amendment to it. If one does then immediately one is slandering. I do not mind being slandered, but I do not like my constituents being slandered, and Canadians being slandered because they ask questions about Bill C-72. I think that the comments that are being made by many Members of Parliament here daily about Canadians who would dare ask a question about official languages or any language Bill are absolutely insulting and intolerable. I will speak up for them at any time. No one will stop me with their name calling. I will try to be as constructive as I possibly can at all times.

With respect to the amendment, Motion No. 2, the clause would read:

> The purpose of this Act is to
>
> (a) ensure respect for English and French as the official languages of Canada and ensure equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all federal institutions, wherever it is reasonable to do so in the circumstances.

This amendment would prevent the emphasizing and the segregating of certain institutions, for example, a parliamentary proceeding. This amendment would also ensure that only where it is reasonable to do so would both languages get absolute equality of use. This amendment seeks to prevent a

great deal of superfluous work that would have to be done to ensure that the strict wording of the Bill was followed.

My Motion No. 2A amends Clause 2, lines two to five. Clause 2(a) would read:

—legislative and other instruments, in the administration of justice and in communicating with or providing services to the public.

This amendment would delete from Clause 2(a) the words "and in carrying out the work of federal institutions". This amendment would allow the merit system to become intact, allowing hiring and promotion in the Public Service to be done on the basis of qualifications and experience rather than official language spoken. It would also close the floodgates on the interpretation of language of work of federal institutions. As the Bill stands, it is far too open-ended.

The reason we have to give serious consideration to the return of the merit system is because we had a recent case in Vancouver in which a civil servant was in line for a promotion. He was denied promotion because somebody here in Ottawa decided overnight to designate the senior position bilingual. This unilingual English-speaking Canadian was fully qualified for the job. The only way he could get his promotion was to hire lawyers and go to court to fight for his promotion. That is not acceptable to me or to the Canadian people. In this case the judge ruled in his favour. He said that there was no evidence presented that, overnight, this position in Vancouver had to be bilingual. He said it was inexcusable for the Government to be designating this position bilingual overnight. The man has been granted his promotion.

Another concern is that the Government has not responded to that court ruling. We do not know whether more and more unilingual Canadians are going to have to hire lawyers to go to court to get their promotions or not. If this is going to be the procedure from now on, then the Government is going to have to look to providing for compensation for individuals who are going to have to hire lawyers to get a job or to go to court for a promotion.

With my amendment, Motion No. 2B, the clause would read:

—support the development of English and French linguistic minority communities and maintain the use of the English and French languages within Canadian society;

This amendment would state that a purpose of the Act is to "maintain" the use of the English and French languages in Canadian society rather than "generally advance the equality of status and use" of these languages. Purposeful advancement of either language would result in discrimination of one of them. Maintenance of both languages would ensure that both remain a part of Canadian society, but are not waged against each other.

I think that this is an important amendment. For example, there was a recent case involving an Anglophone who was running the post office in Otter Lake for 10 months. She could handle the work in French. She could speak reasonable French but all of a sudden Canada Post decided that it would give this individual a language diagnostic analysis. It was found out that her French was not perfect. Thus she was fired.

There is a double standard here. I do not want to get into naming the other side. I have never heard of any people on the other side being fired because they cannot speak perfect English.

Even the French-Canadian community in Otter Lake took up her cause. They were out marching on the street trying to convince Canada Post to give her job back. Not everyone can reach level C French and not everyone can reach level C English.

As far as I am concerned, no one should be fired from their job in this country because they cannot speak perfect English or perfect French.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Madam Speaker, a number of amendments have been proposed here. One by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier), is aimed at reinforcing Bill C-72 by reinstating wording that was dropped from the Bill during consideration in committee.

The other amendments, Madam Speaker, were approved by members of the Group of Fifteen, the dinosaurs, the Tory backbenchers who objected to the principal contained in Bill C-72. I deeply regret the fact that these Members submitted these amendments, because I believe that the split in the Conservative Caucus has been very damaging, not just to the Progressive Conservative Party but also to our country.

I believe the concept of bilingualism, adopted unanimously in 1969 by all political Parties in this Parliament, is very important and deserves our support. I also think, Madam Speaker, that when a Government introduces this kind of policy, it is entitled at the very least to the support of all its Ministers and parliamentary secretaries, including the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie) who just spoke and who is Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs.

Motion No. 2 and Motion No. 2A standing in the name of this Member would have the effect of weakening the Bill's statement of purpose. Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, because of time allocation, I will not have a chance to speak to the other amendments proposed by this Member and by his colleagues who are of the same persuasion. However, my point is that all these amendments are not just minor changes or adjustments. They are major changes.

I will give you an example. In the amendment he just moved, the Hon. Member wants to strike out "and in carying out the work of federal institutions".

In the present legislation, of which Bill C-72 is an extension, it is clear that the objective is to maintain or enhance or reinforce the use of both official languages, not just when the federal Government communicates with or provides services to

the public but also in carrying out the work of federal institutions. That is a very important principle, and it has had the effect of giving Anglophones and Francophones equal status within the Public Service. Before 1969 that did not exist.

Madam Speaker, I am sure you remember when, for instance at CN, everything was in English, and when government cheques were in English only. All that has changed.

An Hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cassidy: Other things still need to be changed, but we have nevertheless made a big step forward.

However, whether French or English speaking and whatever their language of work, young people are still unsure about finding a job in the government of Canada. Madam Speaker, this is a principle I cannot accept. But this is what the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Assiniboine is proposing.

As I said, I deeply regret the statement made by this Hon. Member. Madam Speaker, I deplore that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) is keeping silent. He has not condemned the very negative and destructive series of amendments put forward by many of the government Members. I am sorry that the Secretary of State (Mr. Bouchard) failed to intervene, in spite of his responsibilities towards bilingualism, and that he chose to go on holidays instead of getting involved in this matter in order to give some leadership.

• (1620)

[*English*]

Mr. Cooper: Madam Speaker, on two separate occasions within the last couple of minutes the Member has made reference to the absence of Members of this House, and that is clearly against the Standing Orders. I would ask that the Chair bring that to his attention.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I am sure that the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) does know the normal way of the House, which is not to mention the presence or absence of Hon. Members, but what I have heard, in French, was not the Hon. Member mentioning the presence or absence in the House of Hon. Members. This is what I have heard. This is why I did not make any comment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Cassidy: Thank you, Madam Speaker, if I have referred to a member absent from the House, I made a mistake. I wanted to refer to the silence of the Secretary of State on this matter and to the fact that the government seems to be tolerating the behaviour of some of its important members, and even some of its ministers, allowing them to take a stand against a basic policy of the government.

Madam Speaker, our time is limited, but I would also like to mention an issue which seems to be of concern to Canadians, the problems facing the language teachers who have now been on strike or locked out for a period of eight to nine months, who are being asked by the Treasury Board to work five more hours a week and who would see their capability to teach in both official languages diminished. The four amendments in front of us do not directly, but indirectly, relate to that clause. The member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) wants to know if we think the Act must ensure the strenghtening of the equal status of both languages, Madam Speaker, and that is a very important matter. On the one hand, the government says he is for the official languages principle, but, on the other hand, he does nothing to implement this principle and does not react to the concerns of the French speaking community, and of Quebeckers. But when the defender of the rights of the French-speaking Canadians, the new minister who has just joined us, keeps quiet on this issue, I think we are entitled to ask ourselves some questions and to feel concerned, Madam Speaker.

[*English*]

I just want to say, finally, that in the committee a substantial number of adjustments and changes were made to this Bill. They were made in an effort to try to accommodate some of the concerns that have been expressed by different Members, including some constituents in my riding of Ottawa Centre, and there was an honest effort at compromise and in finding constructive solutions to the concerns being expressed by members from the Conservative back benches and from time to time by constituents of mine in Ottawa Centre or elsewhere.

To come at the last minute with this lengthy series of amendments, which at one time or another suggested that the Armed Forces should be English only, that the National Capital Region's language of work should be English, that the basic commitment to bilingualism should be reversed or should be undermined, at a time when we know that it is fundamental to our country and fundamental to keeping the country together, is not playing fair.

I hope that Canadians who are watching this debate realize what we are talking about here. This began as an effort by the Government, I believe, to reinforce the principle of official bilingualism. Unfortunately, it has turned into a sorry and distressing and regrettable affair in which one is forced to question the commitment of the Government to the concept and principle of bilingualism because of the degree to which they have allowed two messages to go out.

When the Member for Winnipeg—Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie) presents himself in the election next time, will he be supporting the Government's policy of bilingualism or will he in fact be against? No matter how he votes tonight or how he votes tomorrow, a Parliamentary Secretary, without being disciplined, will have been allowed to have raised serious questions which indicate that he is not at all in sympathy with the basic tenet of government policy, and that I believe to be unacceptable.

I think I would apply the same comments to one of the Vice-Chairmen of the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages, who is another of this group of 15 back-benchers

opposed to bilingualism. I think he too, particularly since the position is that of the vice-chairmanship of the Official Languages Committee, should retire himself from those particular functions.

• (1630)

As far as back-benchers are concerned, Madam Speaker, I am not sure whether or not they could be disciplined without being kicked out of the caucus. I think, however, that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the Secretary of State (Mr. Bouchard), who is responsible for bilingualism, should surely by now in a week have been able to stand up and say directly, not indirectly, that they did not agree and that they condemn those interventions which are so harmful to the Party, to our Parliament and to this country.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the report stage debate dealing with the amendments that have been put forward by the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) and the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie).

I find it rather ironic that after all of the rhetoric in the House over the course of the last few days the first motion we are debating is the one put forward by the Member from Ottawa—Vanier. Here is a person who sat diligently during the course of the committee proceedings, had opportunities to deal with every facet of the Bill and had co-operation. I thought he would be the last person to come forward with amendments at report stage, but that, I guess, is a commentary of what goes on in this House from time to time.

Let me simply refresh the memories of Hon. Members and Canadians generally with respect to this legislation. Bill C-72 was introduced by this Government as a follow-up to a commitment made in the Speech from the Throne, one which has been given substantial and absolute support not only by the Government of this country but by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) giving superb leadership on the official languages policy in Canada both as Prime Minister and while Leader of the Opposition. This legislation was brought forward on June 25, 1987, a year ago.

I suppose it is a piece of legislation that has received the most intensive examination of any in the course of this Parliament. It has been scrutinized and examined by Members of Parliament and by the public at large. Representations have been made. But when all is said and done, I think the response to this Bill by editorialists across the country and by people from coast to coast from Newfoundland to British Columbia to the territories can be described as fair, equitable and very much in Canada's national interest.

The Bill itself is a response to our obligation as parliamentarians to deal in a legislative way as a result of constitutional provisions. Language provisions are the most entrenched parts of our Constitution. We are a country in which there are two official languages, and it is important for us to have legislation that recognizes and puts into effect our constitutional obligations. We come from various regions of Canada with different perspectives, but we are all interested in one Canada, a united Canada and one that reflects our heritage.

When I look at this legislation I think in terms of minority groups across the country. We have to be tolerant in the official languages policy. When we are not tolerant of any minority we are intolerant of all minorities in the country.

We have this Bill which I brought before the committee. We had a substantial number of sittings covering days, afternoons, mornings and nights. We were able to discuss in some detail various ideas both from the Government and from the Opposition. As a result of those deliberations we were able to come forward with more than 50 amendments.

What are the amendments with which the committee came forward? They had the effect of clarifying and of making more precise the meaning of the legislation. They were amendments which had the effect of making sure that fairness and equity would prevail in the application of the official languages policy in Canada. After all that is what our function as parliamentarians is all about.

We wanted to make sure, when we had the legislation, we had the best possible legislation to present to the people of Canada so that they knew in this area, as in any other area, that there would be equity of application, that the rules would be fair, and that the development of those rules would be such that they would be seen to be fair, that people would be able to understand the rules and we would be able to deliver on our commitment to make sure that, where there is significant demand, all Canadians receive, at the federal level, services by the Government of Canada in the language with which they are familiar.

What could be more reasonable than to have legislation to recognize that Canada has two official languages, that the country is one where we have a system established to ensure that the services of the Government of Canada are delivered in our official languages? I think the people of Canada understand that this legislation is fair.

An editorialist in the *Globe and Mail* described the Bill as magnificent because it is fair and does set in place reasonable rules. It is a Bill on which we worked together with all Members of Parliament to make sure that various points of view were taken into account.

We have heard statements made concerning the commitment of this Government on official languages and particularly the commitment of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney). Let me conclude my participation at this time by paying special tribute to the Prime Minister in his role on official languages in Canada. I say, and I know that this will not be seriously challenged, that the Prime Minister has been steadfast in his leadership on the official languages policy in Canada. He has demonstrated his belief in one of the fundamental principles on which he as Prime Minister and the Government operate that

there be fairness in the application of the official language policy across the country.

He faced some difficult challenges as Leader of the Opposition when an attempt was made virtually to embarrass him on the day that he arrived her as the elected Member of Parliament for Central Nova. He met that challenge head on. I say to you and to all Canadians that there is no person in this country with a better sense of fairness and equity on official languages than the Prime Minister of our country. I can say that without any fear of serious challenge. He has demonstrated time and time again that he understands this country. He has a sense of the country and is prepared to give it leadership.

This Bill is legislation that will be passed by this House. Actions speak far, far louder than words. We will have this legislation which has been considered in very great detail by Members of Parliament. We have had a chance on the part of the Government to assist as much as possible in making sure that the Bill in the form in which it has come forward does reflect the considered views of Members of Parliament from all sides of the House.

It is fine for the Member from Ottawa—Vanier to come forward and try to be purer than pure concerning Bill C-72, but I commend to Members of the House of Commons that we take the legislation as it has been reported to the House by the committee with its amendments, that it go forward from report stage in that form, that we move forward tomorrow and pass it at third reading and send it to the Senate. We can then at the earliest possible date have Royal Assent and have a fair, equitable official languages law in Canada.

• (1640)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Madam Speaker, I would like to deal more specifically with motion No. 1A on the Order Paper, which is being put forward by my colleague for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier). It aims at restoring the original wording of the Bill, that is to restore the concept that the purpose of the Government legislation now before the House is to extend the Official Languages Act.

Historically, what transpired is that the Bill included that extension concept, but before the House Committee to which the Bill was referred an amendment was introduced to take that concept out. If I understood correctly the committee proceedings, it is the Hon. Member for Charlevoix (Mr. Hamelin), who usually acts as a champion of official languages and the French language in particular who, interestingly enough—but since I did not attend the committee, I would like him to explain why he did that.

I read in the committee proceedings that he did so in a spirit of consensus in order I suppose to try and rally the most regressive Members of his party whith whom there was difficulty in committee in support of official languages. We are seeing the results. Unmoved, the dinosaurs came back with some 136 amendments they put on the Order Paper in order to try not only to completely water down the Official Languages Act, but clearly to try and kill the legislation because as we know the session already is well-advanced. We know we have very little time left, and if each of those amendments were to have been discussed one by one, the legislation would have died on the Order Paper. This is why last week, in the Official Opposition, we challenged the Government to bring in time limitation on the Bill, in order to ensure that the Conservative dinosaurs would not succeed in killing the Official Languages Act.

But to come back to the relevant amendment, what happened in committee in my view is a serious change that significantly weakens the Official Languages Act. To answer the question put by an Hon. Member, let me repeat that it is the Hon. Member for Charlevoix who in committee, to everyone's surprise, put forward that amendment that significantly weakens the Official Languages Act since in fact it deletes from the Act, in clause 2, which is an interpretation clause, therefore a very important clause, a clause that will guide the court when it will interpret the Act, and render a legal decision. In the original wording put forward by the Government, the bill read: "The purpose of this Act is to extend the present laws of Canada relating to official languages to ensure respect . . . ". Those are the terms, "to extend the present laws of Canada relating to official languages" that were taken out by the amendment put forward by the Hon. Member for Charlevoix. Thus, the English version reads:

[*English*]

—the purpose of the Act is to extend the present laws of Canada relating to official languages, and so on, and to ensure the respect for both languages, blah, blah, blah. This concept, in French, "*renforcer*", and in English, "to extend", has been removed by the amendment, all in an attempt to try to appease the most regressive elements of the Conservative Party.

Mr. Hawkes: Not true.

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Yes, read the text of the committee hearings.

Mr. Hawkes: You read the committee hearings, you'll find out it's not true.

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): I have them here. I am being told it is wrong but I will quote it in French because the Hon. Member for Charlevoix (Mr. Hamelin) spoke in French. He said this:—

[*Translation*]

The Member from Charlevoix says: "You can well understand that I am proposing this amendment for reasons—and if I do so, it is via conciliatory spirit." His intentions were good and I am not questioning them. However, it didn't do much good. In fact, the amendment was agreed, and the Bill is now short a very important provision for the reinforcement of the Official Languages Act, but that didn't satisfy the dinosaurs who made new attempsts.

Madam Speaker, of all the things this amendment was proposed on June 22, on the very day when the new Secretary of State was elected in Lac-Saint-Jean and was still celebrating his victory! He did not object to this amendment although he knew full well he was to be responsible for the adminstration of the Official Languages Act. He did absolutely nothing to stop the Conservative members from using their majority in committee to water down with their amendments, the basic concept of the Official Languages Act which is to reinforce not to weaken the Act.

Where is the Secretary of State at a time when we are trying to restore the Bill to its original version? Where is he? I'm not saying, Madam Speaker, that he is absent from these premises. I ask this question: Where is Lucien, the guy who is supposed to defend the people of Québec and the French language? While we are trying to reinstate the concept that the Official Languages Act must be enhanced our man is sunbathing! That is what is going on!

Madam Speaker, allow me to propose an amendment which brings the English version of the amendment put forward by my colleague from Ottawa—Vanier more in line with the French version.

Motion No. 1A proposed by my colleague from Ottawa—Vanier reads as follows: That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out line 40 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor, and I quote:

"2. The purpose of this Act is to reinforce the present laws of Canada relating to official languages to . . . "

Unfortunately, the word "extend" does not appear in the English version of the amended bill, as it did in the original text introduced by the Government. Before the dinosaurs removed this clause in Committee, it was the word "extend" which appeared in the text.

In order to re-establish the original text, I suggest for the English version only, since my colleague's motion is right in French:

[*English*]

That Motion No. 1(a) be amended in the English text only by replacing the word "reinforced" in the fourth line of the motion by the word "extend".

[*Translation*]

I made this suggestion, with the support of my colleague the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau).

Madam Speaker, I suppose that it is with the rather clear and acknowledged purpose to demonstrate that the Liberal Party of Canada has every intention to support the principle that all the amendments to this bill should essentially reinforce the Official Languages Act.

They are not there to make small ad hoc adjustments Bill C-72 is not there to weaken the Official Languages Act but to enhance it, give it more teeth and add in an interpretative clause which is extremely important for legal purposes guarantees, so that a magistrate will readily understand that the purpose of Bill C-72 is to reinforce the current policy of the Federal Government in the area of official languages, a policy established several years ago.

Madam Speaker, such was the purpose of my intervention.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques) seconded by Mr. Garneau moves:

That Motion No. 1(a) be amended in the English text only by replacing the word "reinforced" in the fourth line of the motion by the word "extend".

Mr. Hawkes: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The committee, in its wisdom, considered the issue, and the committee's decision was to remove the lines because of the lack of equivalence between the word "extend" and the word *"renforcer"*. We are dealing with a clause that deals with the equality of status and use of the two official languages.

In this case, this amendment was to change the English-language version to the word "extend". I think if you consult English-French dictionaries and French-English dictionaries you will find that the word is not equal to the word "*renforcer*". I suggest that you have a bit of a dilemma as to whether the amendment is, therefore, admissible. We are dealing with a very sensitive language issue and talking, in this particular clause, about equality.

• (1650)

It is clear that our Party is attempting to pass a piece of legislation which deals equally and fairly with the two language groups in this country. To admit a set of words in the Purpose clause which are different on one side of the Bill from the other would not serve the nation well. It was the committee's conclusion that it did not serve the nation well in the first instance and that is why the words were removed. We have, in the amended Bill as reported to the House, a clause which the committee, in its wisdom, considers to be equal in both languages. The Official Opposition is seeking to amend this Bill in such a way as to produce inequality in the use of language.

Mr. Gauthier: Madam Speaker, what we have just heard is, to my mind, a lot of nonsense. The Parliamentary Secretary is the expert in the domain. I am surprised he used that argument because he is more intelligent than that. He knows, I know, and everyone knows that Bill C-72 was drafted in parallel. That is, it was drafted in English with instructions given by the Cabinet, by the Ministers, to express thoughts clearly and to express objectives clearly.

Indeed, if one looks at the Bill one sees that it sometimes does not go on in French as it does in English. It is not meant to be a direct translation, as it was in the old days. The concept of translating from English to French is now *passé*. We now have the concept of parallel drafting, which the Parliamentary Secretary knows about. The English-speaking team and the French-speaking team are asked to draft Bills in parallel but with the same objective.

Using Clause 11 as an example, it does not make any sense to refuse—

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I think that by discussing the Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques's amendment, we have now reached the point where we are almost dealing in semantics.

As your Speaker, I suggest that the House should set aside this amendment for the time being and allow the procceedings to continue; the Chair would be in a position to rule on the relevancy of this amendment in a few minutes.

[*English*]

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South): Madam Speaker, it is with no joy that I participate in this debate, that I refute the amendments from across the way, and that I support my colleague, the Member for Winnipeg—Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie). I am almost debating a question of privilege, because some of us who moved amendments to this Bill have been maligned from across the way. It has been said that we are opposed to official bilingualism. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are opposed to Bill C-72. It is unfair; it is unjust; it makes second class citizens of Anglophones, and some Francophones; and it was drafted, I might add, by six out of seven Francophones in Treasury Board.

The Speaker explained to the television audience just how important this matter is. I am a Conservative. I am a member of this Government and a strong supporter of this Government and of my Prime Minister. No government in the history of Canada has accomplished more in three and a half years. It has dealt with free trade, the western concept, the Atlantic Accord, aid to farmers, the cancelling of the drastic NEP, and the cancelling of FIRA and bringing this country back, I hope, to a free enterprise system.

I support every bit of that, but I do not support unfairness. I do not support the fact that without the amendments of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Assiniboine people in my riding can be dead-ended on a supervisory position because they are not bilingual. That has nothing to do with bilingualism. Everyone applauds the educating of young people in this country in two official languages.

I am devastated and heartbroken that my English-speaking colleagues, with whom I have served here, would stand back and allow this to be perpetrated on them and their constituents.

I have been called, from across the way, a dinosaur. I would like to tell you what happens when a dinosaur crashes through the bush. It tramples sheep and mice in its way who no longer speak up for their constituents, the reason for which they were sent to these hallowed halls.

I would like to speak for a minute about what happens with the amendments of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Assiniboine in relation to Bill 101 of Quebec. The Government can tell us that we must support bilingualism in Manitoba, that we must oppose bilingualism in Saskatchewan and Alberta, that those people are all wrong, but no one must dare stand in this Chamber or stand in committee and mention Bill 101.

In excess of 800,000 English-speaking people in the Province of Quebec, and in the rest of Canada some 600,000, are trampled by a Bill which prohibits them from putting up an English sign or conducting business in English. Is that fairness?

We heard the Member across the way say that he wanted an amendment on "extension". I do not have a dictionary in front of me, but I know that they spent hours and hours on frivolous amendments to this Bill. One of the things about which they argued for days and days was the word "extend". Members over there tried to say that "extend" has the same meaning as "reinforce". When you reinforce a building that is falling down, you prop it up. Reinforce means a propping up. When you extend something, you lengthen it. They want to lengthen bureaucracy and control from one end of this country to the other. It has nothing to do with bilingualism.

With regard to the fairness about which we speak, we must not even mention the fact that unless people are in "bilingual imperative" positions, which means that they must have C-level French, they cannot be promoted. A little girl from Parks Canada phoned me this morning and told me that she was fired because she could not speak French. A fellow in Mississauga was given a promotion in Revenue Canada. This is recorded in the committee reports and no one denied it. After being given the promotion he was given a language test. This was in Mississauga, Ontario, Canada. They said that with 1,300 more hours of immersion training he could not attain C-level which was required for the promotion. They said "Goodbye, Mister". I can document that. Consider the girl who lost her job in a drugstore here in Ottawa because three customers did not feel she had enough facility in French.

Bill C-101 says:

> Every inscription on a product, on its container or on its wrapping, or on a leaflet, brochure or card supplied with it, including the directions for use and the warranty certificates, must be drafted in French. This rule applies also to menus and wine lists.
>
> Catalogues, brochures, folders and similar publications must be drawn up in French.
>
> Except as provided by regulation of the Office de la langue française, it is forbidden to offer toys or games to the public which require the use of a non-French vocabulary for their operation, unless a French version of the toy or game is available on no less favourable terms on the Québec market.

Mr. Caccia: The same applies here.

• (1700)

Mr. Stewart: Like fun it does. You can sell anything you want in Saskatchewan and Ontario, you can put up any sign or do anything you want. But you will not be able to do it in Saskatchewan with Bill C-72. Everyone knows that Bill C-72

is a power struggle. It is a grab for the bureaucracy of Canada from one end to the other, to control this great nation.

Every company name that is not in French must be changed before December 31. What happened when Mr. Bourassa said that he might change Bill 101? On April 17, 25,000 marched for French in Québec. Did they say anything about bilingualism then? Is there anyone fighting for 800,000 Anglophones in the Province of Québec?

This is a Draconian Bill. It will change the face of Canada. All I can say to my English speaking colleagues who believe in their heritage and have any thought about this nation ever progressing, is, stop this Bill. Let us take bilingualism where it belongs, from the schools up. Give bilingualism to our children, do not force it down their throats.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I have reviewed the points brought out by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary with respect to the amendment presented by the Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault). I found the points to be arguments for debate but not reasons to declare the amendment unacceptable. Therefore, we will continue debate on the amendment of the Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques.

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Madam Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to say something at report stage of Bill C-72. I am particularly pleased to have an opportunity to speak to amendments which deal with both sides of the issue, designed to strengthen the Bill, and amendments designed to weaken the Bill and strike at the very constitutional principle of equality between English and French in our national life.

It is particularly important to make such comments immediately after the observations made by the Hon. Member for Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart). He has attempted to make an emotional appeal to colleagues particularly in the government caucus in order to stir up fears and appeal to rather base emotions. It is even more necessary to consider the importance of our policy of official bilingualism and discuss what happened in the legislative committee dealing with this Bill.

After the constitutional activities of the early 1980s, the passage of a Bill to consolidate the laws of Canada is something that has faced Governments since 1983. It has fallen on the present Conservative Government to take up the work.

We who served on the joint standing committee waited many months wondering whether we would receive a Bill that would effectively renew the policy of official bilingualism to which Canada committed itself in 1969. Bill C-72 was tabled in the House over a year ago. Late this winter it came to second reading debate and finally to a vote. When the question was finally put at second reading stage, there was no vote against Bill C-72. This is noteworthy considering the later activity which took place in the legislative committee and which comes to us now at report stage of the Bill. We know that the vote at second reading is the vital point at which the House of Commons indicates its acceptance of the principle of the Bill. Those who are opposed to it should stand at that time and indicate their opposition, as the opposition Parties often do. However, there was no vote against the Bill and it passed with the appearance of unanimous support in the House and sent to a legislative committee.

The committee spent many hours with Ministers and officials in various Departments considering carefully what witnesses had to say about the Bill. We then proceeded to careful consideration of the successive clauses of the Bill.

The Member for Winnipeg—Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie) said that witnesses were denied the opportunity to be heard. It is true that all of those persons who might have wanted to attack the basic principle of the Bill were not heard.

I know that there are western Canadians who oppose official bilingualism. I grew up in the West and taught university students there. I know their feelings very well. Some of the western Canadian representatives who could have spoken to that Bill failed to appear. When the legislative committee saw that the first ones given the opportunity were not prepared to come here and spell out their opposition and become involved in debate with committee members, the committee decided to take up clause by clause consideration in view of the support of the House at second reading.

Motion No. 1A moved by the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier), is designed to reinsert in the Bill language that was there when it was given second reading. An official from the Department of Justice stated strongly that this language was essential to the Bill as an indication to the official language minorities in Canada.

The language of "extend" in English and "*renforcer*" in French was removed from the Bill after a proposal late on a Tuesday night that was carried through the following afternoon.

The Member for Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart) should carefully consider the fact that the official from the Department of Justice was saying that the English-speaking minority in the Province of Quebec had been given the promise by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) that the language in Bill C-72 would extend the laws of Canada relating to language. I suggest that the French-speaking minority outside Quebec had an equal interest in this assertion.

Those are the best of reasons for recognizing the politics of the matter and for respecting the importance of the amendment put forward by the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier.

It seemed clear that this was the last attempt to get the Conservative Members of the legislative committee on side, in support of the Bill. If this language were dropped and the final compromise made, the Bill could be reported back to the House and passed. However, it is because of the failure of that attempt and the appearance of all of these amendments that we have this unusual situation now, with opposition Parties and a vast majority of the Government fully in support while

suddenly the opposition, which did not exist at second reading, has come forward in the way of amendments.

Let us consider the amendments proposed by the Member for Winnipeg—Assiniboine. First, there is his suggestion that the policy should be applied to institutions wherever it is reasonable to do so in the circumstances. The question of what is reasonable could, itself, be a most disputatious matter. What is reasonable to the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Assiniboine would not strike many other people as being reasonable, even a majority of the country, in the way of working with a policy of official bilingualism.

• (1710)

Concern has been expressed about employment and advancement in the Public Service of Canada, as if it were some type of right. Little concern is expressed for the policy itself by those who are critical of the Bill or those who want to weaken or destroy it entirely. Little is said of the brute reality of the country that there are large minorities who do not know the other official language and who deserve service from the Government of Canada in that language. They also deserve the opportunity of employment in the Public Service of Canada.

I see from press reports that the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields), the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, in his Party caucus apparently alluded to the French-speaking minority in Quebec, and the minority on a national basis, persons who speak only French, who surely deserve service in that language and the opportunity to work in it.

I find the suggestion quite incredible, that persons in the Public Service of Canada should not have to make the effort to learn French. Here I am speaking primarily of English-speaking members of the Public Service, and the fact that they should not have the obligation to learn French and be prepared to work in French in various carefully designed and established situations, but the ordinary citizen of Canada, down to children, should be required to become bilingual because others will not use the opportunity and take training provided by the Government of Canada in order to become bilingual. That is the fundamental unfairness of opposition to official bilingualism of the type expressed by the Hon. Member for Simcoe South.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Charles Hamelin (Charlevoix): Madam Speaker, I am well aware of the solemnity and seriousness of the occasion as I rise today to deal with the amendments and the very principle of the Bill C-72, which in a few hours will become the new Canadian official languages legislation.

I suggest that this new legislation is one of the corner-stones of the new and richer Canada which we want to build, a Canada more receptive to its two linguistic communities.

[*English*]

This piece of legislation is an Act of nation-building. Building Canada is more than a world, more than an attitude. It is at first a behaviour of generosity and openness.

[*Translation*]

I suggest that to build this country will require more than words, more than wishes; it will require openness and generosity towards our two linguistic communities and our minorities generally. Such is the purpose of this bill which is vital for our national unity, that all together we may continue to believe in this great Canadian vision which we must constantly reiterate and enhance. Our two well balanced communities will have to continue respecting each other.

I can understand the concerns of my colleagues who are trying to protect and defend the interests of unilingual Canadians. I understand them perfectly and I respect them for that; moreover I acknowledge their right to rise in the House to express their views. On the other hand, I cannot accept the fact that anyone should try to limit the rights of their neighbours, because by doing so, they are limiting and restricting their own rights, as though they were cutting the tree branch on which they are sitting.

And I am proud of the part I took during four years in the development of this new legislation. Despite all the admiration I have for my colleague, the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) who, for fifteen years has been the true advocate of linguistic minorities in our country, I am sad to see him now play petty politics. I know because he has proved during fifteen years that he is capable of doing much better than that. He himself had been waiting for his own party to act; he had hoped new legislation would be brought forward which would respect minorities better and, as it is said in clause 2 of the Bill, really ensure respect and equality for the two linguistic communities, attempt to recognize and advance the development of our linguistic minorities and define the powers and obligations of federal institutions.

You know, a man called Jean-Claude, who was not from Montreal—Sainte-Marie, his full name is Jean-Claude Saint-Martin, said: I choose to do good because doing good is a quiet activity, and noise never did anyone any good. I feel my colleague, the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) and some others are making statements that foster division more than unity. And what we need . . .

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) on a point of order.

Mr. Caccia: I apologize for the interruption, Madam Speaker. It seems to me that there is a rule of relevance in the House, and the Hon. Member should speak to the amendment that we are presently debating and not on any other matter that may have happened in committee. I bring to your attention, Madam Speaker, that in my view the Hon. Member is out of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Member has spoken to the principles of the Bill. He was mentioning Clause 2 a second ago.

In the last few hours we have been debating the Bill in general, and no one has raised any objections to that. I am sure that the Hon. Member for Charlevoix (Mr. Hamelin) should be given some leeway by the House, considering the limited time given to debating the Bill. The Hon. Member for Charlevoix.

Mr. Hamelin: I am rather proud that in Clause 42 it states that the Government is now committed to "enhance the vitality of the English and French linguistic minority communities in Canada . . . ". That speaks for the English minority in Quebec. I am very proud to see that the Government and Parliament will now enhance the vitality of the English community in Quebec. I know the preoccupation of this community in Quebec. We need this community in Quebec. We need a strong English community in Quebec.

[*Translation*]

I also need, in this Government, in this Parliament, in our country, to feel I am a full-fledged Canadian. With the new provisions of this Bill, with the approval and generosity of my colleagues, today I feel I am more a Canadian than ever, a full-fledged Canadian. As a Quebecer and a Francophone, whether from Quebec or outside Quebec, I want all people everywhere in the country to be full-fledged Canadians, without arrogance but with tolerance, with mutual respect, with respect for others' opinions. Through our caucus and our Party, we have worked extremely hard. True, we negotiated. It has been difficult. But we never lost sight of the substance of the Bill, which is the very spirit of our country, of this big dream. We never compromised on its substance. And that is true!

[*English*]

When we speak about fairness and equity, let me say that we really tried that within our own caucus and within our own Party. That is the mission I have for my colleagues.

• (1720)

[*Translation*]

My colleagues and myself were really committed to working together within this Party and now within this Parliament so we could understand each other better even though it's difficult, because you and I believe in this country.

[*English*]

Do you believe in Canada? I believe in Canada.

[*Translation*]

As long as I am respected. I do not feel superior. I want to join you all in building this great country.

I take this opportunity to thank the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) and the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) for endorsing this bill. I want above all to thank my leader (Mr. Mulroney) who has inspired and supported me. I also want to thank all the linguistic communities that, in the last four years, have helped us develop a significant bill which makes this country grow. This legislation makes me feel better and I really believe in it. Otherwise, I shouldn't be here. I never intended to diminish people or their rights or shove legislation down their throats. What I wanted to accomplish with you all was to improve on the Canadian dream: a country united but respectful of its elements. And it is true that some provinces are taking certain measures. But it is in a spirit of generosity that one day we will understand each other and our first task is to start working on that goal today. I am calling on all my colleagues to unite. Despite all their reservations, we will all examine together, as we have done, this legislation and its application. And that is why our committee made some fifty amendments. The objective is not to win over anyone. It is Canada that must win.

[*English*]

For the sake of Canada and for the sake of its people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Garneau (Laval-des-Rapides): Madam Speaker, I want to take part in the debate this afternoon, particularly with respect to the amendment of my colleague from Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) who is proposing that the original text concerning the application of this legislation be reintroduced in Bill C-72.

Madam, Speaker, the amendment moved by my colleague considerably strengthens the Bill, especially concerning its interpretation by the courts. This is why I draw this amendment to the attention of my colleagues in the House and I urge them to support it since all it does is restore the original text on which the House of Commons voted at second reading. This is a rather important principale and I wonder to what extent the committee could amend it without changing the basic thrust of the Bill itself and the principles which had been adopted during second reading debate.

Madam Speaker, any debate on linguistic issues invariably stirs emotions and Members have an opportunity to make speeches which convey their deepest feelings. Earlier this afternoon I listened to the Hon. Member for Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart), the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie), and the Hon. Member for Charlevoix (Mr. Hamelin) when, with a certain passion, they expressed their views on Bill C-72.

Naturally, Madam Speaker, given the attitude of some Members of the House we may be strongly tempted to politicize the debate but, as it happens, they all belong to the same political Party.

But I do not think our country will be any richer if Canadians start bashing each other on the head. Mistakes do occur now and then, of course, but Bill C-72 now before the House is the result of a long process which began late in the last century

by the election of a French-speaking Prime Minister and which was marked by a series of debates on linguistic issues. It should be noted as well that major steps were taken under several Canadian Liberal Prime Ministers.

I should like to pay special tribute to Lester B. Pearson who, during the 1960s, acknowledged the significance of the linguistic issue in this country by appointing the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission and introducing a number of legislative measures which were the clear and specific expression of the desire of the Liberal Party and of the Government then headed by Mr. Pearson to promote fairness in this country towards one of the important minorities, the French minority which was one of our two founding peoples.

In subsequent years, Madam Speaker, the Trudeau Government did a lot to make the system more equitable, to bring more justice between Canada's two main linguistic communities.

I was listening earlier to the Hon. Member for Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart) talking about injustice and individual cases of people who couldn't get a promotion in the Public Service because they weren't bilingual. I am not going to start this lengthy debate again and make emotional pleas. I simply want to point out that for generations that was the plight of Francophones in this country. However, they didn't complain about promotions. They couldn't get jobs, not because they weren't bilingual but because they didn't speak English. This happened not only in the Public Service but also in the private sector. And today, I hear people saying: Let time take its course. Let our secondary schools teach French, and eventually, people across Canada will be bilingual.

Madam Speaker, that's fine. But meanwhile, what is going to happen to the Francophone communities across this country who will have to wait years and years before they get services in their own language? And what is the Public Service's raison d'être? It is to provide services to the public! People do not have a God-given right to work in the Public Service. They have the possibility of doing so, but the purpose of the Public Service is to provide services to a *clientèle*. And if according to this country's Charter of Rights and Freedoms, that *clientèle* is entitled to receive services in the language of its choice, in English or French, our two official languages, will that right be paramount or will it be outweighed by the promotion of an employee who, all things considered, does not have to work in the Public Service and could find a job elsewhere?

The arguments put forward by the Hon. Member for Simcoe South would seem to be totally unacceptable, at least to someone who belongs to my particular group, and I refer here to the community of French-speaking Canadians.

Madam Speaker, as I was saying, Bill C-72 is the result of a lengthy process that was mostly initiated by the Bill introduced by the Liberal Government under Mr. Trudeau in 1969, and which the Leader of our Party had the privilege of helping to defend in the House and across the country.

So this Bill followed naturally upon that Act, which was implemented and put to the test, but Bill C-72 was made necessary especially by the patriation of the Canadian Constitution and the entrenchment in it of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, in particular sections 16 to 20 inclusive of that Charter, which recognize the fundamental character of the linguistic rights of both the Francophone and the Anglophone communities.

The main section, section 16, states that: English and French are the official languages of Canada and have equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all institutions of the Parliament and government of Canada.

Thus the Official Languages Act had to be adapted to reflect these rights that were entrenched into the Constitution of our country and were approved by Parliament in 1982, after a very lengthy debate.

Bill C-72 constitutes an important additional step that we should take to integrate new realities into our legislation, particularly those which derive from the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and from sections 16 to 20 inclusive.

I would like to point out that if we could amend the Bill according to the proposal made by my colleague the Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier), we would get even closer to achieving the stated objective. The objective pursued was to give Canadians in practice the rights, and the exercise of the rights, recognized by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

How can these rights be applied? Through legislation that will have to be interpreted by the courts, and we believe that the motion of my colleague from Ottawa—Vanier would give the Official Languages Act, Bill C-72, the scope that it really should have.

I do not believe that it is by cutting corners to please so-and-so that we will have greater justice and as I see it, the Government's original intention with this Bill was to fully enforce this law. I deplore the removal of this introduction to clause 2, which could have been very useful to the courts in interpreting this legislation in future, both for English-language and French-language minority communities. Because English- and French-speaking minorities must be treated equally.

Madam Speaker, I would have liked to have much more time to answer the arguments of the Hon. Member for Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart) regarding comparisons between the rights of anglophones in Quebec and francophones elsewhere in the country.

Madam Speaker, one must have never really lived in Quebec to make the comparison the Hon. Member for Simcoe South made. We see a province where the schools at all levels, elementary, secondary and university, are publicly funded. A province with 800,000 or 600,000 English-speakers has three English-language universities totally financed by the Government as are the French-language universities in the same province. We see that the Government, not out of generosity,

but as a matter of right, provides all social services in both official languages from public funds . . . This was the result of legislation.

Madam Speaker, I see that my time is up. Before sitting down, I would like to thank my colleague from Ottawa—Vanier, on behalf of the whole Official Opposition team, for his tremendous work and the cooperation he has given the Government. From the outset, the Leader of our Party stated our intention to support this Bill and the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier was the one mainly responsible for studying the Bill. I wish to thank him for that and congratulate him for the terrific job he has done.

• (1730)

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to take part today in the debate on Bill C-72, especially after my colleague the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) and also the Hon. Member for Charlevoix (Mr. Hamelin). I think that all Members in this House will recognize the tremendous work done by that man over a little more than a year on Bill C-72. Thanks to him the legislation came through as it now stands and as it looks acceptable to us of course, without the amendments moved.

The matter could be dealt with under various angles, Madam Speaker. We could look for various reasons to take heart, point to various aspects showing that the Bill is a tremendous step forward in the recognition of our Canadian language duality, not only for Francophones but also for Anglophones and all Canadians in this country.

I think the essential feature or one of the essential features of the Canadian reality is its bilingual and multicultural nature. And when dealing with Bill C-72, it is fitting in my view that we remember all those who before us, often in the face of great difficulty, and the last time having been in 1969, worked for the official recognition of both languages. It is my view that the country they built, Madam Speaker, holds a very special place in the world thanks to its features, especially its language features.

It is my personal view that courage and determination are needed to build a country, develop it and to give it a greater degree of security and prosperity than we ourselves enjoyed. But more is needed—generosity and also, today especially, Madam Speaker, tolerance. Nothing durable survived in this country unless it was two-dimensional, with the co-operation and above all the respect of both communities.

[*English*]

There is not and there cannot be in Canada only one language or only one culture. There cannot be only one way of doing things, of saying or thinking things in Canada. I could say more. But there must always be only one objective for all Canadians: the unity and the prosperity of this country. The official linguistic minorities in Canada are well aware that the battle for justice and equity is a long one and that it is not over yet. It will not be won by any glorious action, nor will it be won by a long constitutional or political battle.

The battle will be long because it deals with issues that are emotional for all Canadians. We can all say to each other here that by voting for Bill C-72 we will have progressed in the cause for linguistic justice in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, it is important to state here, as I feel I have a duty to do so, in what context we have to deal with amendments to Bill C-72, and my wish is to do so with the least possible degree of frustration and emotion. But it is extremely difficult for a French-speaking Member of this House, whose forebears for 350 years fought for the recognition of one's language, to try and understand why someone might wish through a series of amendments to weaken, slow down and even paralyze in certain circumstances the development of a bilingual Canada.

I think that attempt can only be understood by referring to attitudes and concepts that were more in use in this country some 20 years ago, but no longer appear to reflect Canadian realities. In my opinion, this shows that by updating this legislation which dates back to 1969, this Conservative Government has the courage and the will to make the defense of linguistic rights and cultural minorities priority in its approach to the future.

Madam Speaker, I suggest it is very important . . . I feel I am a richer man today for having had the opportunity over the past four years to learn another language. I must admit it was not always easy.

[*English*]

English has been the key that has permitted me to discover a new country, a new Canada. I have many good friends in places that I did not know existed not too long ago.

• (1740)

I am trying to say that we must not see bilingualism as the only means by which we will give justice to our official linguistic minorities, important as that may be. I think the younger generations of Canadians today all over the country—which is the wonderful part of the new Canada— have shown us something. I had the experience as the Secretary of State of travelling back and forth across the nation two years ago and saw how our young Canadians have taught us that bilingualism is, in fact, an opportunity for our personal and collective development.

There is not a more obvious proof of this new spirit and tolerance than the Meech Lake Accord concluded between all the Canadian provinces and the federal Government. I recognize that Québec constitutes a distinct society within Canada and the linguistic duality is a fundamental distinction that we must protect. This Accord did not happen overnight. This Accord exists because it was inspired by realism, because

it took into consideration the real nature of Québec and of Canada.

[*Translation*]

In any case, Madam Speaker, we must accept Canada for what it is today and what it will be tomorrow. We no longer want a Canada is a constant state of strife ans which is not representative of the reality of today. If Canada is a more dynamic, prosperous and self-confident country, it is because Canadian men and women have become aware that they have more reasons to be united than divided, especially when it comes to languages. In this connection, I am proud to pay tribute to a man who, five years ago, took over the leadership of the Party to which, I belong, a man who rose for the first time in this House to indicate his unqualified support for a resolution of the House upholding the rights of the Francophone minority in Manitoba. He felt that the Government had the absolute obligation to give our linguistic minorities in Canada the justice to which they are entitled.

[*English*]

And so he left for Winnipeg, under particularly difficult circumstances, to repeat his commitment in favour of linguistic justice. I believe that at that time five years ago the urgent need to modernize the law on official languages was not on our Party's national caucus weekly agenda.

[*Translation*]

However, from Cape Breton to British Columbia, Canadian men and women have heard the same message: "a right is a right, always and everywhere", and it should be preserved everywhere in this country. Today, the man who made these remarks is the Prime Minister of Canada.

To conclude, Madam Speaker, I should leave the House this very important message: Both as a Canadian and Francophone Canadian, not on behalf of my Quebec colleagues but together with them, I feel like saying: I should not be here today if I had not been convinced by the leadership of Brian Mulroney that justice is not an abstract ideal, but a means by which great Parties should be guided and great countries governed.

Madam Speaker, we no longer want an intolerant Canada. Countries are built on differences such as languages. Whether we speak French or English, that is a basic difference, not unique to Quebec, but proper to all the provinces of our nation. Canada's horizons are broad, Canada is managed by the courage of its people and the challenges they face. Madam Speaker, can Canada be anything else but the simple recognition of both its official languages which are flourishing thanks to its language policies. Madam Speaker, finally, for the dignity of all Canadians, I would like in the future the people to respect my French origins, along with the reality of the English-speaking Canadians, the two nations which built this country. As a French Canadian, I am proud of my origin, and pleased to share them with all my English-speaking colleagues who wish to do so.

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE IMPLEMENTATION ACT

MESURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Monday, July 5, consideration of the motion of Mr. Crosbie that Bill C-130, an Act to implement the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the United States of America, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee, and the amendment of Mr. Axworthy (p. 16661) and of Mr. Young (p. 17089).

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It being 6:45, pursuant to the Order adopted earlier today, this House will now proceed with the defferred recorded division on the motion of the Hon. Member from Beaches (Mr. Young) concerning the subamendment to Bill C-130.

Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Young), which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 419*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Angus
Axworthy
Benjamin
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blaikie
Broadbent
Caccia
Cassidy
Copps
de Jong
Dewar
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Foster
Frith
Fulton
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Harris
Heap
Henderson
Hovdebo
Isabelle
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
Langdon
MacLellan
Malépart
Manly
McCurdy
McLaughlin
Mitchell
Murphy
Nystrom
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Rossi
Skelly
Tardif
(Richmond—Wolfe)
Tobin
Waddell
Young—52

NAYS

Members

Andre
Beatty
Bernier
Blais
Blais-Grenier
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Boyer
Brightwell
Brisco
Browes
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Champagne
(Saint-Hyacinthe—
Bagot)
Champagne
(Champlain)
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Cochrane
Collins
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Darling
Daubney
de Cotret
Dick
Domm
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine

Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gérin
Girard
Graham
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Guilbault
(Drummond)
Gurbin
Hamelin
Hawkes
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Holtmann
Howie
Hudon
Jacques
James
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kelleher
Kempling
Kindy
King
Landry
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McCain
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McKenzie
McKinnon
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Mulroney
Nowlan
Oberle
Oostrom
Pennock
Pietz
Porter
Reid
St. Germain
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Sparrow
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Taylor
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Tupper
Van De Walle
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson
(Etobicoke Centre)—113

• (1810)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment to the amendment lost.

The next question is on the amendment of Mr. Axworthy. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to dispense with the ringing of the bells so that the vote might be taken immediately.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray).

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Axworthy), which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 420)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Angus
Axworthy
Benjamin
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blaikie
Broadbent
Caccia
Cassidy
Copps
de Jong
Dewar
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Foster
Frith
Fulton
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Harris
Heap
Henderson
Hovdebo
Isabelle
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
Langdon
MacLellan
Malépart
Manly
McCurdy
McLaughlin
Mitchell
Murphy
Nystrom
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Rossi
Skelly
Tardif
(Richmond—Wolfe)
Tobin
Waddell
Young—52

NAYS

Members

Andre
Beatty
Bernier
Blais
Blais-Grenier
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Boyer
Brightwell
Brisco
Browes
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Champagne
(Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Champagne
(Champlain)
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Cochrane
Collins
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Darling
Daubney
de Cotret
Dick
Domm
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gérin
Girard
Graham
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Guilbault
(Drummond)
Gurbin
Hamelin
Hawkes
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Holtmann
Howie
Hudon
Jacques
James
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kelleher
Kempling
Kindy
King
Landry
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McCain
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McKenzie
McKinnon
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Mulroney
Nowlan
Oberle
Oostrom
Pennock
Pietz
Porter
Reid
St. Germain
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Sparrow
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Taylor
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Tupper
Van De Walle

Vankoughnet
Vézina
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson
(Etobicoke Centre)—114

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost. The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Shall I dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Crosbie), which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 421*)

YEAS

Members

Andre
Beatty
Bernier
Blais
Blais-Grenier
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Boyer
Brightwell
Brisco
Browes
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Champagne
(Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Champagne
(Champlain)
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Cochrane
Collins
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Darling
Daubney
de Cotret
Dick
Domm
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gérin
Girard
Graham
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Guilbault
(Drummond)
Gurbin
Hamelin
Hawkes
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Holtmann
Howie
Hudon
Jacques
James
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kelleher
Kempling
Kindy
King
Landry
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McCain
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McKenzie
McKinnon
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Mulroney
Nowlan
Oberle
Oostrom
Pennock
Pietz
Porter
Reid
St. Germain
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Sparrow
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Taylor
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Tupper
Van De Walle
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Waddell
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson
(Etobicoke Centre)—115

NAYS

Members

Althouse
Angus
Axworthy
Benjamin
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blaikie
Broadbent
Caccia
Cassidy
Copps
de Jong
Dewar
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Foster
Frith
Fulton
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Harris
Heap
Henderson
Hovdebo
Isabelle
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
Langdon
MacLellan
Malépart
Manly
McCurdy
McLaughlin
Mitchell
Murphy
Nystrom
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Rossi
Skelly
Tardif
(Richmond—Wolfe)
Tobin
Young—51

• (1820)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

* * *

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-72, an Act respecting the status and use of the official languages of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to order made Monday, July 4, 1988, it is my duty to put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of this Bill.

Mr. Gauthier, seconded by Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques) moved that Bill C-72, an Act respecting the status and use of the official languages of Canada, be amended in Clause 2 by striking out line 40 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

• (1830)

[*English*]

"2. The purpose of this Act is to reinforce the present laws of Canada relating to official languages to"

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques), seconded by Mr. Garneau, moved the following amendment:

That Motion No. 1A be amended in the English version by striking out the word "reinforce" and substituting the word "extend" therefor.

[*English*]

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the amendment stands deferred. The putting of the question on the motion shall also stand deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 2 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 2A standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 2B standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 5—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We are now through the first grouping, all of those motions having been moved at the time of the debate when the debate commenced. I believe that from now on it would be in order to call for the motion to be put to the House.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate that the Hon. Minister is trying to assist the Chair. However, I think that the position we are in is that each of these motions will have to be put to the House. I will carry on in so doing.

The next question is on Motion No. 5.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 3

(a) by striking out line 36 at page 3.

(b) by striking out line 25 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"Act of Parliament but it does not include or extend to any court, tribunal or other body established by or pursuant to an Act of a Province of by any other authority."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Mr. Gauthier: On division.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 5 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is Motion No. 7.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington) moved:

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 3 to 8 at page 4.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Gauthier: On division.

Motion No. 7 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 19.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not believe that the Hon. Member for Mississauga North (Mr. Horner) is in the House.

Mr. Speaker: The motion will not be put.

I think I should advise the House that the next question is on Motion No. 22. A vote on this motion will dispose of Motions Nos. 23 and 29.

• (1840)

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary East) moved:

Motion No. 22.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 22 by striking out line 21 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"significant demand (where the official minority language population is 20 per cent or more) for communications".

Motion No. 23.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 23 by striking out line 32 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"significant demand (where the official minority language population is 20 per cent or more) for those services in that".

Motion No. 29.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 32 by striking out line 24 at page 14 and substituting the following therefor:

"which there is significant demand (where the official minority language population is 20 per cent or more) for the".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 24A standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby) who is not in the Chamber.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby), who is attending a royal function in Nova Scotia, I would like to have the privilege of moving this amendment, seconded by the Hon. Member for Fundy—Royal (Mr. Corbett).

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to the request?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I regret there is no unanimous consent.

The next question is on Motion No. 25.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 25.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 28 by striking out line 2 at page 14 and substituting the following therefor:

"public and this section shall take precedence over Province of Quebec Bill 101."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 25 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 26.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary East) moved:

Motion No. 26.

That Bill C-72 be amended by deleting Clause 31.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 26 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 27.

Mr. Bob Corbett (Fundy—Royal) moved:

Motion No. 27.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 32 by striking out line 21 at page 14 and substituting the following therefor:

"32.(1) The Governor in Council may, subject to affirmative resolution of the House of Commons,".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 27 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 28.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 28.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 32

(a) by striking out line 23 at page 14 and substituting the following therefor:

"(a) subject to subsection (1.1) and (1.2), prescribing the circumstances in"

(b) by adding immediately after line 44 at page 14 the following:

"(1.1) An area in which there is significant demand may be established if

(a) both of the official languages are spoken as a mother tongue by persons residing in the area; and

(b) the number of persons who are in the linguistic minority in the area in respect of an official language spoken as a mother tongue is at least fifteen per cent of the total number of persons residing in the area.

(1.2) Notwithstanding subsection (1.1) where the number of persons in the linguistic minority in an area described in subsection (1) is less than the percentage required under subsection (1.1), the area may be established as a bilingual district if before the coming into force of this Act the services of departments and agencies of the Government of Canada were customarily made available to residents of the area in both official languages."

(c) by striking out line 2 at page 15 and substituting the following therefor: paragraph (1)(b), the Governor in".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 28A.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River) moved:

Motion No. 28A.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 32

(a) by striking out line 23 at page 14 and substituting the following therefor:

"(a) subject to subsection (1.1) and (1.2), prescribing the circumstances in"

(b) by adding immediately after line 44 at page 14 the following:

"(1.1) An area in which there is significant demand may be established if the number of persons in the area in respect of an official language spoken as a mother tongue is at least fifty-one per cent of the total number of persons residing in the area."

(c) by striking out line 2 at page 15 and substituting the following therefor:

"paragraph (1)(b), the Governor in".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 28A negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 30.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington) moved:

Motion No. 30.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 32 by adding immediately after line 16 at page 15 the following:

"(3) No regulations made under this Section shall be inconsistent with subsection (1) of Section 20 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 30 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 32.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington) moved:

Motion No. 32.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 33 by adding immediately after line 26 at page 15 the following:

"Nothing in this part abrogates or derogates from any rights, privileges or obligations with respect to the English and French languages, under the Constitution of Canada or other law."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 32 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 33.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 33.

That Bill C-72 be amended by adding immediately after line 26 at page 15 the following:

"33.1 Nothing in Part IV and no regulations made by the Governor in Council pursuant to Section 32 or Section 33 shall abrogate or derogate from the provisions of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and, in particular, the provisions of Part IV or regulations made under Part IV shall be read or construed not to abrogate or derogate from the requirement of significant demand, significant demand being the number of persons who are in the linguistic minority in the area in respect of an official language spoken as a mother tongue is at least fifteen (15) percent of the total number of persons residing in the area."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 33 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 34.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 34.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 34 by striking out lines 27 to 31 at page 15 and substituting the following therefor:

"34. English and French are the official languages in all federal institutions for use by all officers and employees of the federal institution and shall be the languages of work when there is significant demand for one or the other or both official languages, significant demand being the number of persons who are in the linguistic minority in the area in respect of an official language spoken as a mother tongue and is at least fifteen (15) percent of the total number of persons residing in the area."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 34 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 35 moved by the Hon. Member for Mississauga North (Mr. Horner). The Hon. Member is not in the House and, therefore, the motion cannot be put.

The next question is on Motion No. 37.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary East) moved:

Motion No. 37.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 34 by striking out line 31 at page 15 and substituting the following therefor:

"where numbers warrant."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 37 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 38A.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton—Charlotte) moved:

Motion No. 38A.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 34 by adding immediately after line 31 at page 15 the following:

"in accordance with this Part providing the region has been designated bilingual."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 38A negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 41.

Mr. Bob Corbett (Fundy—Royal) moved:

Motion No. 41.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 35

(a) by striking out line 35 at page 15 and substituting the following therefor:

"and, subject to subsection (2), in any part or region of Canada, or in"

(b) by adding immediately after line 8 at page 16 the following:

"(2) Any part or region of Canada that is precribed by subsection (1) may be established as a bilingual region if

(a) both of the official languages are spoken as a mother tongue by persons residing in the region; and

(b) the number of persons who are in the linguistic minority in the area in respect of an official language spoken as a mother tongue is at least fifteen per cent of the total number of persons residing in the region.

(3) Notwithstanding subsection (2), where the number of persons in the linguistic minority in a region described in subsection (1) is less than the percentage required under subsection (2), the area may be established as a bilingual region if before the coming into force of this Act the services of departments and agencies of the Government of Canada were customarily made available to residents of the area in both official languages."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 41 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 42.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary East) moved:

Motion No. 42.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 35 in the French version by striking out lines 38 to 41 at page 15."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 42 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 43.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary East) moved:

Motion No. 43.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 35 in the English version by striking out lines 42 to 44 at page 15 and lines 1 to 8 at page 16.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 43 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 44.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 44.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 35 by adding immediately after line 8 at page 16 the following:

"(2) No prescription shall be made by the Governor in Council for the purposes of paragraph (a) of Section 34(1) unless the Governor in Council has determined that there is significant demand for the use of both official languages in the part or region of Canada or place outside Canada, significant demand being the number of persons who are in the linguistic minority in the area in respect of an official language spoken as a mother tongue is at least fifteen (15) percent of the total number of persons residing in the area."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 44 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 45A.

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough) moved:

Motion No. 45A.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 35 by adding immediately after line 8 at page 16 the following:

"(c) For an area in Canada to be prescribed as a "bilingual area" and conducive to the effective use of both official languages and accommodate the use of either official language by its officers and employees an Affirmative Resolution of the House of Commons must be recorded."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 45A negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 46.

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough) moved:

Motion No. 46.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 35 by striking out lines 9 to 16 at page 16.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 46 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 47.

Mr. Bob Corbett (Fundy—Royal) moved:

Motion No. 47.

That Bill C-72 be amended by adding immediately after line 16 at page 16 the following:

"36. Officers and employees of federal institutions in parts or regions of Canada where one official language is the language of work of that institution, have the right to carry out their employment duties in that official language except where the ability to speak both official languages is necessary in the performance of such duties. 37. For the purpose of this Part the Governor in Council may make regulations

(a) prescribing the areas of Canada in which English or French or both languages are to be used for the purpose of subsection 34(1); (b) prescribing the parts or regions of the Province of Quebec or Ontario for the purpose of subsection 35(3); and (c) prescribing the functions that are to be carried out in both official languages for the purpose of subsection 35(4)."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 47 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 49.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary East) moved:

Motion No. 49.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 36 by striking out line 19 at page 16 and substituting the following therefor:

"and in designated Bilingual districts of Canada, or in".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 49 negatived.

• (1850)

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 52.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton—Charlotte) moved:

Motion No. 52.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 36 by striking out lines 44 to 48 at page 16 and substituting the following therefor:

"both official languages and where it is deemed appropriate for supervisors to be able to communicate in both official languages with officers and employees of the institution in the exercise of their supervisory responsibility, these supervisory positions be declared bilingual non imperative, and".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 60.

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough) moved:

Motion No. 60.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 38 by adding immediately after line 9 at page 19 the following:

"(3) If within a period of thirty sitting days from the day the Government has laid before the House of Commons or published in the *Canada Gazette* a proposed regulation prescribing any part or region of Canada or any place outside Canada to be designated as bilingual, an objection in writing, in the form of a motion for consideration by the House of Commons of the matter of the objection, signed by not less than ten members of the House of Commons and filed with the Speaker specifying the reasons for the objection, the House of Commons shall, within thirty sitting days after the expiration of that day that the House of Commons is sitting, take up the motion and consider the matter of the objection."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 60 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 61.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 61.

That Bill C-72 be amended by deleting Clause 38.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 61 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 70.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary East) moved:

Motion No. 70

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 39 by striking out line 21 at page 19 and substituting the following therefor:

"communities and the multi-cultural nature of Canada taking into".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 70 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 72.

Mr. Dennis H. Cochrane (Moncton) moved:

Motion No. 72.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 39 by striking out line 35 at page 19 and substituting the following therefor:

"terms and conditions of their employment and where it is determined that these officers and employees should provide bilingual services, these positions be declared bilingual non imperative."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 72 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 74.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 74.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 39 by striking out line 39 at page 19 and substituting the following therefor:

"to merit and merit shall not include linguistic duality."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 76.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington) moved:

Motion No. 76.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 41 by striking out lines 5 to 9 at page 20 and substituting the following therefor:

"(a) preserving the English and French linguistic minority communities in Canada; and

(b) maintaining the use".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 79.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 79.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 43

(a) by striking out line 20 at page 20 and substituting the following therefor:

"appropriate to maintain the status"

(b) by striking out lines 24 to 27 at page 20 and substituting the following therefor:

"(a) preserve the English and French linguistic minority communities in Canada;"

(c) by striking out line 30 at page 20 and substituting the following therefor:

"(c) maintain an acceptance and appreciation"

(d) by striking out lines 3 to 8 at page 21.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 79 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 85.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington) moved:

Motion No. 85.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 56 by striking out lines 10 to 12 at page 25 and substituting the following therefor:

"tutions."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 85 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 86.

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved:

Motion No. 86.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 56

(a) by adding immediately after line 12 at page 25 the following:

"(2) It is the duty of the Commissioner to take all actions and measures with a view to ensuring that no officer or employee of a federal institution is adversely afected unnecessarily by the implementation of any policy or provision of this Act and, where adverse affect is unavoidable, that the officer or employee is adequately and properly treated and compensated and the provision of this Part shall apply to any complaint of adverse affect by an officer or employee."

(b) by striking out line 14 at page 25 and substituting the following therefor:

"the purpose set out in subsections (1) and (2), to".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 86 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 87.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary East) moved:

Motion No. 87.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 56 by striking out line 17 at page 25 and substituting the following therefor:

"complaint made to the Commissioner by any bilingual or unilingual Canadian that feels he or she is being discriminated against and to".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 88 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 88.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 88

That Bill C-72 be amended by deleting Clause 57.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 88 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 90.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary East) moved:

Motion No. 90.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 60 by striking out line 35 at page 26 and substituting the following therefor:

"in public."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 90 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 91.

Mr. Dennis H. Cochrane (Moncton) moved:

Motion No. 91.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 60 by striking out lines 36 to 48 at page 26 and lines 1 and 2 at page 27 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) It is not necessary for the Commissioner to hold any hearing but he may allow any person or any department or other institution concerned in an investigation, and shall allow any person or any department or other institution complained against in the course of such investigation, to be represented by counsel.

(3) The Commissioner shall not make a report or recommendation in respect of any person, department or other institution so complained against until that person, department or other institution, as the case may be, has been given reasonable notice of the complaint and has been allowed full opportunity to be heard in public or in private as that person, department or other institution may elect.

(4) Parliament may,

(a) of its own volition, or

(b) upon the recommendation of the Governor in Council, regulate the procedure to be followed by the Commissioner in the exercise of his powers and duties."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 91 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 92.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary East) moved:

Motion No. 92.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 61 by striking out line 6 at page 27 and substituting the following therefor:

"under this Act, provided that it is carried out in public."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 92 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 93.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary East) moved:

Motion No. 93.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 62 by striking out lines 34 to 36 at page 27 and substituting the following therefor:

"by affidavit or otherwise, where such information and or evidence would".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 93 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 95.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington) moved:

Motion No. 95.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 73 by striking out lines 41 to 44 at page 31 and substituting the following therefor:

"gation under this Act."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 95 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 96.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 96

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 73 by striking out lines 42 and 44 at page 31.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 96 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 96(A).

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 96(A)

That Bill C-72 be amended by deleting deleting Clause 73.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 96(A) negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 97.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary East) moved:

Motion No. 97.

That Bill C-72 be amended by deleting Clause 74.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 97 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 100.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary East) moved:

Motion No. 100

That Bill C-72 be amended by deleting Clause 75.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 100 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 102.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington) moved:

Motion No. 102

That Bill C-72 be amended by deleting clause 76.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 102 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 103.

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved:

Motion No. 103.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 77 by adding immediately after line 40 at page 32 the following:

"(2) Any officer or employee of a federal institution who has made a complaint to the Commissioner that the officer or employee has been adversely affected by the implementation of any policy or provision of this Act may apply to the Court for a remedy under this Part and the remedy may include the provision of adequate compensation by the federal institution."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 103 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 104.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington) moved:

Motion No. 104

That Bill C-72 be amended by deleting Clause 77.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

• (1900)

The next question is on Motion No. 106.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington) moved:

Motion No. 106.

That Bill C-72 be amended by deleting Clause 78.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 106 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 106A.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington) moved:

Motion No. 106A.

That Bill C-72 be amended by deleting Clause 79.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 106A negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 107.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington) moved:

Motion No. 107.

—That Bill C-72 be amended by deleting Clause 80.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 107 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 108.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington) moved:

Motion No. 108.

That Bill C-72 be amended by deleting Clause 81.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 108 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 110.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington) moved:

Motion No. 110.

That Bill C-72 be amended by deleting Clause 82.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 112.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary East) moved:

Motion No. 112.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 85

(a) by striking out line 29 at page 35 and substituting the following therefor:

"sixty days before a copy of that regulation is"

(b) by striking out line 32 at page 35 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) In calculating the sixty day period".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 112 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 114.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary East) moved:

Motion No. 114.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 86

(a) by striking out line 40 at page 35 and substituting the following therefor:

"least sixty days before the proposed effec-"

(b) by striking out lines 4 to 7 at page 36 and substituting the following therefor:

(3) In calculating the sixty-day period referred to in subsection (1), there shall not be counted any day on which Parliament sits".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 114 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 115.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary East) moved:

Motion No. 115.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 87 by striking out lines 8 to 44 at page 36 and substituting the following therefor:

"87. (1) A regulation that is proposed to be made under paragraph 38(a) prescribes any part or region of Canada for the purpose of paragraph 35(1)(a) shall be laid before Parliament at least sixty sitting days before the proposed effective date therefor.

(2) Where, within twenty-five sitting days after a proposed regulation is laid before Parliament under subsection (1), a motion for the consideration of the House to the effect that the proposed regulation not be approved, signed by no fewer than ten Members of the House of Commons, filed with the Speaker of the House, the Speaker shall, within five sitting days after the filing of the motion,

without debate or amendment, put every question necessary for the disposition of the motion.

(3) Where a motion referred to in subsection (2) is adopted by Parliament, the proposed regulation to which the motion relates may not be made.

(4) Where Parliament dissolves or prorogues earlier than twenty-five sitting days after a proposed regulation is laid before Parliament under subsection (1) and a motion has not been disposed of under subsection (2) in relation to the proposed regulation in Parliament, the proposed regulation may not be made.

(5) For the purposes of this section, "sitting day" means, in respect to Parliament, a day on which the House sits."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 115 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 115A.

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants) moved:

Motion No. 115A.

That Bill C-72 be amended in Clause 87

(a) by striking out lines 12 at page 36 and substituting the following therefor:

"before the House of Commons at least"

(b) by striking out line 17 at page 36 and subtituting the following therefor:

"the House of Commons under subsection"

(c) by striking out line 21 at page 36 and substituting the following therefor:

"than ten Members of"

(d) by striking lines 29 and 30 at page 36 and substituting the following therefor:

"tion (2) is adopted by the House of Commons the proposed regulation to which the"

(e) by striking out line 35 at page 36 and substituting the following therefor:

"the House of Commons under subsection"

(f) by striking out lines 38 and 39 at page 36 and substituting the following therefor:

"posed regulation in the House of Commons, the proposed regulation may not be"

(g) by striking out lines 42 and 43 at page 36 and substituting the following therefor:

"ting day" means, in respect of the House of Commons, a day on which that House".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 115a negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 122.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington) moved:

Motion No. 122.

That Bill C-72 be amended by deleting Clause 105.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 122 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion 123.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 123.

That Bill C-72 be amended in the Preamble by striking out lines 7 to 11 at page 1 and substituting the following therefor:

"AND WHEREAS the Constitution of Canada provides for full and equal access to Parliament and to the courts established by Parliament in both official languages."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 123 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 125.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 125.

That Bill C-72 be amended in the Preamble by striking out lines 19 to 24 at page 1.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 125 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 126.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 126.

That Bill C-72 be amended in the Preamble by striking out lines 33 and 34 at page 1 and substituting the following therefor:

"Canada is committed to achieving, in full recognition of the principle of selection of person-".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 126 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 127.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 127.

That Bill C-72 be amended in the Preamble by adding immediately after line 2 at page 2 the following:

"AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada is committed to preserving the rights and freedoms of the people of Canada who speak only English or French, while providing opportunities for Canadians to learn both English and French;".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 127 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 128.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 128.

That Bill C-72 be amended in the Preamble by striking out lines 3 to 10 at page 2.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 129.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 129.

That Bill C-72 be amended in the Preamble by striking out lines 4 to 10 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"Canada is committed to maintaining the English and French linguistic minority communities as an integral part of the two official language communities in Canada;".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 129 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion 130.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South) moved:

Motion No. 130.

That Bill C-72 be amended in the Preamble by striking out lines 11 to 18 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada is committed to respecting the positions of the provincial governments regarding English and French minority communities, the provision of services in both English and French, and the maintenance of opportunities for the people of Canada to learn both English and French;".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 130 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 131.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington) moved:

Motion No. 131.

That Bill C-72 be amended in the Preamble by striking out lines 21 to 27 at page 2.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 131 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 133.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington) moved:

Motion No. 133.

That Bill C-72 be amended in the Preamble by striking out lines 24 to 27 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"Region;".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 133 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 136.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington) moved:

Motion No. 136.

That Bill C-72 be amended in the Preamble by adding immediately after line 33 at page 2 the following:

"AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada recognizes the potential divisiveness of the creation and maintenance of two official languages in Canada and is committed to reducing and eliminating such divisiveness;".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11) the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at report stage of the Bill now before the House. Shall I dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The first question is on the amendment of Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques) to Motion No. 1A.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier) moved:

Motion No. 1A

That Bill C-72, an Act respecting the status and use of the official languages of Canada, be amended in Clause 2 by striking out line 40 at page 2 and substituting the folowing therefor:

"2. The purpose of this Act is to reinforce the present laws of Canada relating to official languages to:"

Mr. Speaker: The question is on the amendment of Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques):

That Motion No. 1A be amended in the English version by striking out the word "reinforce" and substituting the word "extend" therefor.

The House divided on the amendment of Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques), which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 422*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Broadbent
Caccia
Cassidy
de Jong
Dewar
Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Foster
Fulton
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gray (Windsor West)
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Harris
Heap
Hovdebo
Isabelle
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
Langdon
MacLellan
Malépart
Manly
McCurdy
McLaughlin
Mitchell
Murphy
Nystrom
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Rossi
Skelly
Tardif (Richmond—Wolfe)
Tobin
Young—46

NAYS

Members

Andre
Beatty
Bernier
Blais
Blais-Grenier
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Brightwell
Brisco
Browes
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Champagne (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Champagne (Champlain)
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Cochrane
Collins
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
Dick
Domm
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp (Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gérin
Girard
Graham
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Guilbault (Drummond)
Gurbin
Hamelin
Hawkes
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Holtmann
Howie
Hudon
Jacques
James
Johnson (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kelleher
Kempling
Kindy
King
Landry
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Mailly
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McCain
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McKenzie
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Mulroney
Nowlan
Oberle
Oostrom
Pennock
Pietz
Reid
St. Germain
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Sparrow
Speyer
Tardif (Charlesbourg)
Taylor
Tremblay (Québec-Est)

Van De Walle
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson
(Etobicoke Centre)—108

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I think that if you consult the House, you will find unanimous consent for having the results of the vote we have just taken applied to the following vote, that is, to the main motion I moved on amendment 1A.

• (1910)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the suggestion of the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier). Is it agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on Motion No. 1A, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 423*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Benjamin
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blaikie
Broadbent
Caccia
Cassidy
de Jong
Dewar
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Foster
Fulton
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Harris
Heap
Hovdebo
Isabelle
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
Langdon
MacLellan
Malépart
Manly
McCurdy
McLaughlin
Mitchell
Murphy
Nystrom
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Rossi
Skelly
Tardif
(Richmond—Wolfe)
Tobin
Young—46

NAYS

Members

Andre
Beatty
Bernier
Blais
Blais-Grenier
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Boyer
Brightwell
Brisco
Browes
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Champagne
(Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Champagne
(Champlain)
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Cochrane
Collins
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
Dick
Domm
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gérin
Girard
Graham
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Guilbault
(Drummond)
Gurbin
Hamelin
Hawkes
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Holtmann
Howie
Hudon
Jacques
James
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kelleher
Kempling
Kindy
King
Landry
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McCain
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McKenzie
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Mulroney
Nowlan
Oberle
Oostrom
Pennock
Pietz
Reid
St. Germain
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Sparrow
Speyer
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Taylor
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson
(Etobicoke Centre)—108

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 424*)

YEAS

Members

Corbett
Domm
Gagnon
Kindy
McCain
McKenzie
Stewart
Vankoughnet—8

NAYS

Members

Althouse
Andre
Beatty
Benjamin
Bernier
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blaikie
Blais
Blais-Grenier
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Boyer
Brightwell
Brisco
Broadbent
Browes
Caccia
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Cassidy
Champagne
(Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Champagne
(Champlain)
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Cochrane
Collins
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Cossitt
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
de Jong
Dewar
Dick
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine
Foster
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gérin
Girard
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gray
(Windsor West)
Grisé

Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Guilbault (Drummond)
Gurbin
Hamelin
Harris
Hawkes
Heap
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Holtmann
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudon
Isabelle
Jacques
James
Jewett
Johnson (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelleher
Kempling
King
Landry
Langdon
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Mailly
Malépart
Manly
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McCurdy
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLaughlin
McLean
Mitchell
Mitges
Moore
Mulroney
Murphy
Nystrom
Oberle
Oostrom
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pennock
Pépin
Pietz
Prud'homme
Reid
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Rossi
St. Germain
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Skelly
Sparrow
Speyer
Tardif (Richmond—Wolfe)
Tardif (Charlesbourg)
Tobin
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Young—144

● (1920)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The next question in on Motion No. 2A.

The House divided on Motion No. 2A, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 425*)

YEAS

Members

Corbett
Kindy
McKenzie
Stewart
Vankoughnet—5

NAYS

Members

Althouse
Andre
Beatty
Benjamin
Bernier
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blais
Blais-Grenier
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Brightwell
Brisco
Broadbent
Browes
Caccia
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Champagne (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Champagne (Champlain)
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Cochrane
Collins
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Cossitt
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
de Jong
Dewar
Dick
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Epp (Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine
Foster
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gérin
Girard
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gray (Windsor West)
Grisé
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Guilbault (Drummond)
Gurbin
Hamelin
Harris
Hawkes
Heap
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Holtmann
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudon
Isabelle
Jacques
James
Jewett
Johnson (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelleher
Kempling
King
Landry
Langdon
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Mailly
Malépart
Manly
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McCurdy
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLaughlin
McLean
Mitchell
Moore
Mulroney
Murphy
Nystrom
Oberle
Oostrom
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pennock
Pépin
Pietz
Prud'homme
Reid
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Rossi
St. Germain
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Skelly
Sparrow
Speyer
Stevens
Tardif (Richmond—Wolfe)
Tardif (Charlesbourg)
Tobin
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Waddell
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Young—144

● (1930)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I propose, with the consent of the House, that the vote we have just taken be applied to the remaining motions, provided that the names of those voting and the way they vote will be separately recorded for each motion.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the suggestion. Is there agreement?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think that that is a very good suggestion, with the exception that perhaps some Members who did not vote may like to have their names added or subtracted to the lists.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the suggestion. I take it that there is agreement?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the motion—

Mr. Corbett: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There are several of these motions with respect to which I have varying opinions. I would not give my concurrence to the vote being recorded just as the previous one has been taken.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There has only been one individual who has indicated that he may not be in agreement with the suggestion. It does follow my hon. colleague's suggestion that not all Members may be in the same position on all votes. Perhaps I can suggest that we move on and the Hon. Member in question, since he seems to be the only one, could consult afterward with the Table Officers and indicate just where he stands.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Minister of State has made, I think, a helpful suggestion. There seems to be agreement. Is the Hon. Member for Fundy—Royal in agreement with that?

Mr. Corbett: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is agreeable.

Mr. Cochrane: Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with that, except with respect to one motion that is going to be voted on which I would like to vote in favour of.

Mr. Speaker: I think the Hon. Member could see the Clerk and that would be arranged.

Is it agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Domm: Mr. Speaker, I give indication to the Chair that there is one of the motions that I would wish to vote in favour of.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member can then partake himself of the same procedure.

Are there other Hon. Members? The Hon. Member for Bow River.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I definitely want to support Motion No. 2B.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other Members who want to make any variation in this, by arrangement?

Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I would like to partake in that option by speaking to the Table Officers afterward, if that is all right.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I apologize to the Hon. Member who just rose, but I am not at all sure just exactly what he is proposing. Perhaps he could clarify it.

Mr. Graham: I abstained on some of the motions thus far. However, there are others that I would like to vote on in the affirmative or in the negative.

Some Hon. Members: Name them!

Mr. Speaker: Would the Hon. Member agree to make the same arrangement as other Hon. Members have indicated to the Chair?

Mr. Graham: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear so that all of us understand what is going to happen. Some of us vote publicly and openly. If I understand the process now—

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Gauthier: —some others will vote secretly. I do not agree with that.

An Hon. Member: No, it is recorded.

Mr. Speaker: I think perhaps the Chair can assist Hon. Members. First, everybody's vote will be recorded. It will be seen exactly how each Hon. Member had voted.

Second, we are proceeding now because there was an agreement in the House. I think that that stands.

The next question is on Motion No. 2B.

The House divided on Motion No. 2B, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 426*)

YEAS

Members

Kindy	Taylor
McKenzie	Vankoughnet—5
Stewart	

NAYS

Members

Althouse	Champagne (Champlain)	Epp (Provencher)
Andre	Charest	Fennell
Beatty	Clark (Brandon—Souris)	Ferland
Benjamin	Clifford	Fontaine
Bernier	Cochrane	Foster
Blackburn (Brant)	Collins	Fretz
Blaikie	Comeau	Friesen
Blais	Cook	Fulton
Blais-Grenier	Cooper	Gagliano
Blouin	Cossitt	Garneau
Bosley	Crosbie (St. John's West)	Gauthier
Bouchard (Roberval)	Darling	Gérin
Boyer	de Cotret	Girard
Brightwell	de Jong	Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Brisco	Dewar	Gray (Windsor West)
Broadbent	Dick	Grisé
Browes	Dorin	Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Caccia	Duplessis	Guilbault (Drummond)
Cadieux	Edwards	Gurbin
Caldwell	Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)	Hamelin
Cardiff		
Champagne (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)		

Harris
Hawkes
Heap
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Holtmann
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudon
Isabelle
Jacques
James
Jewett
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelleher
Kempling
King
Landry
Langdon
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Mailly
Malépart
Manly
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McCurdy
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McLaughlin
McLean
Mitchell
Moore
Mulroney
Murphy
Nystrom
Oberle
Oostrom
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pennock
Pépin
Pietz
Prud'homme
Reid
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Rossi
St. Germain
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Skelly
Sparrow
Speyer
Stevens
Tardif
(Richmond—Wolfe)
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Tobin
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Waddell
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson
(Etobicoke Centre)
Young—144

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 22.

The House divided on Motion No. 22, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 427*)

YEAS

Members

Kindy
McKenzie
Stewart
Taylor
Vankoughnet—5

NAYS

Members

Althouse
Andre
Beatty
Benjamin
Bernier
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blaikie
Blais
Blais-Grenier
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Boyer
Brightwell
Brisco
Broadbent
Browes
Caccia
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Champagne
(Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Champagne
(Champlain)
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Cochrane
Collins
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Cossitt
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
de Jong
Dewar
Dick
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine
Foster
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gérin
Girard
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gray
(Windsor West)
Grisé
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Guilbault
(Drummond)
Gurbin
Hamelin
Harris
Hawkes
Heap
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Holtmann
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudon
Isabelle
Jacques
James
Jewett
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelleher
Kempling
King
Landry
Langdon
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Mailly
Malépart
Manly
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McCurdy
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McLaughlin
McLean
Mitchell
Moore
Mulroney
Murphy
Nystrom
Oberle
Oostrom
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pennock
Pépin
Pietz
Prud'homme
Reid
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Rossi
St. Germain
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Skelly
Sparrow
Speyer
Stevens
Tardif
(Richmond—Wolfe)
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Tobin
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Waddell
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson
(Etobicoke Centre)
Young—144

Mr. Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 22, 23, and 29 lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 28, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 428*)

YEAS

Members

Corbett
Kindy
McKenzie
Stewart
Vankoughnet—5

NAYS

Members

Althouse
Andre
Beatty
Benjamin
Bernier
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blaikie
Blais
Blais-Grenier
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Boyer
Brightwell
Brisco
Broadbent
Browes
Caccia
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Champagne
(Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Champagne
(Champlain)
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Cochrane
Collins
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Cossitt
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
de Jong
Dewar
Dick
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine
Foster
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton

Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gérin
Girard
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gray
(Windsor West)
Grisé
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Guilbault
(Drummond)
Gurbin
Hamelin
Harris
Hawkes
Heap
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Holtmann
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudon
Isabelle
Jacques
James
Jewett
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelleher
Kempling
King
Landry
Langdon
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Mailly
Malépart
Manly
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McCurdy
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McLaughlin
McLean
Mitchell
Moore
Mulroney
Murphy
Nystrom
Oberle
Oostrom
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pennock
Pépin
Pietz
Prud'homme
Reid
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Rossi
St. Germain
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Skelly
Sparrow
Speyer
Stevens
Tardif
(Richmond—Wolfe)
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Tobin
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Waddell
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson
(Etobicoke Centre)
Young—144

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 52.

The House divided on Motion No. 52, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 429*)

YEAS

Members

Cochrane
Corbett
Kindy
McKenzie
Stewart
Vankoughnet—6

NAYS

Members

Althouse
Andre
Beatty
Benjamin
Bernier
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blaikie
Blais
Blais-Grenier
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Boyer
Brightwell
Brisco
Broadbent
Browes
Caccia
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Champagne
(Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Champagne
(Champlain)
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Collins
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Cossitt
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
de Jong
Dewar
Dick
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine
Foster
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gérin
Girard
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gray
(Windsor West)
Grisé
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Guilbault
(Drummond)
Gurbin
Hamelin
Harris
Hawkes
Heap
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Holtmann
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudon
Isabelle
Jacques
James
Jewett
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelleher
Kempling
King
Landry
Langdon
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Mailly
Malépart
Manly
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McCurdy
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McLaughlin
McLean
Mitchell
Moore
Mulroney
Murphy
Nystrom
Oberle
Oostrom
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pennock
Pépin
Pietz
Prud'homme
Reid
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Rossi
St. Germain
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Skelly
Sparrow
Speyer
Stevens
Tardif
(Richmond—Wolfe)
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Tobin
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Waddell
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson
(Etobicoke Centre)
Young—143

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 74.

The House divided on Motion No. 74, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 430*)

YEAS

Members

Kindy
McKenzie
Stewart
Taylor
Vankoughnet—5

NAYS

Members

Althouse
Andre
Beatty
Benjamin
Bernier
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blaikie
Blais
Blais-Grenier
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Boyer
Brightwell
Brisco
Broadbent
Browes
Caccia
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Champagne
(Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Champagne
(Champlain)
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Cochrane
Collins
Comeau
Cook

Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
de Jong
Dewar
Dick
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine
Foster
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gérin
Girard
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-
la-Madeleine)
Gray
(Windsor West)
Grisé
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Guilbault
(Drummond)
Gurbin
Hamelin
Harris
Hawkes
Heap
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Holtmann
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudon
Isabelle
Jacques
James
Jewett
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—
Conception)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelleher
Kempling
King
Landry
Langdon
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Mailly
Malépart
Manly
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McCurdy
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McLaughlin
McLean
Mitchell
Moore
Mulroney
Murphy
Nystrom
Oberle
Oostrom
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pennock
Pépin
Pietz
Prud'homme
Reid
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Rossi
St. Germain
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Skelly
Sparrow
Speyer
Stevens
Tardif
(Richmond—Wolfe)
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Tobin
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Waddell
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson
(Etobicoke
Centre)
Young—145

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 76.

The House divided on Motion No. 76, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 431*)

YEAS

Members

Kindy
McKenzie
Stewart
Vankoughnet—4

NAYS

Members

Althouse
Andre
Beatty
Benjamin
Bernier
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blaikie
Blais
Blais-Grenier
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Boyer
Brightwell
Brisco
Broadbent
Browes
Caccia
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Champagne
(Saint-Hyacinthe—
Bagot)
Champagne
(Champlain)
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Cochrane
Collins
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Cossitt
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
de Jong
Dewar
Dick
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine
Foster
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gérin
Girard
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-
la-Madeleine)
Gray
(Windsor West)
Grisé
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Guilbault
(Drummond)
Gurbin
Hamelin
Harris
Hawkes
Heap
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Holtmann
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudon
Isabelle
Jacques
James
Jewett
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—
Conception)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelleher
Kempling
King
Landry
Langdon
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Mailly
Malépart
Manly
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McCurdy
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McLaughlin
McLean
Mitchell
Moore
Mulroney
Murphy
Nystrom
Oberle
Oostrom
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pennock
Pépin
Pietz
Prud'homme
Reid
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Rossi
St. Germain
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Skelly
Sparrow
Speyer
Stevens
Tardif
(Richmond—Wolfe)
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Tobin
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Waddell
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson
(Etobicoke
Centre)
Young—144

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 104.

The House divided on Motion No. 104, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 432*)

YEAS

Members

Kindy
McKenzie
Stewart
Vankoughnet—4

NAYS

Members

Althouse
Andre
Beatty
Benjamin
Bernier
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blaikie
Blais
Blais-Grenier
Blouin
Bosley

NAYS

Members

Althouse
Andre
Beatty
Benjamin
Bernier
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blaikie
Blais
Blais-Grenier
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Boyer
Brightwell
Brisco
Broadbent
Browes
Caccia
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Champagne
(Saint-Hyacinthe—
Bagot)
Champagne
(Champlain)
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Cochrane
Collins
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
de Jong
Dewar
Dick
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine
Foster
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gérin
Girard
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-
la-Madeleine)
Gray
(Windsor West)
Grisé
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Guilbault
(Drummond)
Gurbin
Hamelin
Harris
Hawkes
Heap
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Holtmann
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudon
Isabelle
Jacques
James
Jewett
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—
Conception)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelleher
Kempling
King
Landry
Langdon
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Mailly
Malépart
Manly
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McCurdy
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McLaughlin
McLean
Mitchell
Moore
Mulroney
Murphy
Nystrom
Oberle
Oostrom
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pennock
Pépin
Pietz
Prud'homme
Reid
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Rossi
St. Germain
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Skelly
Sparrow
Speyer
Stevens
Tardif
(Richmond—Wolfe)
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Tobin
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Waddell
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson
(Etobicoke
Centre)
Young—145

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 110.

The House divided on Motion No. 110, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 433*)

YEAS

Members

Kindy
McKenzie
Stewart
Vankoughnet—4

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 128.

The House divided on Motion No. 128, which was negatived on the following division:

Official Languages Act

(*Division No. 434*)

YEAS

Members

Kindy
McKenzie
Stewart
Vankoughnet—4

NAYS

Members

Althouse
Andre
Beatty
Benjamin
Bernier
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blais
Blais-Grenier
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Brightwell
Brisco
Broadbent
Browes
Caccia
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Champagne (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Champagne (Champlain)
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Cochrane
Collins
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
de Jong
Dewar
Dick
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Epp (Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine
Foster
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gérin
Girard
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gray (Windsor West)
Grisé
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Guilbault (Drummond)
Gurbin
Hamelin
Harris
Hawkes
Heap
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Holtmann
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudon
Isabelle
Jacques
James
Jewett
Johnson (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelleher
Kempling
King
Landry
Langdon
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Mailly
Malépart
Manly
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McCurdy
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLaughlin
McLean
Mitchell
Moore
Mulroney
Murphy
Nystrom
Oberle
Oostrom
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pennock
Pépin
Pietz
Prud'homme
Reid
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Rossi
St. Germain
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Skelly
Sparrow
Speyer
Stevens
Tardif (Richmond—Wolfe)
Tardif (Charlesbourg)
Tobin
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Waddell
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Young—145

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 136.

The House divided on Motion No. 136, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 435*)

YEAS

Members

Kindy
McKenzie
Stewart
Vankoughnet—4

NAYS

Members

Althouse
Andre
Beatty
Benjamin
Bernier
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blais
Blais-Grenier
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Brightwell
Brisco
Broadbent
Browes
Caccia
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Champagne (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Champagne (Champlain)
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Cochrane
Collins
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
de Jong
Dewar
Dick
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Epp (Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine
Foster
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gérin
Girard
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gray (Windsor West)
Grisé
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Guilbault (Drummond)
Gurbin
Hamelin
Harris
Hawkes
Heap
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Holtmann
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudon
Isabelle
Jacques
James
Jewett
Johnson (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelleher
Kempling
King
Landry
Langdon
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Mailly
Malépart
Manly
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McCurdy
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLaughlin
McLean
Mitchell
Moore
Mulroney
Murphy
Nystrom
Oberle
Oostrom
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pennock
Pépin
Pietz
Prud'homme
Reid
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Rossi
St. Germain
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Skelly
Sparrow
Speyer
Stevens
Tardif (Richmond—Wolfe)
Tardif (Charlesbourg)
Tobin
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Waddell
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Young—145

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: The next question is the following:

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada) moved:

That Bill C-72, an Act respecting the status and use of the official languages of Canada, be concurred in as amended.

[*English*]

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Shall I dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 436*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Andre
Beatty
Benjamin
Bernier
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blais
Blais-Grenier
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Brightwell
Brisco
Broadbent
Browes
Caccia
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Champagne (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Champagne (Champlain)
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Collins
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Cossitt
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
de Jong
Dewar
Dick
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Epp (Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine
Foster
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gagliano
Gagnon
Garneau
Gauthier
Gérin
Girard
Graham
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gray (Windsor West)
Grisé
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Guilbault (Drummond)
Gurbin
Hamelin
Harris
Hawkes
Heap
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Holtmann
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudon
Isabelle
Jacques
James
Jewett
Johnson (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelleher
Kempling
King
Landry
Langdon
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Mailly
Malépart
Manly
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McCurdy
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLaughlin
McLean
Mitchell
Mitges
Moore
Mulroney
Murphy
Nystrom
Oberle
Oostrom
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pennock
Pépin
Pietz
Prud'homme
Reid
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Rossi
St. Germain
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Skelly
Sparrow
Speyer
Stevens
Tardif (Richmond—Wolfe)
Tardif (Charlesbourg)
Tobin
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Waddell
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Young—146

NAYS

Members

Corbett
Domm
Kindy
McCain
McKenzie
Nowlan
Stewart
Vankoughnet—8

• (1940)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Cochrane: Mr. Speaker, I draw attention to the fact that I was in the House but chose not to vote.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the Bill be read the third time? At the next sitting of the House?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Okanagan—Similkameen (Mr. King) on a point of order.

Mr. King: Mr. Speaker, I am seeking unanimous consent to present the report of the legislative committee on Bill C-58.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Official Languages Act

MUTUAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE IN CRIMINAL MATTERS ACT

PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Fred King (Okanagan—Similkameen): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to present the report of the legislative committee on Bill C-58, an Act to provide for the implementation of treaties for mutual legal assistance in criminal matters and to amend the Criminal Code, the Crime Liability Act and the Immigration Act, 1976.

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

Mr. Speaker: Would all those Members who wanted to make a special recording of their vote please report to the Table at their earliest convenience.

It being 7.45 p.m., pursuant to Order made June 23, 1988, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 7.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, July 7, 1988

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table in both official languages the government response to Petitions Nos. 332-4693 to 332-4695 inclusive, 332-4702, 332-4704, 332-4709, 332-4717, 332-4721 and 332-4724 to 332-4745 inclusive, and I move:

That this House do now proceed to Orders of the Day.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada) moved that Bill C-72, an Act respecting the status and use of the official languages of Canada, be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to preface my remarks on this important occasion by recalling to the House what was said here at another time:

> This Bill is placed before the House to strengthen rather than weaken Canadian unity. It is put forward for the purpose of making Canadians, whether they speak English or French, feel at home in this country to the extent that this is practical, and making federal government services available in the two languages.

Those are the words of the Hon. Robert Stanfield in the debate on the first official languages Bill to be considered by this House. It was exactly 19 years ago this week, on July 7, 1969, that the Official Languages Act was read a third time and passed by all Parties in this House. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, as he then was, made the following points in his statement:

> The purpose of this Bill is not to compel English-speaking Canadians to learn French, and vice versa. This Bill is aimed at providing French-speaking or English-speaking minorities with all federal government services in the language of their choice, as far as it is practical. If the purpose of this Bill were to impose bilingualism, I would oppose it, as I believe virtually every Member of this House would.

He went on further to say:

> If this Bill is not administered fairly and sensibly it can very easily create more disunity than unity . . . The emphasis ought to be placed on the bilingual nature of the service rather than on the bilingual nature of the servant to the fullest extent possible and also to the extent that it is fully consistent with French and English Canadians being able to pursue careers in the Public Service . . . If we are to create a feeling of greater unity we have to think in terms of enlarging rights and opportunities, and not of restricting rights and opportunities.

That is the basis of this Bill, Mr. Speaker. That is the essence of this Bill. That is the statement of this Party over the years which has been carried out, developed and evolved by this Government under the leadership of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) to the legislation that we are now considering on third reading.

• (1110)

I want to quote some of the words of the Right Hon. Prime Minister when he was Leader of the Opposition, during the debate on the House of Commons resolution on French-language rights in Manitoba on October 6, 1983. He said:

> Years ago, this House approved the principle of official bilingualism for Canada . . . It is a noble principle, one which is capable of enriching the life of this nation. By our stand today, we reaffirm our commitment and that of our Party given earlier in this same House of Commons by outstanding and distinguished Canadians such as the Hon. Robert Stanfield and the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark).
>
> Bilingualism is a valued principle and an indispensable dimension of our national life. The program, however, must be implemented with fairness and with equity. It is diminished if it comes to be perceived by large numbers of Canadians as an instrument of division or an instrument of unfairness . . . We must seek to understand these differences between Canadians and consider them not as obstacles but as guides to the elaboration of sensible and realistic policies which will enhance rather than lessen the attractiveness of such programs in the minds of all Canadians. Sensitivity to people and the presumption of good faith should be the hallmarks of implementation. They will ensure for bilingualism a more durable character and more pervasive acceptance . . .

The consistency of the position of this Party, of this Government, is evident from the comments I have just read.

[*Translation*]

We have approached the matter of official languages in this same spirit of fairness and equity from the very beginning. When we took office in the autumn of 1984, we stated clearly that one of the Government's aims would be to broaden and strengthen the national consensus on language policy. In the Throne Speech delivered on November 5, 1984, this commitment was expressed in these solemn words: "National unity also demands that the two levels of government co-operate in supporting official language minorities and in fostering the rich multicultural character of Canada. My Government is committed to ensuring that the equality of the two official languages—so vital to our national character and identity—is respected in fact as it is in law. My Ministers acknowledge the need for ongoing improvements and for vigilance in this indispensable area of our national life."

[*English*]

In 1985, the Prime Minister took note of the recommendations of the Commissioner of Official Languages in his annual report as well as the recommendations of the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages in its second report. He asked three Ministers primarily responsible for language matters, the Minister of Justice, the President of the Treasury Board and the Secretary of State, to undertake a comprehensive assessment of the Government's over-all policy in this field and to seek ways of improving it. Ministers were seconded in their efforts by a special senior committee of Deputy Ministers which was designated by the Prime Minister to co-ordinate the renewal.

The Official Languages Act was already under study by the Department of Justice in the context of Charter conformity review. That study was broadened to ensure that, as the Prime Minister stated, that vital piece of legislation was strengthened, enhanced and adapted to new conditions and requirements.

The Throne Speech of October 1986 further underlined this commitment in the following terms:

> Official bilingualism is an indispensable feature of our national character. Seventeen years after its enactment, Canada's Official Languages Act now needs to be revised. Appropriate legislation will be introduced in this Session to ensure, as well, that this Act conforms with the Canadian Charter of Rights.

Shortly after I accepted the responsibilities of Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada in 1986, I stated to the Canadian Bar Association that the re-enactment of the Official Languages Act to ensure conformity with both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution and the implementation of the rights of accused persons to be tried in their own official language under the Criminal Code would be matters of particular importance to me as Minister of Justice, and important elements in the advancement of the Government's policies of social justice and national reconciliation.

It took much of the next year for my colleagues, the President of the Treasury Board, the Secretary of State and I to complete the review and develop renewed policies and programs respecting the use of official languages not only within federal institutions but also within the larger Canadian society. This endeavour required us to review, study and consult in order to ensure that the reforms the Government would be proposing would be balanced ones, reforms which would move official languages policy forward but which would be fair and just for all Canadians and which could be implemented in a reasonable, effective and practical manner.

This painstaking process of consultation and consensus-building did not end with the introduction of Bill C-72 in June of 1987. Despite the very positive reaction the Bill received from the opposition Parties, representatives of the official language minority communities, the Commissioner of Official Languages and major media across the nation, there were further consultations with the Commissioner, minority language organizations and Members of Parliament to pursue any further concerns that may have come up during the general reaction following the introduction of the Bill.

Information sessions were held with various bodies such as the Canadian Judicial Council and the Conference of Canadian Court Administrators. Much correspondence took place with members of the public and with officials of some provincial Governments as well as with a number of provincial Attorneys General.

Such consultations led to the coming into force of the language of trial provisions of the Criminal Code in Saskatchewan and with regard to summary conviction offences in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. Discussions with the two territorial Governments continued and this resulted in the signing of the recent Canada-Yukon language agreement.

As I had stated before in this House, ours is a Government that believes in communication, consultation and co-operation. These virtues, I believe, are essential to foster understanding, acceptance and development of official languages policy in Canada.

Obviously we do have a complex Bill before us, but concerns and questions arise in any legislative initiative, and it has been our duty as legislators to address these and to resolve them. The principles of the Bill were approved by this House on second reading and it has been the firm resolve of the Government not to deviate from these principles. However, as I remarked on March 22 of this year during the opening statement to the legislative committee studying Bill C-72, we remained as a Government ready and willing to consider appropriate proposals for clarification and improvement.

During the next two months, a wide range of witnesses were heard and views were expressed and we heard the comments and questions of committee members. On May 25, having followed the committee's proceedings very closely, I indicated the type of amendments which commended themselves to the Government. The amendment proposals I presented to the legislative committee on behalf of the Government were, I believe, a fair and balanced package that maintained our clear commitment to the underlying philosophy and principles of this legislation.

Several further amendments and adjustments put forward by committee members and the Commissioner of Official Languages were also accepted by the Government as part of our continued willingness to consider reasonable suggestions to clarify specific points without in any way deviating from the true character of this Bill.

• (1120)

Through the useful work of the legislative committee the consensus of understanding and support for this important measure has been broadened. As amended and reported by the committee, Bill C-72 has been improved and enhanced in a number of major respects, and I commend members of the committee for their hard work and patience. It was a very effective co-operative effort and a great credit to Members on both sides.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: At this point I would like to briefly review the major provisions of this important initiative. The Bill commences with a preamble that recalls the fundamental constitutional and policy principles which have guided development of this legislation.

The Bill begins by recognizing that the Constitution of Canada provides for equality of status and equal rights and privileges for the two official languages as to their use in all federal institutions, a principle which is entrenched in our Constitution in Section 16 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This includes their use as languages of work in those institutions.

The Constitution also provides, in Sections 17, 18 and 19 of the Charter and in Section 133 of the Constitution Act, 1867, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, for full and equal access to Parliament, to the laws and to the courts of Canada as established by Parliament, in English and in French. Section 20 of the Charter guarantees the right of members of the public to communicate with and to receive available services from federal institutions.

The Charter contains other constitutional provisions of importance to this legislation: protection of the educational rights of the English and French linguistic minorities; advancement of the status and use of both official languages, recognition of the rights associated with the preservation and enhancement of other languages. "I would suggest that it might be possible to devise a preamble to the Bill which would have that effect". That was a statement made by the Hon. Robert Stanfield in 1969. All of these principles and more are recognized by the preamble.

Moreover, the new legislation contains a purpose clause which states that the aim of the Act is to ensure respect for the equality of status enjoyed by the two languages in all federal institutions; to support the development of the English and French linguistic minority communities, which the preamble recognizes as being "an integral part" of our two official language communities, and advance both languages generally in Canadian society, and to set out the roles and responsibilities of federal institutions in official languages matters.

Parts 1 to 111 of the Bill flow from Section 133 of the Constitution Act, 1867. These parts deal with proceedings in Parliament, legislative and other government documents, and the administration of justice in federal tribunals. They are inspired by the principle that all Canadians must have full and equal access in both our official languages to Parliament, in its legislative and other proceedings, and to the federal courts, in the administration of justice.

[*Translation*]

If there is one part of the Bill that most clearly reflects the Government's desire to make substantive, effective improvements in the existing mechanisms, it is the part that concerns the administration of justice. Sections 14 to 20 guarantee unrestricted use of French and English in Canada's courts.

This means that any Canadian will have the right to speak his own language in any federal court of law or administrative tribunal. Is it too much to ask that, for the sake of equity, these federal institutions render justice to Canadians in their own language? To ask the question is to answer it. I do not think it is too much to ask of them, especially since we have ascertained that it is feasible right now. We will not have to interfere in any way with the internal management of the courts to have them implement this policy.

Under the new Act, federal courts composed of unilingual anglophone and francophone judges and bilingual judges will have no trouble administering their affairs. We have taken care to ensure due respect for a democratic value we consider paramount—the independence of the justice system.

As Minister responsible for Bill C-72, I am proud to put such measures before the Canadian people on behalf of the Government, and it is my personal conviction that no one will ever criticize us for having worked for greater equity in the administration of justice in Canada.

[*English*]

Part 1V deals with the constitutional right of any member of the public to communicate with and receive services from federal institutions in either official language. As under the 1969 Act, the new legislation creates duties on federal institutions to ensure that the right is respected at the head or central offices of those institutions, and at their offices in the National Capital Region. The 1969 Act further provided for the creation of federal bilingual districts where the minority numbered 10 per cent of the population. It stipulated that outside the proposed bilingual districts, services to the public would also be provided in both languages, to the extent feasible, in other locations where there was a significant demand. Bilingual districts were never proclaimed because the concept proved unworkable. For example, certain regional offices would serve minority language populations where located outside the bilingual districts themselves.

With the advent of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the bilingual districts notion was dropped. We believe that such a geographical constraint on the language rights of Canadians is constitutionally suspect. Such a fixed criterion is inherently arbitrary and incompatible with the administrative flexibility that is necessary to make the constitutional language rights a practical, workable and living reality in the relationships between Canadians and the federal institutions that exist to serve them. Amendments to the Bill that would restore this geographical and numerical flexibility are equally dubious, as a matter of constitutional conformity.

Indeed, Section 20 of the Charter guarantees the right of members of the public to services in either language from federal offices where there is a significant demand for communications with and services from that office in such language, or where due to the nature of that office itself, it is reasonable that communications and services from that office be available in both English and French. These criteria epitomize the need for flexibility, and I would like to review them in somewhat more detail to lay to rest misconceptions and misrepresentations about this part of the Bill.

The "demand" test of Section 20 of the Charter is first and foremost a quantitative one, while the "nature of the office" component is essentially a qualitative one, going to the intrinsic qualities of the office, irrespective of demand. However, this is not to say that there can be no qualitative aspects to the significance of the demand, or that the quantitative aspect is strictly numerical. If the drafters of the Charter wanted to cast the demand criterion of Section 20 exclusively in numerical terms, they could have easily done so in the language of Section 23, which provides for minority language education "where numbers warrant".

• (1130)

Indeed, the original October 1980 version of Section 20 provided for services in both languages from federal offices located in areas in which it would be determined that a substantial number of persons within the population used that language, but this formulation was criticized at the time and replaced by the notion of "significant demand".

In any event, even a "where numbers warrant" test cannot be met, the courts have told us, by the strict imposition of an immutable or geographical limitation in legislation. There must be some flexibility of application. To fix, without any justification, an arbitrary figure would, as I have indicated, demonstrably risk violating the provisions of the Charter.

In Bill C-72 we have outlined a variety of quantitative factors, including numerical ones, that the Governor in Council may have regard to in prescribing by regulation circumstances in which there is significant demand. I want to bring these to the attention of the House. They include the number of persons in the English or French linguistic minority population in the area served by the office, the proportion of the minority population to the total population of the areas served by the office, and the volume of communications or services between the office and members of the public using each language.

We have also insured that the Governor in Council will have the flexibility to take into account any other factors that the Governor in Council considers appropriate as well as the particular characteristics of the linguistic minority population.

This latter qualitative factor implies that in some cases the special needs and conditions of a minority language community may result in the demand being considered significant enough to justify the provision of bilingual services even where a purely numerical criteria might suggest otherwise. This is consonant with our commitment to supporting the development of vital minority communities expressed elsewhere in this legislation, and with our commitment to Canada's linguistic duality in the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord.

I would like to turn now to the important area of language of work. Section 16 of the Charter guarantees that the official languages have "equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all institutions of the Parliament and Government of Canada". These constitutional rights are stated very broadly. There is no doubt, in my view, that they include equal status, rights, and privileges in respect of the use of these languages in the work environments of federal institutions. The entitlements flowing from Section 16 are not qualified by Section 20's tests of "significant demand" at federal offices or the nature of the office.

It was thus incumbent on the Government to develop a legislative scheme which would respect the principle of equality of status of the two languages in federal institutions in a way that would reflect the reality of the country and which would be implemented without enormous administrative difficulty.

The guarantees of the Charter are subject, by virtue of Section 1, only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society. If the language-of-work entitlement were expressed exclusively as an individual right, major problems in implementation would have resulted. Consequently, the right is shaped and conditioned in a reasonable, workable and, above all, fair manner by the corresponding duties which are imposed on federal institutions by Part V of the Bill.

Part V recognizes, in Clause 34, that "English and French are the languages of work in all federal institutions, and officers and employees . . . have the right to use either official language in accordance with this Part". Clause 35 then provides that in the National Capital Region and other prescribed regions work environments of federal institutions are to be "conducive to the effective use of both official languages and accommodate the use of either official language by its officers and employees".

Clause 35 goes on to provide that in those regions of Canada which are not so prescribed the treatment of both languages in the work environments of the institutions in regions where one official language predominates is reasonably comparable to the treatment of both languages in regions where the other official language predominates.

The prescribed language-of-work regions are those which have been recognized for the purposes by Treasury Board policy since 1977. In these regions federal institutions must ensure that personnel and central services and regularly and widely used work instruments and, after 1991, newly acquired data processing systems, are available to employees in both languages; that where it is appropriate or necessary in order to create a work environment conducive to the use of both official languages supervisors are able to communicate with their employees in both official languages; and that corporate management groups have a functionally bilingual capacity.

These are institutional duties, not individual obligations. It is not, I emphasize, an individual requirement imposed on each supervisory position in the Public Service of Canada, as has been erroneously suggested by some.

Outside the prescribed language-of-work regions the right to use either official language will be more limited because the obligations on federal institutions are less onerous, but this does not mean that there will be no opportunities to use the other language or that there will be no services to government employees or work instruments, for example, that will be made available through the system in both languages. The Governor in Council may make regulations in this regard and may prescribe the manner in which any of the duties of this Part are carried out.

If fairness and flexibility in the application of the language-of-work and services to the public duties are to be maintained, regulations will be necessary. However, the Government has been sensitive and responsive to the concerns of Members of this House by ensuring that the Bill provides appropriate mechanisms for parliamentary oversight and review. One defect in the 1969 official languages legislation raised by the Hon. Robert Stanfield was that it provides inadequate opportunities for Parliament to examine and criticize the manner in which the Bill is administered and the practices adopted under it.

Up until now Treasury Board has had responsibility for the development and administration of government policy in this area with very little direct accountability to Parliament. Henceforth, under the new legislation, Treasury Board's powers and responsibilities are clearly set out. The President of the Treasury Board will make an annual report to Parliament on the programs relating to official languages in respect of which it has responsibility.

The Commissioner of Official Languages may initiate a review of any regulations or directives on official languages and make a report to Parliament. Consultations with minorities and the members of the public will be held on proposed regulations, and all regulations made under the Bill will now be made by the Governor in Council and not by Treasury Board.

A draft of proposed regulations must be tabled in the House at least 30 sitting days before prepublication. Regulations shall be prepublished in the *Canada Gazette* at least 30 days before coming into force, and a reasonable opportunity will be given to interested persons to make representations to the President of the Treasury Board.

Where a regulation is proposed that would add to or delete from the list of prescribed language-of-work regions, it must be laid before each House of Parliament and a motion to disapprove the proposed regulation may be put forward by Members of Parliament.

Finally, the administration of the Act, any regulations or directives made thereunder, and the reports of the Commissioner, the President of the Treasury Board, and the Secretary of State shall be reviewed on a permanent basis by the parliamentary committee.

• (1140)

These measures are consistent with the reform of the regulatory process undertaken by this Government and our philosophy of openness, accessibility and accountability. This was the result of the work of the committee. It was this accountability to Members of Parliament and the co-operation demonstrated through the committee that allowed us to make these amendments to enhance, strengthen and make more open the whole process, which I think is a distinct improvement to the legislation. Again, I commend members of the committee for their help.

[*Translation*]

The Bill restates a goal that has long been part of the Government's official languages policy: full participation in federal institutions by all Canadians, be they English-speaking or French-speaking, regardless of mother tongue or ethnic origin. It is a goal, not an executory duty.

We made a commitment that federal institutions would be staffed with anglophones and francophones in the same proportions as the national population, with due regard for the nature of each institution.

Far from making irrational commitments, we opted for a policy that was acceptable in that it provided equal employment opportunities for all Canadians, without discriminating against English-speaking Canadians or in favour of French-speaking Canadians, that is, in a completely equitable manner.

[*English*]

If we consider that 88 per cent of all bilingual federal Public Service positions are held within the National Capital area and the Province of Québec and that 96 per cent of all unilingual French positions are held in Québec, Hon. Members will quickly realize that there is no basis to the rumours that Francophones are somehow taking over the federal Public Service. In the Province of British Columbia, for example, 99 per cent of the positions are unilingual English, in Alberta it is 98 per cent, in Saskatchewan 97 per cent, in Manitoba 94 per cent and in Ontario 92 per cent. There is no reason to believe that these figures would change unless the make-up of the population in these regions changed substantially.

These statistics clearly demonstrate how realistic this policy is. Never has the Government supported the imposition of quotas which negatively impact on either Francophones or Anglophones. We have never supported the implementation of language programs which discriminate. The reality is quite the contrary. The official languages policy outlined in this Bill has always promoted and defended the concept of merit. This is a concept that will continue.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the Charter provides that anyone whose linguistic rights have been infringed may apply to a court to obtain such remedy as the court considers just in the circumstances. For the Official Languages Act to be effective, we had to give it executory force. That does not mean that every language dispute will henceforth be referred automatically to a court. Rather, the new Act provides a mediation mechanism with which the Commissioner of Official Languages will be associated by virtue of this role as an ombudsman and the expertise he has acquired over the years.

For that reason, the bill requires that persons intending to file a complaint approach the Commissioner first. He will be responsible for investigating complaints.

It is only as a last resort that the person goes to court. We have thus rectified the shortcomings of the 1969 Act for cases where Canadians have a legitimate grievance. The Commissioner of Official Languages will shift out the frivolous suits from the serious ones. His participation will be the pledge that suits will be based on the principles of law. Of course, the Commissioner will have to act in accordance with the Law, and if he exceeds his competence and finds himself outside the limits of his jurisdiction, he could be the subject of the usual administrative proceedings, on the grounds that he had infringed the rules of fundamental justice.

[*English*]

In closing, let me say a few words about Part VII of the Bill on the advancement of English and French. I am pleased that my colleague, the Secretary of State (Mr. Bouchard) is here. I hope he will be in a position to participate in the debate and expand on this matter.

The Supreme Court has stated that this constitutional principle of progress in language matters is particularly suited to advancement through the legislative process. Surely all Canadians can see the wisdom of supporting, through encouragement and co-operation, not coersion, the development of our official language minority communities and the recognition and use of both official languages in Canadian society as a whole. Surely all Canadians want their federal Government to encourage and support the learning of English and French, and to foster the acceptance and appreciation of our two official languages within the Canadian public. The recent language agreements between the federal Government and the Governments of Saskatchewan, the Yukon and Prince Edward Island are witness to this consensus.

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court put it eloquently in the Societé des Acadiens case, repeated most recently by a majority of the court in the seminal Mercure decision. He stated:

> Linguistic duality has been a longstanding concern in our nation. Canada is a country with both French and English solidly embedded in its history. The constitutional language protections reflect continued and renewed efforts in the direction of bilingualism. In my view, we must take special care to be faithful to the spirit and purpose of the guarantee of language rights enshrined in the Charter.

On this occasion the Government is coming forward with legislation that is fair, equitable and which guarantees fairness to all parts of our country and all members of Canadian society. It is legislation that recognizes that equity and fairness are the cornerstone of this Government's approach to official languages. With the leadership of the Prime Minister on this very sensitive and important issue, Canada will develop as the progressive nation for which it is totally capable. We look forward to this legislation taking us into the next century. I urge the support of all Members.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Minister took the high road today. Indeed, it is an historic day and, for many of us, an important day because after several years of hard work and great experiences, we are coming to a moment when the House of Commons of this country is to approve a new law concerning official languages. It is a new law of this land designed to achieve national unity and unite Canada on the basis of the constitutional goal we set for ourselves, and to have a country where duality is respected and seen as a unifying objective rather than a divisive one.

I am particularly happy that we are dealing with this legislation at this time because I do not believe we have a linguistic crisis in Canada at this time.

• (1150)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, when my leader, the Right Honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner), spoke during the debate in this House last February 9 on Bill C-72—and he was the only Party Leader who spoke in that debate, and I thank him for it—he said, and I quote,

> One of the reasons why this Bill is acceptable to us and to a substantial majority of Canadians is that it is in our Party's tradition, which includes the 1969 Act, the experience we acquired from 1969 to 1984, the Parliamentary Resolution of 1973, the 1982 Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the proceedings of the Joint Committee on Official Languages.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that this Bill is the fruit of the labours of many Canadians, under both this Government and previous Governments: civil servants, Commissioners of Official Languages, members of the language communities in this country, who almost always inspire us, give us ideas, and sometimes even push the politicians to act.

[*English*]

The coexistence of our two linguistic communities symbolizes our Canadian distinctiveness, this society of freedom and tolerance, justice and compassion that we all seek to build. The majority of Canadians accept our nation's duality and this brings greater respect for the rights of all other minorities. Two official languages, therefore, far from being divisive, are a guarantee of tolerance and understanding, because an open mind on language cannot but nurture generosity of understanding and support for other cultural and linguistic groups.

We have had here for several years—at least since I have been here, since 1972— a policy of multiculturalism. I have said it before, if people cannot accept two official languages in this country, they can hardly understand and accept the multicultural nature of Canada and the important policies that have been adopted to support and strengthen and promote our cultural diversity.

Here again we are faced with our large geographic expanse, a large territory, and our regional differences and, admittedly, our differing perspectives. I am confident that we in this country, are beginning to see the importance of looking beyond our local and regional boundaries, to look for the differences; not to criticize them, not to destroy them, not to eliminate them, but to support them, to promote them and thus enrich each other and make this a better country for all of us.

It is the Liberal Party's position that this is a good Bill. It is the Liberal Party's position that we will support and defend across this country the principles of this Bill. We pray for understanding across the country and for the Bill's implementation in a generous, open and, hopefully, quick way.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gauthier: I say that because the regulations that will flow from this Bill will be subject to parliamentary review, in the committee on regulatory review, and it is very important that the Bill be applied in a generous, open manner.

[*Translation*]

We must not be mean about this, we must not be petty, the regulations and the whole application must be generous. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, it will be a beautiful Charter but it will have neither teeth nor impact.

The problem is quite simple: how do we ensure equality between anglophones and francophones despite their unequal distribution on Canadian territory? That is a question our predecessors in government and our forebears have alerady tried to answer, beginning with the Fathers of Confederation in 1867. Since then every generation has had to adopt, modernize, modify and let us say reinforce where necessary the laws and regulations regarding official languages, in order to adapt them to a sociological reality that itself is constantly changing.

In this search for legislative perfection, perhaps impossible to achieve but still a valid goal, there are two dimensions: the national dimension—Canada as a whole; and the regional dimension—our cities and towns, our communities, our regions and provinces. At the national level, legislation and regulations must be brought in that ensure members of the two main language communities equivalent rights, neither more nor less, so that they can feel at home in their country, at least at the institutional level. That is the role that the federal government must try to play, that is the goal of Bill C-72: to create an atmosphere of generosity toward all Canadians who need to deal with federal institutions for service and communication in the language of their choice and not in the language of the institution, which as we know can vary from region to region.

At the regional and local level, what is at stake is not quite the same. Naturally, that equality of rights and privileges that have been granted remains constant no matter what the region. But a new dimension must be added, that of minorities, individuals situated in a cultural and social environment dominated by the other group. Whether it is the anglophones in Quebec among the francophone majority, or the francophones outside Quebec who live among or in surrondings that are largely anglophone, they experience situations that are, if not the same, at least comparable. The result is that at the national level we have to pay particular attention to the unique situations in our cities and towns and in the provinces. We have always done so in the past, and we will continue to do so. It is one of the characteristic things about Canada, and I for one am proud of it.

It was in fact partly because of our geography, and the distribution of our population over so vast a territory, that we opted for a federal system in the first place. It follows that we must endow ourselves with the necessary constitutional provisions that will unite all the different pieces into one mosaic.

• (1200)

That is the origin of the interplay of the national and regional dimensions to which I referred earlier. The broad goals are set at the national level. But each province has specific responsibilities through which the national goals are achieved—health services, education, social services, domestic trade, the administration of justice, the obligation to make rules for the professions and for municipal and regional governments. All those sectors are, according to the Constitution, matters for provincial jurisdiction. In all those sectors, the federal government has no jurisdiction, and in none of them will Bill C-72 have any direct effect. And yet, the provinces have an important role. It is the provinces that will have to establish within their borders the language régime best suited both to national objectives and to the particular needs of their provincial populations. That is why Canada's linguistic mosaic is so diverse.

Quebec has its own language legislation, which reflects its unique linguistic and cultural situation. Alberta and Saskatchewan have also adopted language legislation, more or less forceful, more or less acceptable, but which reflects their realities; so have Ontario, my own province, and New Brunswick, the only officially bilingual province in Canada, a status enshrined in the Constitution. In each case, Mr. Speaker, we see different solutions, all possible answers to the question I asked at the start of my speech. What is Canada?

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are preparing to give Canada a new bench-mark, a new milestone in the area of language legislation. This afternoon the House of Commons is going to adopt Bill C-72, an Act respecting the status and use of the official languages of Canada. It is a proud day for me. I worked on this Bill, with the Hon. Member from Charlevoix (Mr. Hamelin), and I hail it. I am perhaps not 100 per cent satisfied with it, neither is my colleague, but I think it represents an enhancement, if I can put it like that. We tried to keep as much as possible the heart of the Bill, and I think that in general . . . I will return, later on in my remarks, to the improvements I would like to see in this legislation, which will probably be the subject of Private Members' Bills.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of official languages is not new. It is as old as Canada. It goes back to the British North America Act, notably section 133. That section stipulates that either English or French may be used before the courts of Canada and Quebec but that both languages shall be used in the "respective Records and Journals" of the Houses of Parliament. There was something that responded to a requirement of the time. So linguistic duality goes back to the birth of this country. And even if they were not recognized as "official" languages, both English and French could rightfully be used in Parliament and before the federal courts, from the very beginning.

The protection, or regulation, of the status of French and English was ensured by a series of Acts and administrative measures both federally and provincially. This continued right up to 1963, when the federal Government created the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, with a view, as the Commission's mandate put it so well, and I quote: "To recommend what steps should be taken to develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races, taking into account the contribution made by the other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada."

Mr. Speaker, I don't need to tell you that André Laurendeau and Davidson Dunton were two very brave men in their day and generation. They toured the country with their team to hear Canadians' complaints, comments and recommendations, and in a preliminary report from the B and B Commission appears this sentence of Mr. Laurendeau's about the Commissioners, and I quote: "[They have been forced to conclude that] Canada, without being fully conscious of the fact, is passing through the greatest crisis in its history." That was in 1963. Something had to be done. And Mr. Pearson, the Liberal Prime Minister of the day, did it. It was a turning point for official languages, which was to lead us to the proclamation of the Official Languages Act in 1969, then to the constitutional recognition of official languages in the Constitution Act, 1982, and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms that went with it, and finally to the Meech-Langevin Accord, which recognized our linguistic duality as one of Canada's fundamental characteristics. So we have a process, a series of important and historic events.

I would like to point out to the Hon. Members, Mr. Speaker, that the impetus given to the cause of official languages in 1962-63 and after, right up to 1984, was given by Canadians, Liberals, Mr. Pearson and Mr. Trudeau, and I take off my hat to them, because they did what had to be done at the time with courage and with great personal satisfaction.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gauthier: Moreover it was the Pearson government, Mr Speaker, in 1964, that authorized the Civil Service Commission, as it was known then, to set up a language bureau and to offer, for the first time, language training; and it was Mr Pearson himself who called for the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission, and saw that this generous and open new approach to official languages was implemented. In response to the B and B Commission's recommendations in 1969, the federal Government, with all-Party support, passed the Official Languages Act, which gave English and French equal rights and privileges as languages of Parliament and languages of Canada. The culmination came in 1982, when the official status of English and French was made part of the Constitution, and language rights enshrined in sections 16 to 20 of the Charter of Rights, as we all know. There is also section 23, the right to minority-language education, which is also a very important provision but which is not what we are looking at today.

Starting from the moment when sections 16 to 20 were added to the Constitution, language rights were protected by laws and regulations passed by both the federal Parliament and the provincial legislatures, and it could then be said that Canada had a true language charter.

Mr. Speaker, if I have begun with a look back at our history, it is because I think it is essential to have a historical perspective on the problems relating to official languages if we really want to understand what is at stake. As we have just seen, the Constitution takes priority over ordinary laws and the 1982 Charter represents an invaluable asset, because it puts language rights out of the reach of the political arm. That was one of the things that brought me into politics. I wanted language rights to be in the Constitution, to be safe from the interference of politicians, who change from time to time—a merciful dispensation of Providence, perhaps—and who ought to be bound, by an important document called a Constitution, to respect the will of the people.

The question of official languages needs more than political will, as history shows us. It also requires that dynamic administrative measures be put in place to ensure that the political will is translated into action. Nevertheless, a strong political will is essential, because it must be there to generate the dynamism, to inspire the renewal. It was in that spirit that in 1979 a political will created the Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on Official Languages.

Since 1979, the Joint Committee has met many times to consider both the Act and the regulations, and to oversee the implementation of the Act and report on it to Parliament at regular intervals. That is what we have done.

The Committee has tabled a number of reports, and they have been taken seriously by this assembly and by the various governments. I am happy to say that I have been a member of the Committee since it was created, and I even chaired it for several years with Senator Lowell Murray, whom everyone knows, and who is, I should add, a Minister in the present Government. We worked hard and I want to take this opportunity to thank and congratulate all those who collaborated and worked with us, not only the MPs and Senators but also the research staff and the Clerks in particular.

Mr. Speaker, it was political will to change and revitalize that also led to the creation in 1982 of a Special Committee of Deputy Ministers and experts. The Prime Minister at that time, the Right Honourable Pierre Elliot Trudeau, after reading the Joint Committee's reports and realizing that the Official Languages Act had to be updated and made to reflect the new Charter of Rights passed by Parliament in 1982, decided to create a Special Committee of Deputy Ministers and experts in this field, who toiled away under the aegis of the Privy Council on the task of renewing, strengthening and updating the Act. They studied the issue for some years, and when the present Government came to power in 1984, they had a thoroughly well-documented file that only needed to be recast as a piece of legislation. This the Government has done, and I congratulate it.

So there we had the political will, and by a joint effort of various committees and other people who took a hand, Bill C-72 was born. Bill C-72 thus follows up the Accord, the constitutional commitment, and acknowledges the formal commitments of the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord. It goes a little further than the Accord, because we were able to get the word "promotion" into the text, the wording of the Bill, which as you know we were, alas, not able to do in the case of the Accord.

Bill C-72 is thus in the same vein as the constitutional commitments. It defines federal objectives within the framework of a revitalized and modernized Act. It seems to us—to us Liberals, at any rate—that it was imperative to give the Bill (which was tabled in the House on June 25, 1987) prompt and serious consideration.

We had been waiting for the Bill for a long time, since it had been announced in two Throne Speeches, but the Government dawdled, the Bill didn't appear. I was obliged to raise the matter in the House on 27 separate occasions, in an attempt to encourage, to stir up interest—I may have overdone it a little, sometimes, but my goal was always to get the Government to take action, to keep its promises and bring a Bill before the House.

Finally, as I said, the Bill saw the light of day. It took nine months, and in February of this year, after a very long delay, we got to second reading. We drew the media's attention to the Bill and then things began to get interesting, because then people began to realize that this Bill was a significant Bill, which went much further than the 1969 Act.

Bill C-72 was supported by three Ministers, the Minister for the Treasury Board, the Minister of Justice, and the former Secretary of State, who gave a press conference where no words got minced. It was a fantastic moment, June 25, to see the government so enthusiastic. But it didn't last long. We had to keep up the pressure and encourage a hesitant government. We wondered why. And then we found out: there was a war going on. There was a war going on between certain Conservative Members. There was a group of about 30 of them, the dinosaur club I called them, which some people didn't like, but I thought it was an appropriate name.

They were carrying on an internal guerilla war against the Bill, in an effort to make people believe there was a crisis in the country. Well, there wasn't any crisis. Not a hint of one. And when my Leader, the Right Honorable John Turner, spoke on February 8, 1988, he said,

• (1210)

[*English*]

"The time is right, the subject is right, the content is right. In other words, why do we have to wait for a crisis, Mr. Speaker, let us act now".

[*Translation*]

And he was right. There was no crisis. There were some people trying to create one. The Government had to be encouraged to resist the preposterous pressure being put on it by some of its own MPs.

In committee, finally, after three days of debate in the House, there was a succesion of MPs playing at musical chairs. That went on for three months. They replaced one another almost like clockwork, the Tories, one saying his little piece and then the next day another one. We bore with them. One even suggested we hear from 130 witnesses, and 130 witnesses, Mr. Chairman, would have meant the Committee would have had to sit for the whole year, probably, and into next year. We said no. It was time for action. And at the end of three months—and I must say it took patience, you have to be patient in the game of politics—

An Hon. Member: Always!

Mr. Gauthier: . . . and we came out with a report that was tabled in the House. At that point, we realized that the Government was beginning to show a little courage. Suggestions had to be made to the Government, of course, but that can happen. Last Thursday, my colleague from St-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault) rose in the House and proposed that since certain people wanted to create a crisis where there was none, the Government should use Standing Order 115 and move forward. We did not tell the Government to make it one day, one short day, and two hours; we simply told the Government we would support it if it decided to use Standing Order 115 to limit debate. The Government subsequently decided to put a very tight rein on the debate, but that was not our decision. We merely tried to get the Government to act.

Yesterday evening, Mr. Speaker, this House approved the Committee report as tabled in the House. It contained 136 amendements, but even though I personally might have been willing to spend all night here, some of my colleagues did not relish the prospect, and we voted. We decided not only to act responsibly but also to consider all the staff of the House who had to wait. It was chiefly for their sake that I suggested to my House leader that we could apply the result of one vote to the other votes and dispense with the recorded votes. It took time, but it was worth it, Mr. Speaker. After 20 years of waiting, getting concurrence in the report stage of a new Act was important, at least for me. However, for some Conservative Members who, as I say, still had doubts about the principle of linguistic duality it may not have been a very pleasant experience. For us, it was the fruit of years of unremitting hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I will not go on at length about the amendments considered yesterday. They might receive more recognition than they deserve. Happily, I think we have passed that difficult stage, and we can put them aside. Nevertheless, we have seldom seen a Government forced to gag its own Members . . .

An Hon. Member: No, I think it is the first time.

Mr. Gauthier: . . . on one of its own bills. It is a historic event.

On the one hand, the Government refuses to disavow the dishonorable actions of its language reactionaries. On the other hand, it limits debate to prevent them from speaking. That is a form of disapproval. Mr. Speaker telling us, as the Government did, to wait for the vote today to find out whether they would disavow the "dinosaurs" is, to me, unacceptable. As I said yesterday, it is like telling us a thief is only guilty if caught; it is like telling us a liar is guilty only if caught. It makes no logical sense. At the end of the day, though, we will see whether these reactionaries will be called to account for their decision.

Mr. Speaker, if one does not agree with another's statements, one must say so. Why wait! And if Conservative Members make unacceptable statements, they should be told as much. And they must accept their responsibilities. In any case, the main thing is that the Bill is now at third reading stage and will be passed. Even though the Government is not unanimously for it, the official Opposition at least will be. That is not how we Liberals work. We work as a team, and we make progress as a team.

Mr. Speaker, Bill C-72 is appreciably different from the 1969 Act. I would like to make a few comments on the Bill. The new Act contains a 10-point preamble that clearly establishes the link between what is enshrined in the Constitution and the spirit of generosity and reform on which interpretation of the Act must be based. Under the Interpretation Act, the preamble is a part of the Act intended to assist in explaining its purport and object. The preamble to Bill C-72 mentions sections 16 to 20 of the Charter and the federal Government's commitment to protect and promote bilingualism and official language minorities. In this respect, the Act goes further than the Constitutional Accord of 1987, which recognizes only the federal Government's duty to preserve the linguistic duality.

It is stated that Canadians have the right of access, under the Constitution, to the institution of Parliament and the Government. Bill C-72 contains the necessary provisions to ensure that this constitutional right is respected. It is stated that the Government will support the development of minority groups, enhance the bilingual character of the National Capital, encourage the business community to promote the official languages. All of this is repeated in Bill C-72, and I know, Mr. Speaker, because we will be watching very closely, it will help strengthen the linguistic situation.

With regard to other legislation, I should point out that the Bill contains some important legal rights. In particular, Section 82 provides for the primacy of the Act. As you will recall, that was the subject of a number of recommendations by the Joint Commitee on Official Languages, since it had been recognized as a weakness of the 1969 Act. I myself introduced a number of Bills between 1979 and 1986 in an attempt to give the Act primacy over all other legislation.

Clearly then, this is not a new idea, and this Government did not invent it. Nevertheless, it is important to recognize what has been accomplished, and since the primacy of the Act is assured, I have achieved my goal and I am satisfied.

Mr. Speaker, Part II of the Bill deals with legislative and other instruments such as federal-provincial agreements. The Government decided to take up one of my amendments to this Part and incorporate it into the Bill. It is a new section, specifically section 8, which deals with the tabling of documents in the House. It will force the Government to table its documents in the House in both official languages, which it did not have to do before today.

With regard to federal statutes, there is nothing new. For many years, they have been enacted by Parliament in both official languages and both versions have equal weight and force of law.

Mr. Speaker, while we approve of this Part as a whole, we have a few concerns. Under Section 10, it is theoretically possible for the Government to avoid signing its federal-provincial agreements in both official languages. I understand the arguments the Minister made before the Committee—that some agreements concern only one individual and that small amounts of money are involved. That is true in the case of grants awarded to university researchers, for example. It is therefore difficult to oblige the Government to sign all federal-provincial agreements in both official languages because it is not always necessary. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, five or six amendments that I introduced in committee and that were defeated concerned some very important issues. I cannot go into detail on those issues today, but as I said earlier, there will certainly be Private Members' Bills in the future on those issues, which include the Supreme Court of Canada and such important matters as the tabling of federal-provincial agreements in both official languages.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I remain somewhat concerned, as there will be a need for vigilance to ensure that agreements that may be important to minorities are actually signed in both official languages, whether the language of the province is French or English. It is a simple precaution I am proposing, Mr. Speaker, but in my experience both as a parliamentarian and as a member of a minority in my province, it is an important one. Without it, minorities will again have to fight and beg to have their rights respected.

• (1220)

[*English*]

I want to pay special tribute to three Canadians who have occupied the position of the Official Languages Commissioner, Mr. Speaker. I am speaking of Mr. Keith Spicer, Mr. Maxwell Yalden and Mr. D'Iberville Fortier. Their work and dedication, their professional advice to the Parliament of Canada in their annual reports and in their appearances before the committee speak highly of their excellent stewardship of this important national policy.

I would like to pay tribute also to my colleague, the Hon. Member for Notre Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East (Mr. Allmand), who has travelled with me on the road to language equality from our respective provinces and from our different perspectives with regard to official language minorities. I want to thank all my colleagues on this side of the House who have helped and supported me and who have many times come to the committee to assist me in the work of doing the best we can to improve the language obligation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau) and the Liberal Members who often attend Committee meetings to reinforce the Liberal presence and help to take stock . . .

[*English*]

The importance of language rights to many of us is grounded in our belief that Canada is a better and stronger nation if we care about each other's aspirations in dignity and respect. Languages can bridge the gap between communities and regions in this country, as I said at the beginning of my remarks.

[*Translation*]

The official language minorities throughout Canada are the cement of national unity. Canada is strengthened and enriched by them.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great joy that I say to the Government: Thank you, well done, Minister; we have found in you someone who, I think, understands the official languages problem! I encourage you to stay on the right path. I encourage you to ensure that all your colleagues support you in your proposals and I hope we can continue to work together to improve Canada and make it a respectful, generous country and, above all, the Canada that must be ours, a Canada that will be respectful and generous to all Canadians.

[*English*]

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise on behalf of my colleagues in the New Democratic caucus to speak in third reading debate on Bill C-72, the official languages Bill.

The day is a happy and an historic one. It is a day that I sometimes wondered about our achieving, given the lengthy committee hearings and the many witnesses who came before us. There was as well extended consideration of amendments to the Bill that were put forward in committee. It was very important for that process to have been worked through carefully to ensure that Bill C-72 is a good measure for this Parliament to pass.

I want to say immediately that Bill C-72 impressed many people at the outset in June, 1987 as being well drawn over-all. There were individual points of concern. I felt one or two of those at the time and expressed them, but the approbation which the Bill received at the outset from persons concerned about the policy of official bilingualism which was reflected by members of all three Parties and people concerned with the policy of official bilingualism is something worth saying at the outset. This was well expressed at second reading debate when the Bill was given approval in principle. No voices were raised against it. It appeared that the Bill had unanimous support in this House at the time, but more recently it has become clear that was not the full reality of the situation. There is across the country still some opposition to the policy of official bilingualism.

I am constrained in the time that I have to speak and envy my friend, the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) for the time he had to address the matter. I would like to speak particularly to some of the concerns that exist across Canada about the process, the Bill and the policy in order to try to set at rest those minds which still feel concern about the policy of official bilingualism dating back to 1969 and the first Official Languages Act. For those who are concerned about the implications of this Bill for Canada, it is worth looking at some of those concerns.

• (1230)

I think I would be justified in saying that if some Members felt it took courage yesterday to be opposed to various clauses of the Bill and to bring amendments forward, I was equally impressed as far as courage is concerned and far more impressed in terms of vision by those Members of all three Parties who supported the Bill. One is tempted to looked at individuals in terms of the areas from which they come. I of course speak as someone who grew up in Manitoba, who taught for the better part of a decade in the Province of British Columbia and who now lives in northwestern Ontario. I think I have some sense of the feeling in western Canada on the matter of official bilingualism. I became particularly aware of it as a professor in the history department teaching Canadian history. I could single out persons and say to myself, here was courage, here was a vision of the country being expressed, when Hon. Members of opposition Parties and almost all Hon. Members of the Conservative Party gave their support to the Bill.

I think it is worth recognizing that amendments that come forward in the House at report stage are not likely to get very serious consideration by the House. I say that with a good deal of regret and rue as a member of the Opposition. Of course, we may well put amendments forward for political purposes, but the fact is that the job has been largely done in the legislative committee and it is expected that it will be so done there.

The Government appointed as its members of the legislative committee persons almost entirely from an official language majority. Even my good friend, the Hon. Member for Charlevoix (Mr. Hamelin), is in a provincial sense a member of the majority community. In fact, the only exception to this in any kind of ongoing way would be the Hon. Member for Lachine (Mr. Layton) who could speak for the English speaking minority of Québec. The French speaking minority in the rest of the country was never represented in committee, certainly not as far as I recall.

A large opportunity was given to representatives of the English-speaking majority in Canada. As we watched them in operation, we knew that there were skeptics if not critics and outright opponents of the legislation present with opportunity to put their views forward. To his credit, the Hon. Member for Swift Current—Maple Creek (Mr. Wilson) was dogged in his persistence in some of these concerns. At times, this frustrated some of us who were watching him, but I suppose it played its part in leading the Government to put forward those provisions on regulations that represent an interesting addition to the Bill from the view of Government over-all. Perhaps it represented a very significant development for the Government of Canada. Those provisions for publicity to be given to regulations before they are finally declared so that Members of Parliament have an opportunity to comment on them were the result of the process in the legislative committee.

I can say quite advisedly, I think, as a member of the New Democratic opposition, that when amendments are put forward in the House at report stage, they are generally put forward in order to make certain important points. They are put forward to try to make changes in the Bill but also to make certain points, and from that perspective, in addressing the feelings across Canada and the opposition that I know exists among some people, I want to consider two of the amendments that were put forward. These amendments are very revealing of the kinds of attitudes that exist.

Motion No. 2B put by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie), for example, applied to Clause 2 of the Bill and specifically to subclause (b) which declares the Act to be in support of the development of English and French linguistic minority communities and generally advance the equality of status and use of the English and French languages within Canadian society. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Assiniboine wanted to strike out the words relating to equality of status. He was prepared to allow this Bill, when finally passed and proclaimed, to support the use of English and French but equality of status stuck in his craw.

Amendment No. 28A put by the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) was put forward quite late in the process at report stage. It was even more revealing because it dealt with the very important matter of when the Government of Canada might respond to the existence of minority official language communities, whether the English-speaking minority in Québec or the French-speaking minority in other parts of Canada. The proposal put forward by the Hon. Member for Bow River was that an area in which there is significant demand may be established if the number of persons in the area in respect of an official language spoken as a mother tongue is at least 51 per cent of the total number of persons residing in the area. That has to be about the most incredible amendment that could be put forward. The Government would respond, under this proposal, only if the official language minority happens to be the majority in the area. I do not know from where this idea came, but it is a splendid example of the kind of proposal which might have come forward at the legislative committee, been given short shrift and then set aside.

I am not meaning to ridicule a particular proposal or the Member who put it forward so much as I mean to indicate that in these two motions, we see the kind of feeling that exists in some parts of the country among persons who have not yet accepted the necessity of the policy of official bilingualism to which all three Parties, the Parliament of Canada and the Government of Canada have been committed since 1969. What I find particularly distressing about the failure to accept that is the way in which those who oppose the policy make demands on ordinary Canadians because they do not want to see the Government of Canada establish expectations for itself and for the persons who work in the Public Service.

If the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) has been reported correctly in the press, and this was of course one of those leaks from the Conservative caucus, as it happens, he recognized as a result of a drive through rural Québec in which he needed help and discovered people who did not speak English, that there are persons who do not know the language which prevails in an area and surely the Government of Canada has an obligation to serve those persons in the language that they do know.

It seems to me ultimately outrageous that we will not use the facilities of the Government, we might not on the view of these persons make language training available or hire persons who are not fluent in both languages in order to serve these people but we will instead—and I speak now for the English-speaking majority who take this particular view—demand that all of those persons become bilingual themselves through whatever means possible at whatever difficulty, if they are to deal with the Government of Canada. That seems to me so monstrously unfair that I cannot believe that any Canadian with whatever view of this country could really persist in a rejection of the policy and say that the Government of Canada should not make that effort, take that extra step to ensure that the official language minority in an area is able to obtain services in its own language.

The reality, of course, is that the Government of Canada has since 1969 been committed to the policy and has generally acted on it. I want to suggest, however, that in ensuring that the Public Service is capable of serving the minority, there are some very real concerns, and one of them deserves to be stated here this afternoon. While committed to the policy, and the Bill we have been considering represents a significant renewal of the policy of official bilingualism, there are still some very grave shortcomings in the teaching of the language to members of the Public Service and in the provision of interpretation services.

• (1240)

The government's commitment has not really been reflected in practice. There has been a reduction in the number of interpretors and an increase in their workload. There has been privatization of a substantial part of the translation service in order to reduce costs, in spite of concern about the effect this will have on the quality of translations.

Language teachers in the public service have been forced to work for almost two years without a new collective agreement. Faced with demands for an increase in the amount of teaching that they do every week, they will of course have to reduce their preparation time. An increase from 20 to 25 hours a week represents a very significant change in the working conditions of these teachers.

I think this is a matter of considerable concern because speaking for, if you will, the English speaking majority of the country who are concerned about what will happen in the public service, they want the assurance that they will be able to obtain the kind of language instruction that they need in order to provide the kind of service to the French speaking minorities of the country that our policy envisions. If they are not able to obtain the kind of instruction that hones their skills and targets well the kind of service they are required to provide, then the policy to which we are committed in principle is not being fully achieved in practice. Although that may in a sense be in parenthesis in our general consideration of the Bill, it is a concern that I want to underscore for the Secretary of State (Mr. Bouchard), who is in the House this afternoon, and for others concerned, the President of the Treasury Board (Miss Carney) and so on.

As I have already indicated, in the years since 1969 we have seen an acceptance of the policy of official bilingualism. It is tempting to review how that happened, to refer to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, the Act of 1969, and recognize, as the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) did, the policy of multiculturalism stated in 1971 in this chamber and its acceptance by all Parties, and to recognize the movement toward recognition of aboriginal self-government. All of those are aspects of the building of a new Canada on which we have been embarked since the 1960s. It is that voyage that is of such crucial importance to this policy and this Bill.

The fact that there are still some Members in this House who speak for another view and wear the dinosaur button proudly is an indication that they speak for a dying view, I suppose I am not sure there were dinosaurs around when the sheep and mice wanted to enjoy the earth, but without elaborating on that, I think there is a growing number of people in this country who accept the policy and want it to flourish. I want to say to them and to all of us here that it is imperative that this Bill receive passage here and in the other place and be proclaimed. It is necessary in order to renew official bilingualism and establish the policy across the country. It is necessary for various reasons. It is necessary in order to have a footing on which to stand if one wants to express concern, as someone said yesterday, about the rights of the English-speaking minority in Québec and the impact of Bill 101.

It is surely to be profoundly regretted that the Conservative Government of Bill Davis in Ontario never took the step of making the province officially bilingual back in the 1970s. Who knows, it might have changed the history of Québec in additional creative ways. It is surely to be regretted that the Conservative opposition in Manitoba fought the attempt of the Manitoba NDP Government to implement what eventually became the declaration of the Supreme Court of Canada. It is surely to be regretted that Conservative Governments in Saskatchewan and Alberta have finally recognized that there is an official bilingual reality in their provinces, only to then largely do away with it.

Those realities across the country we can do very little about. However, as Members of Parliament we can ensure that Bill C-72 becomes the law of the land. We can ensure that the policy is renewed and strengthened and extended, whatever happens to Clause 2 of the Bill. As we strengthen official bilingualism and reassure the majority in Québec, perhaps we will see a day, sooner rather than later, when restrictions on English in the Province of Québec will seem less necessary to the majority; when French flourishes there and in so many other parts of Canada far beyond the National Capital Region in a community in which we are truly committed.

Let me say in conclusion, with respect to the concern about employment and the public service expressed by so many of those who are still opposed to the policy and the Bill, that this is surely addressed under a very simple rubric. We now have in the marginal note not the fact of law but the reality that the Government practices a commitment to equitable participation. When the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Masse) seeks to have a quarter of his staff be francophone, that reflects proportions. The reality of employment equity for the target groups that the Government has declared, in which the ethnocultural diversity of the country is to be recognized, is the context within which equitable participation by the official language communities will occur. In Clause 39 of Bill C-72, we have an assurance that proportionality will be maintained.

With those concluding reassurances to the English-speaking people of this country whom I particularly address because of my background and experience and the concerns I know are out there, I want to urge all to join me in giving firm support to Bill C-72.

Mr. Speaker: Questions or comments.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, my comment will be brief. I wish to state unequivocally to every Member of this House and every citizen of this nation that I have been a supporter of bilingualism. That position has cost me in my constituency. It nearly cost me my seat on one occasion. Therefore, I think my dedication to bilingualism has been proven by my vote, my behaviour, and I cannot be seen as opposing bilingualism in practice in the Government of Canada. Let that be clearly understood by all concerned.

I want to compliment those whose principles required they stand in contradiction of my stand, such as the Hon. Member for Charlevoix (Mr. Hamelin) and his confreres. I compliment them on the principles they espouse. It is only appropriate that one should recognize the principles of others. My difficulty has not been with bilingualism but with its heavy-handed administration to the prejudice of unilingual Canadians of whatever language. Let there be no misunderstanding about that. I do not rise to confront my Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) or my Party. I rise in support of the principle which I believe transcends some of the obligations one has as a member of a Party. This Government has been a good government, perhaps the best in the last 25 years, so let there be no misunderstanding about my loyalty to bilingualism.

However, I want to see unilingual Canadians able to use federal premises in the language of their choice, whether it be in Chicoutimi or St. Stephen. I want to see unilingual Canadians able to tender on the Government of Canada in their own language. I want to see bilingual competence in federal offices. However, I do not want to see it to the prejudice of the talent of unilingual Canadians who may seek education which this Bill does not offer.

• (1250)

I want to compliment the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) for his very fine and reassuring speech. He has given Canadians the reassurance that this may be applied in an even-handed way. My objection is that scientists and experts, in whatever sphere, find themselves barred from occupations as federal civil servants because of lack of language.

I, Sir, have had more difficulty with learning language than any other subject, and I sympathize with those who are dead-ended because they have neither been offered training nor are capable of accepting it.

The assurance I would like is that there will be unilingual opportunity in Canada in every sphere. My position in no way qualifies my support of my colleague or my Prime Minister.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): I must say I do not doubt the sincerity of the Hon. Member who has just finished speaking, although I believe many of them do not fully understand the purpose of this Bill. I know there are many anglophones in English Canada. I said it, and I will say it, without trying to anger anyone. In Canada, especially English Canada, there are many people who say: We love you French Canadians . . .

[*English*]

As I said, I am a *Canadien français*, and there is no translation for that.

[*Translation*]

There are English-speaking Canadians who love French Canadians, but, as I have said before, in subservience if possible! But that cannot be. It is impossible, and we will not accept it. That must be understood. That is what the people who are outside now, as we speak, do not understand. We want to be at home. We want to be ourselves. We are not taking anything away from others who also have the right to be themselves. That is what must be understood, and that is the purpose of this Bill, the continuation of everything we have known. Lastly, I would like to thank someone who has always cared about us. I think we ought to pay tribute to him, our colleague who has always . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am sorry to have to interrupt the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme), but his time has elapsed. Consequently, unless there is unanimous consent that the debate continue, it is my duty, since it is now 12:42 p.m., pursuant to the Order passed on Monday, July 4, 1988, to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of this bill.

[*English*]

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Call in the Members.

Mr. Speaker: I should advise the House that according to the rules the bell will ring for 15 minutes.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Hnatyshyn), which was agreed to on the following division:

• (1300)

(*Division No. 437*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Andre
Axworthy
Baker
Beatty
Bernier
Blackburn
(Jonquière)
Blais
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Bouchard
(Lac-Saint-Jean)
Boyer
Brightwell
Brisco
Browes
Caccia
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Cassidy
Champagne
(Saint-Hyacinthe—
Bagot)
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Collins
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Cossitt
Darling
de Cotret
Della Noce
Dewar
Dick
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine
Foster
Friesen
Frith
Fulton
Gagliano
Gagnon
Garneau
Gauthier
Girard
Graham
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-
la-Madeleine)
Gray
(Windsor West)
Grisé
Guilbault
(Drummond)
Hamelin
Hawkes
Henderson
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Hudon
Isabelle
James
Jewett
Johnston
(Saint-Henri—
Westmount)
Joncas
Jourdenais
Keeper
Kelleher
Kempling
King
Ladouceur
Landry
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Mailly
Malépart
Manly
Marchi
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mayer
McDermid
McLaughlin
McMillan
Merrithew
Mitchell
Mitges
Moore
Mulroney
Murphy
Nystrom
Oberle
Parry
Pennock
Pietz
Prud'homme
Reid
Riis
Robichaud
Rossi
St. Germain
St-Julien
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Skelly
Sparrow
Stevens
Tardif
(Richmond—Wolfe)
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Warner
Weiner
White
Wilson
(Etobicoke
Centre)
Young—129

NAYS

Members

Corbett
Domm
Kindy
McCain
McKenzie
Nowlan
Stewart
Taylor
Vankoughnet—9

• (1320)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Hon. Minister for Employment and Immigration rising on a point of order?

Mrs. McDougall: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for my tardiness. Had I been here, I proudly would have voted for the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Vézina: Mr. Speaker, I too am sorry for being late. I missed the beginning of the vote, and I wanted to assure the House that I would have voted in favour in the vote just taken.

Some Hon. Members: Bravo!

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: It being 1 p.m., I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m.

At 1.23 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

S. O. 21

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

LAKE MICHIGAN—PROPOSED DIVERSION OF WATER IN UNITED STATES

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, there is disturbing news from south of the border. Governor Thompson of Illinois has urged the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to divert billions of gallons of Lake Michigan into the midwest river system. The Governor of Illinois described the situation as "a navigation emergency" and requested the Corps to divert Great Lakes water at Chicago to get river traffic flowing again.

This is the thin edge of the wedge. Today's emergency will become tomorrow's routine. The Government of Canada should make strong representations in Washington and make it absolutely clear that Governor Thompson's proposal is unacceptable today, tomorrow, and one hundred years from now.

When will the Government wake up to the fact that water is included in the trade agreement, whether or not it acknowledges it? Americans say that water is included, according to the July 1 issue of *Inside U.S. Trade*. If the Government does not wake up, Canadians will have a strong message at the next election.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADA DAY

QUÉBEC-EST CONSTITUENCY—CONGRATULATIONS ON INITIATIVES OF LIMOILOU ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec-Est): Mr. Speaker, July 1 was a day of joyous celebration for all Canadian men and women, whatever part of Canada they hail from, and whatever their language or origin.

Canada Day is an event that rekindles the feelings of pride and belonging that are natural to any nation with a strong identity and strong roots.

Once again this year, thanks to the brilliant initiative of the Limoilou Economic Development Corporation, people in my riding of Québec-Est celebrated the arrival of their ancestors with a lively performance by gifted actors in period costumes.

All of those who participated in this day of rejoicing in beautiful Cartier-Bréboeuf Park will remember that in our area, people take things in hand, know how to organize and bring their projects to fruition.

Thanks again to the Limoilou Economic Development Corporation, to the thousands of young people who participated, and to the people of Québec-Est!

* * *

CONJUGAL VIOLENCE

IMPORTANCE OF SENSITIZATION TO PROBLEM

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Quebec film maker Jean-Claude Lauzon, whose public service announcement on violence in the home was awarded a prize at the International Publicity Film Festival at Cannes.

Of the 216 entries from numerous countries, only the Quebec Government film dared to deal with the problem of violence against women.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Health and Social Services, as well as the Solicitor General of the Province of Quebec for their publicity campaign against family violence.

The federal Government should follow their example and plan a similar campaign in order to sensitize all Canadians to the problem of family violence.

Each year, more than a million women are battered in Canada. It is the federal Government's duty to try to curtail violence against women by encouraging victims to come out of their isolation and by urging relatives, friends and neighbours to intervene when necessary. The Government must accept its responsibility and break the silence which surrounds the problem of family violence.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST THAT NAGORNO—KABARACH REGION BE ANNEXED TO ARMENIA

Mr. Raymond Garneau (Laval-des-Rapides): Mr. Speaker, I have spoken in this House several times this year to draw the attention of Hon. Members and the public to the aspirations of the Armenian community living in the Soviet Union. This winter, I asked the top Soviet leaders to deal with the demands of the Armenian people who want the autonomous region of Nagorno-Karaback, with its Armenian majority, to be annexed to the Republic of Armenia.

[*English*]

Today we learned from the newspapers that more demonstrations have taken place during this week in the Armenian capital, Yerevan, and that there has been a call for a general strike, which seems to have been respected.

[*Translation*]

It is reported that during these demonstrations, five Armenian demonstrators were killed by the forces of the Soviet Department of the Interior and about thirty more were injured.

My office reached the Soviet Embassy this morning, but it refused to confirm or comment on these events, although Soviet television itself, picked up by Agence France Presse, reports bloody demonstrations in the Armenian Republic.

[*English*]

I wish to press the Government of the Soviet Union to bring more comprehension to dealing with what seems to me to be the legitimate grievances of the Armenian people. I offer my sympathy to the Armenian community on the suffering it is undergoing.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

POLLUTION OF ST. LAWRENCE RIVER

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, the federal Government will spend $110 million to clean up the St. Lawrence River. This is the most important federal environmental initiative in Quebec.

Our Government recognizes the priceless value of the St. Lawrence River, this living heritage. Most Quebecers have had the pleasure to live by its shores, to admire it and to swim in it.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all Quebecers, I thank the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and his Environment Minister (Mr. McMillan) for this timely initiative to revive the magnificent St. Lawrence River.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIVE PEOPLES

JOB TRAINING PROGRAM—DELAY IN FUNDING

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, the on-the-job training of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has provided an excellent program for facilitating the entry of aboriginal people into the workforce. The Government states that it wishes to support the self-sufficiency of aboriginal people. Nowhere is this more important than providing people with the skills to enter the workforce.

Despite these fine sentiments there is a situation in the Yukon, brought to my attention by a number of constituents, both employers and potential trainees, that this program has not yet received funding for the 1988-89 fiscal year. This means that potential trainees in business, mining, government services, and band offices sit waiting for positions. Last year the program had over 100 trainees with a 95 per cent success in job placement rate. At the present time 45 trainees could be placed, but three and a half months after the start of the year there is still no money.

Where is the commitment of the federal Government? Is it more interested in ramming through legislation in a vain attempt to impress voters than seeing ordinary Canadians get jobs?

* * *

DISASTERS

EDMONTON TORNADO DAMAGE—FEDERAL COMPENSATION PAYMENTS

Mr. William G. Lesick (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, on July 31, 1987, a vicious tornado devastated areas of Edmonton. The cost in lives and property damage was enormous. In disasters of this magnitude the federal Government has always rushed to provide emergency aid in many forms.

The morning after July 1, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark), the Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada (Mr. Mazankowski), and CMHC officials and I flew in an Armed Forces helicopter to assess the degree of damage.

Last month the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Beatty) presented a cheque for $22 million to the Alberta Government as partial compensation for those damages.

The previous year the federal Government allocated $16 million as its contribution to the Edmonton flood disaster of 1986.

Our Government is always ready to help ordinary Canadians when disaster strikes.

* * *

• (1410)

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

BILL C-72

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, if we consider today's vote on the Official Languages Bill, during which nine government Members voted against the advancement of official languages and other Members either stayed away or abstained, the demonstration on Parliament Hill by Canadians who are opposed to the advancement of official languages and the speeches made by certain Members here in the House on the amendments, especially by the Hon. Member for Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart), all this goes to show that once again, part of the population of Canada and especially part of its Parliamentarians have no understanding of Quebec and Canada, no understanding of our history. I think that the purpose of the official languages legislation is to protect francophones, and I hope that sanctions will be taken against certain individuals, because to us francophones, despite today's vote, the insult remains. No apologies were made to the francophones in this country.

S. O. 21

TAX REFORM

BENEFITS OF REFORM

Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, critics of the tax reform proposals of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) have lost face once again, since as a result of this reform, the vast majority of wage earners and pensioners will pay less income tax. Eighty-five per cent of Canadians will pay less income tax as of July 1, and they will notice the positive impact of this reform when they realize they are getting a bigger paycheck that will put more money in their pockets.

From now on, there will be only three taxation levels instead of ten, which will make the system easier to understand. The tax rate will be set at 17 per cent for taxable incomes below $27,500, at 26 per cent for incomes from $27,500 to $55,000, and at 29 per cent for incomes over $55,000. Many tax concessions have been eliminated to make up for the drop in tax rates and to spread the tax burden more equitably. Income tax credits will take the place of a number of exemptions and deductions. Furthermore, the maximum credit per eligible child has been increased to $559 for 1988.

Mr. Speaker, since the Conservative Government came to power, more and more people are working, we have managed to reduce the deficit, and 850,000 Canadians on low incomes will no longer pay income tax. We can say that with this Minister of Finance, consumers are getting their money's worth, Mr. Speaker!

* * *

[*English*]

PRIVATIZATION

ELDORADO NUCLEAR—WORKERS' PENSIONS AND BENEFITS

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, when the Government announced that it would be privatizing Eldorado Nuclear the Minister then in charge of privatization said in a press release that "existing pension and benefit plans will be adopted by the new company". In a statement and a letter sent to employees she repeated that promise. The company itself repeated that promise before a committee of the House of Commons.

Now in a proposal made public to the workers yesterday it becomes apparent for existing workers who continue to work for this firm that they will lose the protection of their present pension plans. The protection will only exist for those people who have already retired.

I call upon the Government to reaffirm the promise it made to the workers. I call upon the company to reaffirm the promise it made to the workers.

I can tell the Government at this time that any work it wants done on that legislation this afternoon is in jeopardy if this broken promise is not rectified by the Government.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

WESTERN DROUGHT—FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. Felix Holtmann (Selkirk—Interlake): Mr. Speaker, on June 30 the Government of Canada announced its drought relief program for livestock producers. The federal Government will spend $76 million, and share assistance with all three prairie provinces.

This is just another example of the kind of leadership western Canadians have come to expect from the Conservative Government. This Government never has to wait for the squeaky calls of the lonely drugstore cowboy Grits in the West or, worse yet, a drought wish list by the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Broadbent) and a Mr. Nobody from Saskatchewan called Romanov or Romanow or something.

No western Canadians can see any leadership qualities in the Hon. Member for Oshawa. Apparently the NDP drought policy will be issued during the next federal election campaign. By next spring, if they waited for New Democrats to take action or form policies, farmers in Saskatchewan will be spitting pure dust and dead cows will be pushing up daisies.

* * *

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

MEMBER FOR CHARLEVOIX—PLEA ON BEHALF OF ANGLOPHONES

Hon. Bob Layton (Lachine): Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon the walls of this great House of Commons were vibrating. They were vibrating with the passionate call of my colleague and friend, the Hon. Member for Charlevoix (Mr. Hamelin), for support of Bill C-72. A great worker for Québec, he wanted that support and I quote:

—for the sake of Canada and for the sake of its people.

Speaking, I believe, for the vast majority of French Québecers, the Member of Parliament from Charlevoix pronounced clearly and precisely the message that is needed for a strong and united Canada. He said:

> I need you English Québecers. I need a strong English community in Québec.

These words, Mr. Speaker, were music to my ears, and I know my hon. friend was direct and sincere in his delivery. We the anglophone minority of Québec have contributed much to our *Belle Province* and must continue to play an active role in our distinct society.

Yes, we are a fundamental part of this distinct society, and good will, demonstrated in concrete terms by our Québec and Canadian Governments, will go a long way to reassuring my community that we are, in fact, needed. Our federal Government and the Government of Québec must respond to this call. They must recognize the special needs of the minorities across Québec and Canada.

Improved access to services in one's language, increased opportunities in jobs and careers in one or both languages, and support for the special needs of the minority communities are prescribed in laws like Bill C-72.

But the good will, the trust, the confidence, and the generosity called for by the Member from Charlevoix must come from all our leaders. Canadians deserve nothing less.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—CONSERVATION AND ELIMINATION OF POLLUTION

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Beauce): Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Conservative Government has decided to spend $110 million on cleaning up the St. Lawrence River.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I hope the applause will not be counted as part of my speaking time.

This amount includes $20 million for the protection of endangered species and environmentally sensitive areas. There are plans for upgrading existing wildlife reserves along the St. Lawrence and for creating a national wildlife reserve between Montreal and Sorel.

Survival plans will be implemented for the most endangered species like the peregrine falcon and the beluga whale, and the Government has announced funding of $6 million for an action plan for the whales. Finally, negotiations will start with the Province of Quebec on creating a marine park at the mouth of the Saguenay, at a cost of $75 million.

Mr. Speaker, free trade, official languages and bilingualism, the environment, tax reform: you can count on the Tories to do the job!

An Hon. Member: Dinosaurs keep out!

* * *

[*English*]

CANADA POST CORPORATION

WINNIPEG—ALLEGED LACK OF STAMPS BEARING MONARCH'S PICTURE

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, you will know that we often deal with very important and global matters in this House, but I have a small item that was brought to my attention by a constituent that I thought deserved the attention of this House.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that it is not possible in the city of Winnipeg at the main post office to buy a stamp with the Queen's picture on it? This may not be a national disaster, but it certainly is an inconvenience and it is a public relations disaster for the Post Office.

My friend, who writes to many people in many countries, likes to use the stamp with the Queen's picture on it. Why can't we buy a stamp for 37 cents to mail a letter in the city of Winnipeg with a picture of the Queen on it?

Let's take care of the little things and the big things will take care of themselves.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

WATER RESOURCES POLICY—INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION URGED

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, many Canadians who strongly support the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement just as strongly object to the large-scale export of Canadian water to the United States.

The Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) has stated quite clearly that nothing in the trade agreement requires Canada to export water and that it is government policy not to allow any large-scale export of Canadian water. That being the case, there is no reason that the Government should not introduce its own legislation to turn its policy into the law of our land.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

DROUGHT IN SOUTHWESTERN ONTARIO

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture but in his absence I will address it to the Minister of State for Grains and Oilseeds.

Southwestern Ontario is facing the worst drought in some 50 years. For example, corn producers have already lost 20 per cent of their crop worth over $200 million. Every day the drought continues it amounts to some $20 million of additional loss to farmers. By the end of this month if the drought continues it is estimated that the losses will approach $800 million. Losses are similar in other field and fruit and vegetable crops. I wonder what action the Government is taking in the face of this worst drought for farmers in southwestern Ontario in a generation.

• (1420)

Hon. Charles Mayer (Minister of State (Grains and Oilseeds)): Mr. Speaker, we are well aware of the situation. The Hon. Member did not mention that there was a frost in parts of Ontario as recently as about 10 days ago that has also caused problems. We have been monitoring the weather situation, and particularly moisture, going back to the beginning of February. We are doing the same thing in Ontario as we are doing on the Prairies.

We have meetings planned with the respective farm organizations regionally for the end of this month or the beginning of next month so that we can get a good assessment of the situation. I think the Hon. Member would know, as an agriculture critic, that some of the crops are not beyond help yet as far as rain is concerned, and the reason we have scheduled the meetings with the farmers and farm groups in about a month's time is because we think that at that time we will be in a much better position to assess exactly what the situation is, and on that basis be able to determine what kind of assistance will be needed.

If the Hon. Member wants to be fair about this, he will recognize that this Government has been very responsive when dealing with farmers' problems, whether they be weather related, market related or whatever. We have been very much on top of it and have been very willing to provide assistance to farmers. We will do the same thing in this case.

CROP INSURANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, over a year ago the Canada-Ontario Crop Insurance Review Committee reported to the Minister of Agriculture recommending, for instance, that benefits be increased from 80 per cent to 90 per cent. Corn producers have asked that the compensation level be increased by 50 per cent this year. The Ontario Government has offered to put in place a tripartite system which would provide additional benefits. The Minister of Agriculture has apparently told the Ontario Government, "We will take your cash but we won't increase the benefits".

I wonder why the Government has failed to act on those recommendations made over a year ago in a booklet entitled *Looking Ahead Toward 1988*. In fact, those recommendations which were made by that federal-provincial review committee were designed for exactly the kind of disaster we face today. Yet no action has been taken. The Government has been sitting on the report and has done nothing for over a year.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, I think that the Member for Algoma should know that our Government has done everything in its power to assist Canadian farmers and that we are at the present time reviewing all of our programs with regard to grain throughout Canada. My colleague the Minister responsible for grains, the Minister of Agriculture and myself will be holding consultations in all regions of the country in the course of the next few weeks. We will meet with all interested parties to see how the present structure in the grain sector could be modified to advantage. We have stood up for Canadian farmers, and invested more in their well-being that any previous Government. I have no doubt that we shall continue to do so and we will ensure that grain sector programs in Ontario and the rest of Canada match the needs of producers as closely as possible.

[*English*]

CROP INSURANCE—REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF APPLICATION DEADLINE

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, we know that the Government was able to come up with $164 million for what was almost a political disaster in Lac-Saint-Jean last month, while a natural disaster in western Canada got only $76 million.

Since the Government has failed to act for a year to put in place better crop insurance programs, and thus the participation rate has been very low because the present program is simply no good, and since the Government did not act on the recommendations of the committee, will the Government extend the deadline so that farmers can apply for crop insurance up until at least the end of August? This will provide some assistance from the Government to help them face the worst natural disaster they have faced in over 50 years.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago we announced that the Government would allot $153 million to aid western producers. We clearly indicated that we were monitoring the situation very closely in Ontario and in Quebec, and indeed everywhere in Canada. We are currently in touch with Mr. Riddell who toured Southern Ontario to gain first-hand knowledge of the drought situation in that area and we hope that if we have to intervene the Government of Ontario will be as receptive as were the Governments of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba, who provided us with exceptional co-operation in the application of a program in the prairie provinces. And we hope that in this case the Government of Ontario will co-operate closely with us in the application of a program to meet . . .

As for crop insurance, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture and myself will be meeting with our provincial counterparts on Monday for the annual federal-provincial conference, and the question of crop insurance is on the agenda.

* * *

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

LAKE MICHIGAN—PROPOSED DIVERSION OF WATER IN UNITED STATES

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, my question is directed to the appropriate Minister. In light of disturbing reports from Illinois where Governor Thompson is proposing to triple the flow of Great Lakes waters from Lake Michigan into the mid-West river system because of navigation problems, why is the Government of Canada not making strong representations in Washington to the effect that this proposition is totally unacceptable because of its effect on Canadian waters in the Great Lakes?

Hon. Tom McMillan (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, the thrust of the Hon. Member's question is a charge that the Government of Canada is not making a sufficiently vigorous representation to Washington. I do not know why he would make such a statement. I do not think he is privy to the inner workings of the Government of Canada or to any diplomatic notes that may be sent by us to the U.S. Government.

In any event, I assure the Hon. Member that the Government of Canada is taking the issue very seriously. The Hon. Member must know that there is enormous pressure from within the United States to resist what Governor Thompson is seeking, the diversion of water from Lake Michigan at the Chicago diversion point. Ohio, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, for example, have already made their opposition clear, as has the Government of Canada.

The U.S. Government has given us its assurance that we will be fully consulted at every stage of the U.S. Government's deliberations on the matter. For our part, we are making our concern known to the U.S. administration in the strongest possible terms.

CANADIAN POSITION

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, there is a big difference between being consulted and making Canada's position clearly and effectively known. The Minister does not seem to be informed on his own Government's inner workings, judging from his answer. He did not answer my question.

Why is the Government of Canada not making strong representations in Washington on this matter? When will the Government of Canada wake up to the reality that, as far as Washington is concerned, the trade agreement includes water? Having included water, the federal water policy of the Minister of the Environment becomes a mockery because of the fact that water will then be part of the American interpretation of the agreement. Why is Canada not making strong representations in Washington on the proposal of Governor Thompson of Illinois?

Hon. Tom McMillan (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member must have water on his brain. The proposal of Governor Thompson is to have the U.S. administration, through the Supreme Court, as a matter of fact, approve and arrange for the diversion of American water from Lake Michigan, which is totally within U.S. boundaries, to elsewhere within the United States. It has nothing to do with diversion of Canadian water, or inter-basin diversions, or water exports.

In any event, we take the matter seriously. We are concerned about the effect on Canada of possible American action on American water for American domestic purposes. In that respect, we are making the most vigorous representations that could possibly be made to the U.S. administration.

RIGHT OF UNITED STATES TO DIVERT WATER—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on this very serious problem. Diversions which in fact take place from Lake Michigan, as the Minister knows, would have serious and damaging effects on downstream Great Lakes communities. Does the Government accept that the United States has the right to undertake such diversions from Lake Michigan unilaterally?

• (1430)

Hon. Tom McMillan (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, there is a long tradition of joint management of the Great Lakes by Canada and the United States. Some decisions do require joint decision-making or some recourse, for example, to the International Joint Commission. This particular question happens to be within the jurisdiction of the U.S. However, given the spirit of co-operation over many years, in fact over many decades, in the management of the Great Lakes in general, it is expected by both parties that any decision by one affecting the other would involve the utmost in consultation. Certainly that principle applies in spades here.

In any event, it has nothing to do with free trade, federal water policy, or inter-basin diversions within Canada affecting the U.S. It has everything to do with a proposal from one State Governor, in connection with which there is great opposition in the U.S., for diverting American water from Lake Michigan to somewhere else, in this case to the Mississippi. We oppose it for good domestic reasons, and in that connection you can be assured that the Government of Canada will continue to be very categorical in its representations to the U.S.

CANADIAN POLICY

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, surely the Minister recognizes that a diversion from Lake Michigan would have a serious impact on water levels in Lake Huron, Lake Erie and Lake St. Clair, and would affect all the communities along the Canadian side of those lakes.

The Government of Canada, in a statement tabled at public meetings held by the IJC in 1983, stated its "longstanding opposition to unilateral increases in diversions from the Great Lakes system", and its view that "such proposals should be considered only after consultation and agreement between Canada and the U.S." Therefore, is the Minister saying that his Government has changed that policy and we are no longer taking the position that we must agree to any water diversion from Lake Michigan?

Hon. Tom McMillan (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, there is no change in policy. Canada has not been approached formally by the U.S. administration about any decision the U.S. Government has taken or is even contemplating taking on this question. All we have is an idea or proposal from one state Governor, that being Governor Thompson of Illinois, who is trying to do the very thing which has been proposed by all kinds of different state Governors over the years in connection with one water situation or another. In almost every case there has been as much resistance within the U.S. to what was proposed as there has been in Canada.

In any event, we expect to be consulted. We expect to be informed. Ultimately, if there were to be any diversion, which we do not expect, we would expect our concurrence to be granted before the project could be proceeded with. However, the matter is totally academic. It is only a proposal and no decision has been made, much less it is likely to happen.

REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT ASSURANCE ON POSSIBLE DIVERSION OF WATER

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, it may be academic for the Minister; it is not academic for the hundreds of communities along the Great Lakes that will be affected by this kind of diversion.

I put it to the Minister as straightforwardly as I can, that he said previously that there was not a Canadian role in this as far as agreement was concerned. It was an American decision with respect to American water. Is he now prepared to stand up and very clearly tell this House that we will insist, as we have in the past, that there be Canadian agreement before any diversion takes place?

Hon. Tom McMillan (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, as far as any diversion is concerned the answer is yes. I am saying as clearly as I can that any such diversion from Lake Michigan within the U.S. would have profound implications for Canada. It would have profound implications for navigation, for recreation, and for commercial interests. We oppose it in the strongest possible terms. However, it is only a proposal. It has to go through a labyrinth of complex legal obstacles in the U.S.

As long as we are making our views known, and as long as we have a commitment from the U.S. Government to consult us at every stage along the way, and ultimately we are in a position to oppose the diversion if the Americans were ever stupid enough to proceed with it, I think the Hon. Member should not be so exercised.

* * *

NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD

DECISION ON NATURAL GAS EXPORTS TO UNITED STATES

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. Yesterday the Minister of Energy was asked what the Government was going to do to ensure that some of Canada's natural gas was reserved for use by Canadians when the Americans already have one-third of our total reserves under long-term contract. We learned the answer when listening to the speech of the President of the Treasury Board yesterday in Calgary. She said in effect it really does not matter if the Conservatives lose the next election because we cannot make any change to our energy policy anyway, it is enshrined in stone under the free trade agreement. It is really under the jurisdiction of Washington to make decisions as to whether any changes are going to be made.

Why does Washington now control our energy policy? Why did the Government feel it necessary to have Washington make these decisions on Canadian energy policy?

Mr. Jack Shields (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the National Energy Board decision on the Pan-Alberta application was and is based on procedures developed and announced prior to completion of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. There is no direct link between that agreement and the NEB decision. It is clear, however, that as U.S. buyers are becoming more confident in stability of supply in the Canada-U.S. energy environment, we are going to have more sales to the U.S.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, there is a significant impact involved in the decision of the NEB on the Pan-Alberta Gas proposal. That impact is that under the free trade agreement the NEB has had its powers almost completely stripped away. It is nothing more than a monitoring agency. It cannot turn down those requests. More and more of our natural gas is to be destined for delivery to the U.S. and Canadians will not have access to it. I take great exception to the President of the Treasury Board saying it does not matter who you vote for, you cannot change energy policy—

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member will put his question, please.

Mr. MacLellan: I want the Government to know that galls me and other people on this side and I want to know why it does not gall the Government.

Mr. Jack Shields (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have never heard anything so silly in all of my life in this House. That Member knows full well that the NEB operates under a set of guidelines and those guidelines are clear. They have public reviews where every consumer and consumer organization in this country has an opportunity to appear and make a complaint. There was virtually no complaint submitted to the NEB on this ruling. He knows that, and he is just trying to make political points on something he knows full well is not true.

* * *

• (1440)

AGRICULTURE

SASKATCHEWAN STORAGE RESERVOIRS AND IRRIGATION PROJECTS—TRANSFER OF CONTROL

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Grains and Oilseeds. Agriculture Canada is in the process of transferring storage reservoirs and irrigation projects in southwestern Saskatchewan in particular from the PFRA to the Saskatchewan Water Corporation.

Given that this provincial body is primarily concerned with municipal, urban, and recreational use of water, can the Minister assure the farmers of the Swift Current—Maple Creek area that agriculture will be given the same priority as it was under the PFRA and that the traditional responsibility of the PFRA is not going to be abandoned?

Hon. Charles Mayer (Minister of State (Grains and Oilseeds)): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member raises a question which has a certain amount of topicality as far as the negotiations are concerned. The simple answer to that question is yes, that is one of the prime objectives of the negotiations. The way in which the PFRA has been able to deliver services in the past will be maintained if and when there is an agreement reached with the Government of Saskatchewan. Therefore, the simple answer to the question is yes.

FUTURE OF PRAIRIE FARM REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, the cattleman who was denied the Saskatchewan Water Corporation's permission to water his thirsty cattle because boaters on the Duncarn Dam would suffer will need stronger reassurance from the federal Government than that.

Is this the first step in the privatization of the PFRA as was recommended by the Nielsen Report?

Hon. Charles Mayer (Minister of State (Grains and Oilseeds)): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member has specific concerns about farmers in areas affected or about to be affected, I would be more than happy, as would the Minister of Agriculture, to look at them specifically. If he has some things with which he wants us to deal, we will be happy to do so if he lets us know.

Second, no, this is not the first step in any kind of privatization as recommended by the Nielsen Commission, absolutely not.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADA POST CORPORATION

QUERY WHY MAIL NOT DELIVERED IN SAINT-MAURICE DE L'ÉCHOUERIE

Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard—Anjou): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister responsible for the Canada Post Corporation.

Two hundred and fifty-five families in Saint-Maurice de l'Échouerie, in the Gaspé, have not received their mail since July 4, because Canada Post failed to renew the delivery contract with the drivers who normally deliver the mail.

Could the Minister explain to these families why Canada Post decided, without warning, to send the mail 30 miles down the road to the village of Rivière-au-Renard? Why do these families have to travel 60 miles a day to pick up their mail? Is that the new Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, apparently the Hon. Member is not able to direct that question to Canada Post directly, where he knows it belongs. I will refer it for him.

I also refer him to Beauchesne's where he will see that that type of question is, if anything, an Order Paper question and is not fit for Question Period.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST THAT MINISTER INTERVENE

Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard—Anjou): Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, 255 families at Saint-Maurice de l'Échouerie are protesting and holding up a truck that delivers all the mail in the area. Is the Minister going to act responsibly and intervene to restore mail delivery to these people who are entitled to this service?

[*English*]

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Hon. Member might do the House a favour and spend a half hour with his colleague, the Member for Papineau, the former Postmaster General, who was the Minister responsible when Canada Post was made a Crown corporation. The Hon. Member for Papineau should instruct that Hon. Member as to what is the role of Crown corporations.

ROUTE TAKEN BY MAIL TRUCK

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the same Minister.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the women and children of Saint-Maurice de l'Échouerie took over their post office to draw the public's attention to their situation. The mail truck goes past their door, past their post office and off to another village, without stopping, and drops their mail there. Why can't the truck stop in their village? Why not? Why do women and children have to risk criminal charges to get their point across and get proper service?

[*English*]

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, that Hon. Member stood up on a Statement Pursuant to S. O. 21 before Question Period and said that at the main post office in Winnipeg they were unable to buy a stamp with the Queen's picture on it. I am informed that Winnipeg Postal Station A has 10,000 stamps with the Queen's picture on them.

With regard to the question or statement or whatever it was the Hon. Member made, I will refer it to the Post Office and seek their reaction since he is apparently not able to do that on his own.

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives may think it is funny, but a constituent of mine in Winnipeg wrote me a letter to indicate that he could not buy a stamp in Winnipeg with the Queen's picture on it.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, the Hon. Member has the floor.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST THAT MINISTER INTERVENE

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. I would like to ask the Minister whether he realizes that when ordinary citizens can't use Parliament to voice their needs, they have only one alternative and that is take direct action or let themselves be victimized. Is the Minister prepared to act responsibly as a Minister of this Parliament and protect Canadians against the arbitrary decisions of the bureaucracy?

[*English*]

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, when the Canada Post Corporation Act was brought before committee Jean-Claude Parrot, the head of CUPW, stated: "What we are saying is that under a Crown corporation we hope management will have its own authority to make certain decisions and to act as management".

That is what happened. The Hon. Member's question is one for management. Why does he not follow his leader's example and let management deal with it?

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

LAKE MICHIGAN—PROPOSED DIVERSION OF WATER IN UNITED STATES

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of the Environment and relates, as well, to the proposal to divert water from Lake Michigan into the Mississippi Valley.

The Minister's answer to the House a few moments ago indicating that the American Government had given our Government assurances that we would be consulted all along the way has an ominous ring and is reminiscent of the days when the *Polar Sea* sailed through our Northwest Passage.

Can the Minister advise the House whether the Government of Canada is prepared to join with those in the United States who oppose this diversion in the American courts, to oppose publicly any move to divert water from Lake Michigan into the Mississippi Valley, rather than waiting till later, as we did in the case of the *Polar Sea*?

Hon. Tom McMillan (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member must know that the Supreme Court is the effective regulatory body in connection with the project in question. There is at present no formal process in train, as I understand it.

• (1450)

It is a proposal from only one state Governor. His proposal is being vigorously resisted by neighbouring states and by conservation groups and, as I understand it, even from within the U.S. administration itself.

If at some point the Government of Canada thought it advisable to intervene in some fashion—I do not know whether it would necessarily take the form of the recommendation of the Hon. Member—he can be assured that the Government of Canada, on behalf of Canadians and in the public interest, will take every relevant step necessary, as we have in the past, to oppose this insane kind of idea.

IMMIGRATION

DECISION TO STOP PROCEEDINGS AGAINST MEMBERS OF ANARCHIST DELEGATION

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. At a special immigration inquiry convened in Toronto yesterday, 14 Americans and one West German, who were members of an anarchist delegation and who took part in a violent and ugly rampage through downtown Toronto on Monday, were suddenly freed after immigration enforcement officers were ordered, from on high, to drop the cases and testimony that they had prepared against these individuals.

Will the Minister explain why the Government made a back-room deal to drop the cases that would have prevented these people from ever returning to Canada without special permission? Does the Minister believe that this kind of sweetheart arrangement will engender public confidence in the system, when such violent radicals will have full opportunity to return, while so many relatives of Canadians, for example, are denied the legitimate right of visiting or gaining landed immigrant status in Canada? For whom is the law working?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, in this case the law was working to get them out of the country, which I would have thought the Hon. Member would have supported. There is no secret deal. The counsel for the 13 Americans and one West German gave assurances to the adjudicator that her clients would leave the country. To my certain knowledge, I believe 13 of the 14 have already left. We are seeking confirmation on the 14.

There was nothing behind the scenes about it. It was an assurance that was given to the adjudicator. Since the objective was to have them leave the country so that we can do more for people who are trying to bring in relatives and so on, it was a perfectly appropriate action.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, the Minister had the obligation to uphold and apply the law, and to send a strong message that such violent elements are not welcome in Canada. She abandoned her obligation. That is most regrettable.

Given that these 15 individuals were charged with property damage, mischief, obstructing and assaulting police, escaping custody and resisting arrest, is she not worried that she has set a very dangerous precedent in cutting a deal that is very convenient to these culprits? Why does she believe that the price of the important principle in barring these people from re-entering Canada and of sending a clear signal to other like-minded radicals, is a price not worth paying? Since these individuals were not deported, they are allowed to return into the country scot-free.

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, under the process in place at the moment, it would have taken another two or three years to get them out of the country, as the Hon. Member well knows. He also knows that we are trying to change that, but I will not get into that again.

Let me just say that these people are now gone and they will not come back.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

SITUATION OF OLDER WORKERS

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour. It has been almost three years since the Standing Committee on Employment and Immigration recommended to the Minister of Labour that there be a program for older workers. It recognized the plight of older workers.

It has been two years since the Minister declared his program. Why does he continue to blame the provinces? When will he meet the promise to older workers of Canada and implement the program?

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, let me put the record straight. I do not blame all the provinces. There are definitely some provinces that are not co-operating the way they should. I believe that the plight of older workers is the responsibility of all governments in Canada, including the provincial governments. Hopefully with their co-operation the program will be announced soon.

FUNDING OF PROPOSED PROGRAM

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, 41 per cent of older workers are frustrated and depressed, and have actually left the labour market. If the Minister is sincere about implementing the program, why does he not take the advice of the committee and contribute 100 per cent of funds to implement the program and keep his promise?

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the Opposition always comes back with the 100 per cent program. Let me remind the Hon. Member, who, like myself as a matter of fact, was not here at the time, that that program was not for all older workers. It was discriminatory in that it dealt only with older workers in particular domains. The program we are proposing will deal with all older workers.

Oral Questions

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

LAKE MICHIGAN—PROPOSED DIVERSION OF WATER IN UNITED STATES

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of the Environment. It concerns the matter of diversion of Great Lakes waters to the United States. The Minister says that this is only a proposal from one state Governor and therefore it is not necessary for him and the Canadian Government to act on this matter right now.

Is it not true that this is a matter that the United States Corps of Engineers, an institution of the U.S. Federal Government, is looking into right now and about which it is on the verge of making a decision within the next two weeks? Why will he and the Canadian Government not intervene now to head off that decision by the U.S. Corps of Engineers?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, it should be very clear that the Canadian Government has already made its representations known. I also want to assure the Hon. Member that arrangements regarding the Great Lakes waters go back to 1909. The House may recall that there was a Liberal Prime Minister at the time. Since then, all of the arrangements in the Great Lakes water systems and the boundary water systems have been organized to the mutual benefit of both countries. It is Canada's belief that no diversion can take place without our official consent.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, if the representations by the Canadian Government have been so effective, will the Acting Prime Minister tell us why the United States Army Corps of Engineers is still looking into the matter? If the Government is so serious about the boundary waters treaty, why has the Government failed to raise this matter immediately with the International Joint Commission that operates on behalf of both Governments under that boundary waters treaty?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Because, Mr. Speaker, we have taken our concerns directly to Washington and we feel that it is important in this case to do so.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

CONTROL OF CHICKEN AND EGG IMPORT QUOTAS

Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade and concerns the control of incubated eggs imported from the United States. Many producers have made representations to me, saying that they are worried and wonder why nothing is done to control American imports that are replacing Canadian domestic production.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary assure the marketing board and its members that measures will be taken to control import quotas for eggs and broiler chicks so that producers can plan their investments and production accordingly and thereby make this whole industry secure?

[*English*]

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the Government is aware of the pressures in the hatching egg sector and the request by the Canadian Broiler Hatching Egg Marketing Agency. There is speculation that importers have been attempting to establish artificially high historic levels in case controls are introduced.

Let me advise the Hon. Member that over-all levels of imports have declined by 14 per cent in the first five months of this year over last year's imports. While Canadian production is increasing, the Government has the agency's request under consideration.

* * *

• (1500)

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

CARMANAH VALLEY, B.C.—PRESERVATION OF SPRUCE TREE HERITAGE

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Hon. Minister of the Environment. Carmanah Creek Valley adjacent to Pacific Rim National Park contains the largest and tallest spruce trees in Canada—probably in the world. MacMillan Bloedel has proposed that a small portion of this valley be set aside as a park that would preserve some of the largest trees.

I would like to ask the Minister if he recognizes the importance of saving the Carmanah Valley in its entirety as a miniature eco-system that will go on living, and not simply preserving a few of the largest trees that will eventually die off and fall. If he does, could he tell the House what he and the Government are prepared to do to save this valley from logging?

Hon. Tom McMillan (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, in response to the first part of the Hon. Member's question, my answer is yes, I do recognize the ecological treasure at stake here. After some 15 or 17 years of a combination of procrastination and insurmountable difficulty, the federal Government under our administration finally confirmed the boundaries for Pacific Rim National Park and arranged for the transfer of provincial Crown land to the federal Crown, paid out from the A-Base of my own budget $25 million to make it possible to establish the national park, only to discover that another area to the west of the park was at risk.

Some of the trees simply had not been identified previously by conservationists or others as being so special as to warrant being included in the national park.

It would be with great reluctance that I would ever consider reopening the question of Pacific Rim and renegotiating the boundaries, because of the difficulties that bedevilled successive Governments to get the park completed. But I will use my good offices and those of the federal Government as a whole to see whether the provincial Government might be prevailed upon to establish a provincial ecological preserve, and also to put some benevolent pressure on MacMillan Bloedel, whose tree licence is relevant in this case, to see whether they would not respond very favourably to the overture being made by the Sierra Club and by others to have those trees saved.

PROPOSED MORATORIUM ON LOGGING

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Minister for his favourable response. We recognize on this side of the House that the Government has had difficulties in dealing with the Government of British Columbia. I would like to ask the Minister will he pursue actively the possibility with MacMillan Bloedel and the provincial Government of a two-year moratorium on the Carmanah Creek area while individuals and concerned organizations work for a more permanent solution.

Hon. Tom McMillan (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I think that the Hon. Member would know that it would be a matter of moral suasion in trying to exercise benevolent influence. There is not anything that is legal that I could do, nor would the Hon. Member want me to, in the sense of expropriating the land. I will say that the area in question is precious, the trees are almost unprecedented in their magnificence. I think all Members of the House would agree that everything that could be done ought to be done to protect them, and in that connection I will be doing what I can.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

SHORTAGE OF SKILLED WORKERS—TRAINING PROGRAMS

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration. According to a recent report of the Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre, a tripartite agency of the Government, there is a serious shortage of skilled workers in Canada while, at the same time, we have over one million unemployed. The Centre concluded

that the rate of unemployment would be lower if we had more effective training and mobility programs provided by the Government.

In these circumstances I want to ask the Minister how she and the Government can justify a cut of 32 per cent in training programs since 1984, and a further 11 per cent cut in those programs for this fiscal year? Since she is relatively new at her portfolio, would she not take a fresh look at this and recognize that labour market training and mobility should be a government public responsibility and should not be left to the free market system?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that the Hon. Member knows, but I will remind him again, and that is that there are four million Canadians who change jobs every year. Most of them do not need government help. What we have done under the Canadian Jobs Strategy is to concentrate first of all on those areas where there is a need, both on the side of the employee, who may need the training and upgrading, but also of employers who are looking for help.

The free market functions very well for most of those four million people. We have in the Canadian Jobs Strategy 84,000 participants in the skill investment area, 160,000 participants in the skill shortages area, from 1985 to 1988. Within the Canadian Jobs Strategy we have the flexibility to deal first of all with people who need training and upgrading at an entry level, plus the flexibility for areas where there is labour shortage and where people can upgrade their skills. That is why the program works so well.

Mr. Speaker: Given the time, we are going to have to close Question Period. I will come to the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) in just a moment.

* * *

[*Translation*]

POINT OF ORDER

VOTE ON BILL C-72

Hon. André Bissonnette (Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell Canadians that I was not able to be present for the vote on Bill C-72 at noon today because of communications and traffic problems, but that I unequivocally support this Bill.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask the Treasury Board to solve the problem of the language teachers which has been going on for too long and affects my riding as well.

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Deputy Government House Leader to give us a statement of the business that the Government intends to put before the House for the coming week.

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, today we will proceed to deal with the Bills that are on the *Projected Order of Business* as much as possible. The first Bill that we are going to deal with is Bill C-58. We will need unanimous consent in order to proceed with report stage and third reading of this particular Bill. We will then move to Bill C-61, an Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Food and Drugs Act, at report stage and third reading. Then, Bill C-124, an Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, report stage and third reading. It will be followed by Bill C-75, report stage. That is the Act to implement an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Nova Scotia on offshore petroleum. Then we move to report stage of Bill C-122, followed by report stage of Bill C-129.

Mr. Speaker, the comments that I am going to make *vis-à-vis* report stage and third reading should apply to all Bills at all stages, and that is that obviously we can only move to third reading of a Bill with consent, where it is easy for it to be given. Naturally we would like to do third reading, but in the event that it is not possible to do third reading the same day, we will move it on and try to find a time which is convenient to the opposition spokespersons and the Government.

Tomorrow we will proceed with any of those Bills which have just mentioned which are not completed. In addition, I believe there has been some discussion with the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Clark), and their respective spokespersons *vis-à-vis* Bill C-92 at report stage, Bill C-132 at second reading and Bill C-112. I believe those discussions have taken place and that we will move those measures forward.

• (1510)

If it is at all possible, we would like at least to get started on the Government's reply to the Senate's amendments to Bill C-84.

On Monday morning, it is our intention to call Motion No. 25, the abortion motion, for procedural debate only in order to determine whether or not the motion as put on the Order Paper is procedurally correct. As soon as the procedural arguments have been made, we would then adjourn that matter to allow the Chair an opportunity to decide on it.

We would then move to report stage and third reading of Bill C-93, the multiculturalism Bill, followed by Bill C-82, which is the lobbyists' registration Bill. Obviously, we would also complete the proceedings on the reply to Bill C-84.

There is a Bill that has been sent to us from the Senate, Bill S-17, regarding a trust company. I understand that consideration on it will take place on Monday at a time which is convenient to the spokesperson for the Liberal Party who has some questions which he wishes to ask of the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Hockin).

That brings us to Tuesday morning when we will call Bill C-126, the Bretton Woods Bill, for report stage and third reading, and Bill C-110, the trade tribunal Bill for report stage and third reading.

I would also point out that we have had a request from our colleagues in the Liberal Party to recess the House on Tuesday at 6 p.m. We find that to be appropriate. Thus we will be moving a motion in that respect on either Monday or Tuesday.

I would point out that this schedule may sound like a reasonably heavy one, but it has been put together in the interests of getting us out of here. It has been put together with the assistance of the opposition spokespersons in order to meet the convenience of as many people being here at the appropriate time as possible.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order with respect to the House business. I would like to inquire of the Government House Leader whether there have been some discussions and whether the Government is now prepared to take Bill C-273, which is the Bill put forward by the Hon. Member for Ottawa West (Mr. Daubney) regarding political rights, and turn it into a government order in order that this Bill may be expedited and may go to the Senate, and in order that the campaign promise of the last election made by not just my Party but by his Party with respect to granting political rights to people working for the Government of Canada may in fact be implemented. I say that particularly in light of the fact that the Bill as it has been adopted and redrafted by the legislative committee in large measure conforms to the promises which were made by the Progressive Conservatives during the last election campaign. In addition, it is acceptable to the other two Parties.

Given that there is a willingness on the part of the other two caucuses to see this go through with a minimum amount of House time, is the Government prepared to bring it up as a government order and see it expedited rather than continue to drag it back and possibly not get it up before the next election?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that my colleague opposite brought up the results of one of our election promises, that is, our promise with respect to parliamentary reform. As a result of parliamentary reform Private Members' Hour and Private Members' Business now mean something. My hon. colleague knows that the first Bill to pass all three stages was the Bill on tobacco presented by his colleague, the Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald). We did as a House and as a Government implement parliamentary reform to allow for Private Members' Business to mean something.

There is one thing that I think will be confirmed by his colleague, the House Leader for the NDP, and also by members of the Liberal Party too, that is, we have been very careful *vis-à-vis* Private Members' Hour to stand back and to let it operate as Private Members' Hour. The Hon. Member's suggestion has merit. However, I would not want to suggest that we do anything which abridges the rights of other private Members with other Bills and which sets a bad precedent. I am not afraid to set precedents, but I do not want to set one that disrupts what all of us have spent two years building in terms of an effective Private Members' Hour.

I take the representation seriously. I will look into it. We will try to work it out with the House Leaders so that whatever we do is done with the agreement of caucus and does not abridge the rights we have built up over time.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I rise on that same point. I want to ask the Deputy House Leader if he has not indeed heard the suggestion that was made. I think it came from me some weeks ago. That is to say, if we want to get through with Bill C-273 then we could ask the Government to take that order upon itself and put it to the House in due course.

It is much more difficult, as the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) has said, to use the present system because that Bill will only come back next fall. There are only two days of debate, one at report stage and one at third reading. We are asking the Government, telling the Government, that if it wants to co-operate with us, that is, the Members interested in this Bill to give political rights to public servants, then it could pick up the Bill as a government order. That would make it a lot faster and a lot easier.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I will take that representation under advisement too. I do say that whatever we do we should do as a House *vis-à-vis* Private Members' Hour. I think that is the safest way to proceed, but I will take it under advisement.

Mr. Speaker: I am going to interrupt Hon. Members for a moment. I will then come back to continue on some points of order and to continue this discussion, if it is necessary to do so. I see that the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre and others are rising.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill C-141, an Act to regulate the marketing of agricultural products in import, export and interprovincial trade and to provide for national standards and grades of agricultural products, for their inspection and grading, for the registration of establishments and for standards governing establishments, without amendment.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

Government House
Ottawa

July 7, 1988

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Gerard V.J. La Forest, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 7th day of July, 1988, at 3:30 p.m., for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain Bills.

Yours sincerely,
Anthony P. Smyth
Deputy Secretary, Policy and Program

* * *

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Speaker: I will now hear the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre on the same point concerning the business of the House.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I was going to say that I am sure the discussions on this matter having been raised in the House can be pursued privately. I hope they could have a positive and early outcome. I will leave it at that.

Mr. Daubney: Mr. Speaker, as the proposer of the Private Member's Bill in question, I would just like to make it clear on the record that I support the suggestion of my two colleagues, the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) and the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier). While I am a great believer in parliamentary reform and am proud that my Bill has got this far in that process, I recognize the reality of the legislative and electoral timetable. The only way I think that our Party would be in a position to fulfil its promise to the people made in 1984 is if the Government adopts this as a piece of government business. I certainly urge it to give serious consideration to doing that.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, this morning, the Senate split Bill C-103. It is sending back Bill C-103 to the House of Commons as Bill C-103, Part I, dealing with the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency.

Point of Order—Mr. Plamondon

I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether the Government will consider introducing this Bill C-103, Part I immediately to the Chamber so that it can be passed, with one minor amendment.

• (1520)

Mr. Speaker: There is a procedural difficulty in this matter. There is a long-standing tradition that we do not comment upon the proceedings in the other place until we have received some notice one way or the other. The Hon. Member may have had a special communication, but the House has not received anything official. The Hon. Minister of State may wish to respond.

Mr. Lewis: We would be very disappointed if the Senate has done anything to interfere with the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. We think this Bill will really help Atlantic Canada and it will put the administration of regional development into that area. We will be replying very quickly if there has been any tampering with that Bill by the other place.

* * *

[*Translation*]

POINT OF ORDER

VOTE ON BILL C-72

Mr. Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, point of order. I would like to state that I was absent for the vote on Bill C-72 this morning for reasons beyond my control, but I wish to register my vote in favour of this Bill that is so important for Canada.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

PRESENTATION OF FOURTEENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, I am rising to seek the consent of the House to present, in both official languages, the fourteenth report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, and at the same time I am seeking consent of the House to move concurrence in this report.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

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

CONCURRENCE IN FOURTEENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): I move that the fourteenth report of the Public Accounts Committee be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

PROCEEDINGS IN LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON BILL C-130

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege arises from the deliberations of the legislative committee dealing with Bill C-130. This morning the chairperson indicated that it was to be his ruling throughout the considerations by the legislative committee that the committee would not interrupt its proceedings in response to a vote within the House of Commons.

As an individual Member of Parliament responsible to my constituents for voting on a vast number of pieces of legislation coming before us, this seems to me to be a distinct limitation of my privileges as a Member of Parliament. I would ask the Speaker to review the situation and to make some remedy, if possible.

Mr. Speaker: The complaint of the Hon. Member is that it may well be from time to time a committee might decide, as a consequence of the majority of the members in that committee, to carry on its proceedings even when a vote is taking place. Whatever may be the particular virtue or otherwise of that procedure, it has been allowed for a great many years in our tradition.

I might just say to the Hon. Member, with respect to the particular committee to which the Hon. Member refers, this morning, at the helpful suggestion of some Hon. Members and the co-operation of others in the committee, the committee did adjourn and all Members did take the vote.

I am aware of the complaint, and the Hon. Member will have to leave it with me. Under those circumstances, I cannot rule at the present time that it is a question of privilege.

Mr. Langdon: If I could just clarify the ruling which was made by the Chair, it was not that a majority of Members would have to be in favour of an adjournment, but instead that unanimously the committee members would have to agree to adjourn in order to permit their participation in a vote in the House. I felt it important to make that distinction for you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I have the Hon. Member's distinction, and I will consider the matter further. In the meantime, unless I feel it necessary to reopen it, that is where the matter lies. I will take a look at the particular distinction raised by the Hon. Member. If I feel that it is appropriate to do so, I will come back to the House and ask Hon. Members to argue the matter briefly.

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. For purposes of this legislative committee notice was not received of the meeting this morning until well past the period customarily expected by the House. In that case, I wonder if the meeting itself has any force.

Mr. Speaker: I must ask the Hon. Member to take that issue and raise it at the committee. I do not think that the Chair can rule on a matter like that.

With respect to the other matter raised by the Hon. Member, I have to be absolutely sure that it has not extended to the point where, in some way or another, Hon. Members in the committee, or the Hon. Member who has raised the complaint, are denied their rights to function as Members of Parliament. That, of course, is an issue of privilege.

I will further consider the distinction raised by the Hon. Member, but on this latter matter clearly the Chair does not have any jurisdiction to intervene. I invite the Hon. Member to take the problem back to the committee.

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I know that the Member did not receive notice of the committee meeting at the appropriate time. In addition to that, and this may be a more general problem, I do not believe that the announcement that the committee was meeting was in the general notification of committees meeting that is circulated to all Members. In the House there are people who are not serving on standing or legislative committees who are interested in the transactions of those committees. The only means that Members have of knowing if a committee meeting is occurring is if it is listed in the daily bulletin.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member for Churchill. I know the Hon. Member understands that in this particular matter it is not the place for the Chair to intervene. However, the Chair has very generously allowed the matter to be raised. I am sure the appropriate people will attend to it.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

MUTUAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE IN CRIMINAL MATTERS ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-58, an Act to provide for the implementation of treaties for mutual legal assistance in criminal matters and to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act, and the Immigration Act, 1976, as reported (with amendments) from the legislative committee.

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, I indicated when I did the projected business that we would need the consent of the House to proceed at this time to report stage and third reading of this Bill, and I would ask for that consent at this moment.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

• (1530)

Mr. Speaker: I must now give to Hon. Members my ruling on Bill C-58, an Act to provide for the implementation of treaties for mutual legal assistance in criminal matters and to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Immigration Act, 1976.

There are two motions in amendment on the Notice Paper for report stage of Bill C-58, an Act to provide for the implementation of treaties for mutual legal assistance in criminal matters and to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability and the Immigration Act, 1976.

[*Translation*]

The two motions standing on the Order Paper in the name of the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) are in order. They will be grouped for debate and voted on separately.

[*English*]

I will now put Motions Nos. 1 and 2 to the House.

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-58 be amended in Clause 4 by striking out line 37 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"shall, by order, add to or delete from the".

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-58 be amended in Clause 4 by striking out line 41 on page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) The Governor in Council shall, by".

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have a number of comments to make about the Bill. As I understand the Government will support these amendments, I suggest that I make my comments on third reading when I will perhaps take issue with some of the general aspects of the Bill. In this case the Government and the Opposition are agreed that we might go forward to the vote, so I will raise my points generally at third reading stage.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, obviously, as my colleague from Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) has just said, his amendment is in order and acceptable to the Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, as is clearly stated, not only must the word "may" be replaced by "shall" on line 37 of the English version of the amendment, but also on line 41. Also in the French version, Mr. Speaker, the word *inscrit* must now appear in the amendment to be consistent with the word "shall", and also the word *prend* in French.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, regarding this extremely important Bill on mutual legal assistance in criminal matters, I would like to congratulate Hon. Members from both opposition Parties for their co-operation so that this Bill can be dealt with as soon as possible.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 1 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Centre (Mr. Cassidy). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 1 agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 2 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 2 agreed to.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada) moved that Bill C-58, as amended, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the Bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Hnatyshyn moved that the Bill be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) rises and gives his fulsome support to this very progressive piece of legislation, I thought I might set the groundwork to allow him to understand the Bill fully so that he can convince his colleagues to support the Bill on third reading.

I want to join with the Parliamentary Secretary who made reference earlier on today with respect to the work of the legislative committee which studied the provisions of this Bill. There was excellent co-operation. The committee gave prompt attention to the Bill and dealt with it on a deliberate and reasonable basis. It is important for us to try to bring pieces of legislation forward in all stages of the process as best we can, have the differences fully examined and have the matters put to a vote. I do thank Members from all sides of the House for their co-operation.

At the outset of the Government's mandate, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) enunciated a goal of constructive internationalism. This principle recognizes that some problems being international in scope can only be adequately addressed through international co-operation. Law enforcement agencies have long recognized that major crimes, such as drug trafficking, the laundering of money obtained by crime, fraud, tax evasion and offences committed by terrorists and organized crime are often transnational in scope. Criminals seek to use international boundaries to cloak their activities, hide the proceeds of their crimes and escape detection. It is clear that nations must act together if this growing phenomenon is to be stopped because crime is no longer merely a local or national affair.

• (1540)

Hon. Members will recall that an important mutual legal assistance treaty was signed by the Prime Minister on March 18, 1985, at Québec City. Since then, a second treaty with the United Kingdom limited to drug offences was signed by the Prime Minister and Prime Minister Thatcher at Ottawa on June 22 of this year. A number of other treaties are presently under negotiation with Australia and European and Caribbean countries.

Our goal is to negotiate a network of treaties so that we may, in concert with our treaty partners, improve our ability to investigate and prosecute transnational crime. The Bill before us today sets out the legal framework necessary to implement Canada's obligations in the Canada-U.S. and the Canada-U.K. mutual legal assistance treaties and in any other treaties to which Canada may become party.

I refer Hon. Members to my remarks at second reading on this Bill when I laid out the principles of the Bill. I think there is a stranger knocking at the door, interrupting an otherwise brilliant speech.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[*Translation*]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

> Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Deputy to the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

and being returned:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I have the honour to inform the House that when the House went up to the Senate Chamber the Deputy Governor General was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

Bill C-131 an Act to amend the National Transportation Act of 1987—Chapter 26, 1988;

Bill C-141, an Act to regulate the marketing of agricultural products in import, export and interprovincial trade and to provide for national standards and grades of agricultural products, for their inspection and grading, for the registration of establishments and for standards governing establishments—Chapter 27, 1988.

• (1550)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

MUTUAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE IN CRIMINAL MATTERS ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Hnatyshyn that Bill C-58, an Act to provide for the implementation of treaties for mutual legal assistance in criminal matters and to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Immigration Act, 1976, be read the third time and passed.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Madam Speaker, I know you are highly regarded in this House as a very excellent Speaker. You now have a new qualification as probably the fastest Speaker one has seen around here in a long time. You certainly got down there and back in very short order and I was unable to even finish my coffee while you were away.

I was referring to the Canada-U.K. mutual legal assistance treaty, but this legislation makes provision for other treaties which Canada may enter into with other countries.

Briefly, the mutual legal assistance as implemented by this Bill will be carried out by Canadian authorities making applications where necessary to Canadian courts according to recognized Canadian legal principles. The Bill provides authority to Canadian Superior Court judges to order four types of compulsory measures: search warrants; summonses to witnesses; orders to transfer temporarily persons in custody; and orders to lend exhibits. None of these types of assistance will be provided unless a treaty provides for the particular type of assistance, the request was made in compliance with the treaty, the assistance requested is not contrary to a Canadian public interest as determined by the Minister of Justice, and any conditions imposed by a Canadian judge have been accepted. In addition, there must be grounds sufficient to satisfy a Canadian judge that an offence has been committed in the requesting state to which a treaty applies, and that evidence of that offence or the whereabouts of an offender can be found in Canada. In the case of a search warrant, the Canadian court must also be satisfied that a less intrusive order, such as an evidence gathering order, would not suffice.

The same measures of assistance made available to a treaty partner will be available as a treaty obligation to Canadian

authorities investigating offences committed in Canada where there is believed to be evidence abroad.

[*Translation*]

During consideration in committee, several amendments were made to the Bill. The purpose of these amendments is to increase the flexibility of our legislative framework, so that we can achieve our objectives and meet the requests of the countries with which negotiations have been initiated since the introduction of Bill C-58.

One of these amendments expands the meaning of the word "treaty" as defined in the first version of Clause 2, since the legislation allows the implementation of only those treaties whose primary purpose is to provide for mutual legal assistance.

The amendment, as approved by the committee, now recognizes that Canada may wish to be a party to other conventions such as the proposed United Nations convention on unlawful trafficking in narcotics and psychotropic substances, whose primary purpose is to fight drug trafficking which will probably contain important provisions on mutual legal assistance.

This amendment gives Canada the requisite flexibility for being a party to such a convention and implementing the major mutual assistance measures provided therein, but only if the convention includes the guarantees set forth in paragraph 2 of the Bill.

[*English*]

Another amendment was the addition of a new Section 41 providing for the safe conduct of persons who voluntarily come to Canada pursuant to a Canadian request, to assist a Canadian investigation or to testify in court. This safe conduct for a person not in custody would parallel the safe conduct provided in Section 41 of the Bill for persons in custody who come to Canada pursuant to a request for assistance. This provision will encourage persons whose assistance is requested to travel to Canada. The safe conduct is provided only for a limited time and applies only with regard to acts committed prior to arrival in Canada pursuant to the request. This assurance is a prior requirement for this kind of assistance from some European countries. It is found in the European Convention on Mutual Assistance and the Australian legislation.

These are the principle elements of amendments made to Bill C-58. In conjunction with Bill C-61 concerning proceeds of crime, which I hope to take up immediately after this Bill, Canada will be taking a major step forward in the international fight against drug trafficking and other serious crimes.

Simply put, this Bill allows us to carry out our international obligations with respect to the examination and investigation of transboundary international crime, and allows us to assist other western industrialized countries and others around the world with respect to dealing with organized crime and terrorism, and the locating of evidence to make sure there are successful prosecutions of these undesirable and untenable acts.

I think we are giving leadership in this area of international co-operation. As I indicated in my remarks, we are in the process of dealing with a number of countries to obtain similar treaties. When we consider, in the light of my responsibilities as Minister of Justice, the actions taken to amend the Criminal Code so as to allow us to better investigate and prosecute criminal activity, I think this is the type of legislation that should commend itself to all Members of Parliament.

I hope there will be support from all Parties for this legislation because it is based on fair principles, it is under Canadian control, and allows us to call upon our friends who have signed treaties with us to collect evidence in Canada at the same time we extend our good offices to assist them. This is good progressive legislation whose time has come and I ask Members to support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Madam Speaker, I am standing in for the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson), our justice critic. I think all my friends and colleagues in this House know that he is one of the most hard working Members of this House and has taken a good deal of interest in this Bill. Unfortunately, he is unable to be here today and I have been asked to speak on his behalf.

• (1600)

I sought to speak a few minutes earlier and, probably because my head was turned, two amendments were accepted by the Government which will presumably go down in the history books as standing in my name. That is something that has rarely occurred in my many years in Opposition, both in Queen's Park and here. I am, of course, seeking the privilege of being able to move amendments and have them carried as a matter of course. I trust that will occur very shortly once we become the Government.

I do not intend to be that controversial in my remarks. I simply want to talk about the reservations which we expressed when Bill C-58 came before the House for second reading which, unfortunately, have not been responded to by the Government during the course of committee stage or today. In other words, although we appreciate the modest improvement in the Bill which has occurred as a consequence of the two amendments which have just been accepted, we still have grave reservations about the Bill.

The Hon. Member said that this is because of the need for mutual legal assistance, particularly in such areas as the prosecution of drug traffickers and with respect to other serious crimes. To the extent that that is the purpose of what has taken place, I do not think there is any particular objection. In fact, most people would endorse that particular provision, particularly given the fact that along with the globalization of finance, commerce, and tourism, et cetera, has come the globalization of crime. Perhaps the easiest place for that to occur is where there is a lengthy common boundary as occurs between Canada and the United States with a good deal of traffic back and forth in many areas between the two countries.

What concerns us in this particular case is the fact that there are a number of areas in the legal systems of the two countries in which there are significant irritants, as the word is used in international Parliaments.

The United States, as the larger country, has a rather less coherent legal administrative system. It, as well, takes a different view of freedom of speech with regard to people who take progressive opinions in different areas. There are really some significant irritants which we believe should have been sorted out prior to legislating to bring this treaty agreement into force.

My friend, the Member for Burnaby, mentioned as an example Farley Mowat who produced a wonderful book based on his experiences when he was bumped off an airplane bound for Los Angeles in 1985. Farley Mowat is a distinguished, famous, and popular author, not only in this country but around the world, including the United States. As the Member for Burnaby pointed out, Farley Mowat's offence was to suggest that he was going to shoot down American aircraft a few years ago using a shotgun somewhere in Newfoundland and hoping the planes would fly over him and within range. He was, of course, speaking in jest. One would question whether Farley Mowat would have been able to shoot in a vertical rather than horizontal direction.

The point is that the Americans lacked both the sense of humour and the administrative system, first, to recognize that this should not have been subject to an offence. Second, if it was noted in their intelligence files it should not have stayed as a black mark on the books of a Canadian citizen forever. Third, there should be some means by which this type of thing could be wiped off the books. Fourth, the degree to which the Americans seem to exercise their sovereign right to exclude people from their country is ridiculous. They are exercising this right against distinguished Canadians whom, there seems to be no conceivable reason to exclude from going into the United States, just as Canada would see no conceivable reason for excluding from Canada Americans of similar stature and similar distinction.

A friend of mine from Toronto, Professor Don Wilmott, a distinguished academic teaching at York University, has also suffered under the McCarran Act provisions which were brought in at the height of the red scare in the United States in the 1950s, which provisions have stayed on the books. It seems to me that a Canadian Government which was negotiating at the highest level for mutual legal assistance should have been entitled, while negotiating this agreement for which there is obviously a need, to ask to get away from the kind of legal irritant which is barring Canadians citizens from reasonable access to the United States.

We are not talking about the relationship between Canada and Pago Pago, Uruguay, or some other distant country from which there is a small volume of annual traffic. There are tens of millions of visits between Canada and the United States by citizens of the two countries on an annual basis. Probably one-quarter of the population of Canada seeks to visit the United States at some point during the course of a year because we are good neighbours and good friends in many ways.

However, there are too many cases where Canadians have been blocked because they attended a conference which was deemed to be left wing, because as students they went to a peace conference sponsored by a Soviet-sponsored peace body, or because they associated with a group in Canada which was legitimate under Canadian law and had the right to free association in Canada but which the Americans considered for some reason to be subversive and not acceptable in their country.

This is the kind of thing which should not occur between two mature nations which seek to be friendly with each other in a reasonable and normal way. Since Canada does not reject people on these grounds, one has to assume that it is the United States which is immature in this particular case.

I am glad to know that Congress now has before it legislation which would repeal these offensive provisions of the McCarran Act. However, a person whose name has been put into a computer by American immigration because of the McCarran Act has to go through incredible amounts of red tape. I have approached the American Embassy here in Ottawa on behalf of constituents on this particular matter. I was subjected to bureaucratic bafflegab and stonewalling beyond belief. The Americans essentially say, "Oh, you know what Congress is like, we can't do anything about it. We're awfully sorry, we're terribly sympathetic, we can't help you, goodbye". I do not think that is good enough. The Government of Canada should have exercised the leverage it had in order to do away with an irritant which affects thousands of our citizens who would potentially go into the United States, which is quite unreasonable.

I know the problem is that the Government is uncritical with regard to actions and policies of the United States Government. That may be the reason it decided not to do anything in this particular area. We heard the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) say the other day, with regard to the tragic loss of life when an Iranian plane was shot down by an American missile, that as far as the Government was concerned it saw no reason to question the American account of the incident. Therefore, initially, the Government was not prepared to support requests which we and many other people, including the Iranians quite properly, were making for an impartial investigation into what took place there.

That same kind of credulity and perhaps naïvety seems to exist with respect to the trade agreement. I will not go too far in that direction or you might call me back to order. The point I want to make is that while we are good friends, good neighbours, and extraordinarily important trading partners with the United States, and vice versa, at the same time Canadians too have interests with respect to the United States. We should be using every opportunity to promote those interests and ensure they are rolled over by American authorities. We also know that the Americans are too prone to do that.

• (1610)

The Corps of Engineers wants to open the taps and drain water from the Great Lakes. As far as they are concerned, it is a matter that could be approved by the Pentagon with no problem and Canadians should not be so presumptuous as to suggest that since we are affected by a lower water level of the Great Lakes, decisions on the Great Lakes should be made jointly rather than unilaterally.

I would also speak passionately about another unresolved matter. It is the failure of the Canadian Government to use every means possible to seek justice from the United States over the Canadian victims of brainwashing in Montreal which was sponsored and financed by the Central Intelligence Agency. That too is a legal question involving a mutual legal affair. In this case acts in Canada—

Mr. Friesen: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the Member would want to be a little more accurate. The victims in Montreal were in fact victims but, as I understand, not victims of brainwashing but as a result of the use of drugs that are found to be harmful. I think it is in error to say that it was brainwashing. It was medical treatment that was untried and should never have been used. They are victims, but I wish the Hon. Member would be accurate about that.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I would only suggest to the Hon. Member to heed his own advice and let us perhaps stay closer to the subject at hand so that we may be able to keep on with the debate.

Mr. Cassidy: Madam Speaker, I think the Hon. Member would agree that these were victims of experiments which were financed by the CIA and certainly related to brainwashing although they may or may not have involved the use of brainwashing.

The reason I raise these questions is that our country is being given authority, according to the Bill, to enter into pacts for mutual legal assistance with many other countries in the world. There is no assurance that where there are irritants or outstanding legal questions with those countries, we will undertake to sort out those questions at a point when we have leverage. It is in the mutual interest of both countries to have a treaty for mutual legal assistance.

The Bar Association was not happy about the rather broad powers granted under this Bill. We believe that the problems with the Bill are sufficiently serious to justify our view not to support it as it stands at third reading.

The Government is prepared to give more legal recourse to foreign jurisdictions than Canadians give to ourselves. For example, in Canada, a person cannot be compelled to give evidence, but under this legislation any person can be forced to give evidence as a result of the invoking of the procedures in this treaty. If the requesting country, under a mutual treaty, provides that a witness is not required to give evidence when self incrimination might be involved, Canadian authorities cannot insist and the witness cannot be compelled to give evidence.

While my knowledge of the law fails me somewhat here, in the case of a country which may not have such a respect for the rule of law as we do here, and there may be no legal restriction on witnesses being compelled to give evidence, it could be that rather than Canadian standards of justice, the standards of testimony of a country about whose social and legal system we have grave misgivings would be brought to bear on the witness who is here in Canada.

I recognize that drug trafficking and other serious crimes are a great problem. However, the Bar Association itself gave a great deal of thought to its presentation and raised concerns about evidence gathering. Mr. Victor Paisley, Chairman of the Bar Association, said this in the Bar's submission:

> ... these provisions are at variance with Canadian criminal law. Interference by a state with the lives of its citizens or those under the protection of its laws ought to be kept to a minimum. The measures proposed under clause 18 seem to us to risk authorizing mere fishing expeditions.

He went on to say:

> Compulsory examination on oath of individuals as an aid to criminal investigation is a substantial departure from Canadian traditions of fair play.

He cited the Court of Star Chamber in England, saying that it was a brief episode in British legal history under common law. He went on to say:

> While some nations may still feel comfortable with inquisitorial procedures, we do not believe Canadians should be denied their traditional rights simply because a foreign state wishes to be accommodated.
>
> In our view, no case has been made for an additional broad power to compel suspects or other persons to answer questions beyond the present provisions of Canadian criminal law. The right of an accused person not to be required to incriminate himself—the right to remain silent—is a fundamental part of our legal tradition.

This Bill does not supersede the Charter. It does supersede all other Canadian laws with respect to the requirement of evidence and other matters involved in the Bill. Therefore, the point raised by the Bar is valid and serious.

Whether or not the Bill would stand up to the Charter is something that I suppose would be tested in the courts at some point. Regardless of the outcome of such a decision, do we in the House wish to proceed with a Bill that would appear to be greatly at variance with the Canadian legal tradition of the right not to incriminate oneself? That is a fundamental part of Canadian legal tradition, as the Bar has stated. The Bill in its present form strays from that fundamental legal tradition. The Bill does not exclude the use of hearsay or opinion in evidence as invalid. I will leave it to knowledgeable legal persons to expand on that issue, but that too is at variance with our existing practice.

The investigatory powers provided for in the Bill are very broad and subject to mischief and abuse. The concern is that a foreign government would be able to invoke the provisions of the treaty in order to investigate a criminal matter.

Present outstanding treaties exist with the United States and Great Britain. Despite President Reagan and Mrs. Thatcher, we enjoy a good deal of common cause with those countries and we tend to trust their legal systems.

What about treaties with Governments in Africa or Latin America? We are concerned that a Government from Chile, El Salvador or Guatemala could use the powers under this treaty in order to harass people or make charges for offences that would not be considered offences in the normal way by Canadians.

This Bill represents something of an open door policy. It is skeleton legislation under which 100 treaties could be signed, with no further recourse to Parliament except for the possibility of questions in the House or occasional questions to the Minister during the Estimates.

There is also a concern about confidential information provided by the Canadian authorities. It should be clarified whether all of the protections guaranteed by the Privacy Act apply in this legislation. This concern was raised at second reading and it is important to raise it again.

● (1620)

The Bar Association also raised the question that in some foreign states they may be prepared to consider as domestic offences, offences that were committed outside of their territory, something which is not inherent in Canadian law. That, too, could raise a situation of harassment or of unreasonable intrusion on people living in Canada or on people who would become Canadians.

I have to say that I am concerned that, in the case where you have a dictatorial government in a foreign country which seeks to extend these powers into Canada, the protections which are given to the person who is the subject of investigation in Canada are significantly less than, for example, those that exist in the extradition treaties which Canada has signed with some 40 or 50 countries around the world.

Some of those countries have Governments which are perhaps not wholly democratic in the sense that we understand it here in Canada. Nonetheless, it is appropriate that there should be an extradition treaty with those countries if there is a significant risk that there may be criminals who are accused of an offence and who are suspected of being harboured in the other country. Canada has a reverse interest in terms of being able to pull people back from those countries as well. We have a case under way currently with respect to a person suspected of being involved in the explosion aboard the CP Air jet in Tokyo three years ago.

The extradition treaty provides for a court process before the suspected or the accused person can be extradited. The standards under which these provisions are being put forward would appear to be somewhat less in terms of the gathering of evidence, investigations and other forms of mutual legal assistance.

The final point I want to make is the following. The Government has agreed that the Schedule to the Act will contain the names of states which are signatories to the treaties. If we had had the opportunity, we would have liked to have moved as well for some means of public disclosure around the power of the Government to enter into informal or temporary agreements for mutual legal assistance for periods of up to six months. This can be done either for areas not specified in the treaty—if a treaty exists—or with a country that has not signed the treaty.

Again, there is the possibility of being able to agree to the request from, let us say, a country in Central America, where there are rather undemocratic regimes, for mutual legal assistance because they feel that there are persons in this country whom they are pursuing because of some political problems in their own country. And the idea that that could be done for six months and possibly renewed thereafter—

Mr. Hnatyshyn: It is not possible.

Mr. Cassidy: —without any public disclosure under Section 6—the Minister says that it is not possible, but I am sure that that is the case. That is a very legitimate question which raises concerns with us.

According to the note that was prepared for the House of Commons in June by the Parliamentary Research Bureau, "the administrative arrangements that would be allowed under Section 6 could be negotiated and executed in total secrecy". I do not believe that that has changed.

Those are some of the concerns that we have and those are the reasons why we are not prepared to support the Bill. As indicated previously, we will agree to let the Bill go to third reading on division rather than calling a vote.

I would like the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) or one of his colleagues to stand up and say, at the very least, that Canada had now determined that we are going to take an active role in negotiating those restrictions on Canadians under the McCarran Act, and in reaching for a resolution for the victims of the CIA experiments and that that would be one of the things that the Government would guarantee as part of the package for mutual legal assistance with the United States.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Hnatyshyn moved that Bill C-58, an Act to provide for the implementation of treaties for mutual legal assistance in criminal matters and to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Immigration Act, 1976, be read the third time and do pass.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion agreed to on division and Bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE, FOOD AND DRUGS ACT AND NARCOTIC CONTROL ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-61, an Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Food and Drugs Act and the Narcotic Control Act, as reported (with amendments) from the legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): There are 14 motions and amendments on the Order Paper for report stage of Bill C-61, an Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Food and Drugs Act and the Narcotic Control act.

[*Translation*]

Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 14, standing in the names of the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson), the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) and the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mrs. Dewar) are the same as the amendments which were moved, debated and negatived in committee. Therefore, in accordance with Standing order 114(10), they will not be selected for debate in the House.

[*English*]

Motion No. 5 of the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) is similar to an amendment moved at the committee stage, debated and later negatived. Although similar, this motion is sufficiently different that it shall be put to the House.

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 10, standing in the name of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada (Mr. Hnatyshyn), will be debated and voted on separately.

[*English*]

Mr. Cassidy: Madam Speaker, it was agreed that in the absence of the Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) the motion could be moved by the Member for Hamilton Mountain (Ms. Dewar).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grisé: Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council (Mr. Grisé), on a point of order.

Mr. Grisé: Madam Speaker, after discussion among the various parties, I believe you will find there is unanimous consent for the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain to move the motion in the name of the Hon. Member for Burnaby.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Ms. Marion Dewar (for Mr. Robinson) moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-61 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out lines 36 and 37 and substituting the following therefor:

"judge shall require notice to be given to and shall upon request hear any persons who, in the".

She said: Madam Speaker, the purpose in asking for this amendment is that if a person has an interest in the property it should be not only a request but a demand that they be heard. That is all we are asking for. I certainly hope that the Government will agree to the amendment.

• (1630)

The other amendments which have been ruled out of order were ruled out of order because they were debated at committee. However, this one, as you have seen, Madam Speaker, and as you agree, is different enough that it would certainly make the Bill much more fair. The judge would have to hear anybody who has an interest in the property. I see the Minister nodding. I hope that the Government will agree to the amendment.

The amendments which were not allowed included references to bawdy houses and prostitution. Prostitution in this country is not illegal. If this type of recommendation were included, and the Fraser Committee report was very clear on what it would do, prostitutes would be put in the same category as victims of organized crime. If their property, which was acquired not as a result of organized crime but legally, is seized and they have not been heard, it seems important that they should be heard before there is an order put in on it.

I must admit that I am certainly not as familiar with the Bill as the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) who worked on it at committee. I apologize for that. But the measure made all sorts of sense to me and I believe that this is the type of amendment that helps to make the Bill more fair.

I will speak to the Bill as a whole after report stage is dealt with.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Parliamentary Secretary, on a point of order.

Mr. Grisé: Thank you Madam Speaker. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mrs. Dewar) is speaking to Motion No. 3, which the Chair has already ruled out of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I will try to clarify the issue for the Parliamentary Secretary. It is true that in the case of Motion No. 5, the Chair's decision acknowledges there is a similarity with another amendment. However, the Chair found that there was nevertheless sufficient difference to allow Motion No. 5 to be moved again in the House.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn).

[*English*]

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Madam Speaker, I just want to spend a couple of minutes trying to deal with the motion which has been accepted by the Chair moved by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Ms. Dewar) on behalf of the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson).

This appears to be something which, if one were to use the logic that is put forward by the Hon. Member that it is something that is desirable, would mandate a court to take certain action, that is to say, hear people who claim to have an interest in property which is subject to deliberations before the court. However, one can understand, in terms of our judicial process, that these are questions, after all, that should be left to the courts to decide.

First, does the claimant have a sufficient *prima facie* basis upon which to have a hearing? Second, once that has been established, the court should have the discretion to determine the basis upon which the person claiming interest can be heard. It is up to the court, in the final analysis, to determine the merits of these cases.

If we were to put a mandatory provision such as has been suggested by the Hon. Member there would be absolutely no discretion. Anyone could walk in off the streets and say: "I have an interest in this matter" and would be able to take up the time of the court simply as a matter of right.

You point out in your ruling, Madam Speaker, that a similar matter was discussed in the course of the committee. In effect, it was voted down. But since there is some difference in the wording put forward by the Hon. Member today and because it is sufficiently different we are considering it.

We still think that this Bill in its present form, with the exception of an amendment that I want to put forward myself at report stage, achieves a reasonable balance in the interests of the state to pursue, to seize, to freeze and, in effect, to forfeit the proceeds of illicit activity. The whole function of the Bill is to allow us to overcome a situation which, on the face of it, to any Canadian looking at the present situation is absurd.

What we now have is a situation in which a person could be convicted of illegal drug trafficking, could have made an enormous amount of money out of this activity, could be convicted of the offence, served time in jail, came out and enjoyed the proceeds of the crime in circumstances in which the state has no right to attach the proceeds of that illicit activity and use the money for worth-while purposes such as public health, education and other important governmental objectives.

What happens is that we also in the same vein want to allow people who have a legitimate claim to come forward and make application to the court to establish that the moneys that are attempted to be seized by the provincial Attorney General are in fact property which should not be seized because it belongs to them. In our system, of course, there is an obligation to establish not beyond a reasonable doubt but on the basis of reasonable probabilities that there is a case for that person to make. It is always left in these circumstances for the court to hear the application. The discretion is there in the court to hear the application, by all means, but then if it is satisfied that there is a sufficient basis it will give an order.

I do not know whether there is anything accomplished by mandating every claimant, regardless of the merits of the case, to have their day in court to put forward this situation. I think that this balance is one which is understandable. It is consistent with the processes that we have in our Canadian judicial system. It allows an opportunity, a counterbalance, for legitimate third party interests to come forward and to apply to the court to have their cases heard.

I cannot say anything further. I will talk on third reading about this Bill which is, I think, a very good Bill which moves us forward in terms of fairness in the criminal justice system to allow the state to pursue and to discourage people who make large amounts of money out of illicit activity. I gave the example of drug trafficking.

This Bill is a good Bill. I wish I could be more accommodating to the Hon. Member with respect to her amendment. I think, on balance and reflection, she might agree with me that it might lead to unusual and unacceptable consequences for our judicial system. With the greatest of respect for the Hon. Member, I would like to indicate that we are not prepared to agree at this point in time.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Cassidy: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 5 negatived.

• (1640)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada) moved:

Motion No. 10.

That Bill C-61 be amended in Clause 2 in the French version by striking out lines 2 and 3 at page 14 and substituting the following therefor:

«contrevenant à qui une amende est infligée en vertu du paragra-».

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Debate. The Parliamentary Secretary.

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Grisé: I am sure my comments will be much shorter than the applause I just received, since this amendment, proposed by the Government, is merely aimed at bringing the term "amende" in the French version in line with the word "fine" in the English text in Clause 2, lines 2 and 3, at page 14.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 10 agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada) moved:

That Bill C-61, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Food and Drugs Act and the Narcotic Control Act, be concurred in as amended.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): When shall the Bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada) moved that the Bill be read the third time and passed.

He said: It gives me great pleasure to rise once again to speak to Bill C-61 which has been recognized as fundamental to law enforcement efforts against enterprise crime, especially drug trafficking. It is now recognized that it is long overdue. The Bill is designed to ensure that offenders are not allowed to profit from their crimes. Bill C-61 will provide effective but fair measures to ensure that crime does not pay.

At this time, I would like to commend the legislative committee that reviewed Bill C-61 and has now presented its report to the House. It is obvious that all members of the committee recognized the pressing need for this legislation, given the growth of enterprise crime in recent times. They have obviously carefully considered both the need for the new measures in the Bill and the safeguards contained therein which ensure that the interests of the accused person and the innocent third parties are protected.

Regarding the principles of the Bill, I refer Members to my remarks during second reading. Allow me to review briefly some of the major aspects of the legislation. The courts have been empowered to authorize seizure and restraint of assets upon the undertaking of the Attorney General to provide such compensation as the court deems appropriate where the case for forfeiture cannot be made out and losses to the owner or third parties are suffered. A process of immediate judicial review of these powers, upon application by the persons concerned, has been provided for and includes an opportunity for an accused person to claim the payments of reasonable living, business, and legal expenses out of the seized or restrained property.

I must point out that these types of safeguards are unprecedented in Canadian law. In addition, the rights of third parties are recognized throughout the entire process of seizure, restraint, and forfeiture. The legislation has balanced an effective forfeiture mechanism with the constitutionally protected right to counsel in a manner that is characteristic of the Government's approach to criminal matters and avoids the criticisms that have been levied at similar American legislation in this area.

[*Translation*]

The Bill also provides that a court may order the payment of a fine when forfeiture is impossible either because the offender has hidden his illicit gains or has removed them from the jurisdiction of Canadian courts.

Aside from the power to order the forfeiture of property on conviction, when the prosecution has established beyond a reasonable doubt, following a hearing, that the property in question is proceeds of crime, the Bill provides that the court may order forfeiture of the goods when the offender has died or absconded to another country.

Madam Speaker, in this regard the legislative committee has passed an amendment allowing this procedure to be applied if the offender has fled to a country that refuses to extradite him to Canada where he would stand trial in criminal court.

I think that this is a useful amendment that complies with the spirit of the act.

[*English*]

In recognition of the sophisticated attempts that are made to disguise the tainted sources of proceeds of crime and to invest them in so-called "legitimate" enterprises and other forms of property, the Bill creates a new offence of "laundering" that will be punishable by up to 10 years imprisonment.

In recognition of the need for assistance to law enforcement agencies in their efforts against organized and enterprise crime, the Bill has created a protection against liability for any person, such as a bank employee, who reports to the authorities activity related to proceeds of crime on condition that the belief is reasonably held. Also, a provision for access to income tax records to assist in the investigation of drug related offences has been proposed. This will only be available upon court authorization to ensure that confidentiality of these records will be protected as much as possible. All members of the committee recognized the need for special rules regarding income tax information.

These are the principal elements of Bill C-61. In conjunction with Bill C-58—which has just received third reading—concerning mutual legal assistance in criminal matters, Canada will be fulfilling her international commitment to combat organized crime, especially in the area of drug trafficking.

In this regard I find it most appropriate that at this very time officials of my Department, as well as of the Departments of National Health and Welfare, External Affairs, and the Ministry of the Solicitor General, are in Vienna, Austria, with other officials from all countries of the United Nations finalizing the *Draft Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances* which is expected to be concluded this fall. That document specifically calls for an undertaking on behalf of signatories to implement proceeds of crime legislation.

Bill C-61 represents, together with Bill C-58, Canada's commitment to the international fight against drug trafficking. I ask that Canada be allowed to join the ranks of such nations as the United Kingdom, Australia and the United States that have all recently passed similar legislation.

• (1650)

Let me point out once again that this Bill has finally proceeded to third reading. I trust it will be accepted by the other place and made the law of the land. Similar attempts have been made by previous Governments to bring in legislation in connection with forfeiture of illicit proceeds of crime. This Bill is the synthesis of much consultation by Members of Parliament, in particular the Hon. Member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore (Mr. Boyer) and others who have been of great assistance to me with the legislation.

This Bill is a balanced and fair piece of legislation which does not contain some of the excesses seen in previous legislation. It is one in which the rights of parties are fully respected. There is an an effective mechanism for getting at the illicit proceeds of crime. It does not expand itself to the extent that it is done in the United States. I think this is the Canadian way. We want to make sure, when we are attacking the proceeds of crime, that we do so in a fair way respecting the rights of individuals to ownership of property legitimately obtained.

I commend this legislation at third reading. I hope it will receive the unanimous consent of all Parties. I thank Hon. Members who have been so helpful in their deliberations, especially the Parliamentary Secretary, the Hon. Member for Chambly (Mr. Grisé), who has been in the forefront of the legislative committee's work on Bill C-58 and to whom I owe a great debt of gratitude. He is an outstanding parliamentarian, a man who commands respect of Members on both sides of the House and who does a lot of work for me. I appreciate the great assistance that he gives.

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, I only wish this Bill contained all the great attributes to which the Hon. Minister has alluded. But we are very disappointed on this side of the House. It could have been a much better Bill.

First, I think this kind of legislation is long overdue in Canada. It is something that we must see implemented. I want to commend the Minister and the Parliamentary Secretary for the amendment which they accepted in recognizing that if a person were found innocent the Government would be required to see that he or she was compensated for loss. That is very important. I also commend the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) for putting the amendment forward.

I am disappointed with some of the inclusions. I refer particularly to procurement and bawdy houses. It has been very clear in studies done in this country over the last decade—the latest one being the Fraser Commission Report—is that no direct connections have been made between organized crime and prostitution. We recognize that prostitution is not legal in Canada. But it has not be tied to organized crime. Some prostitutes have been seen to be operating very much in an entrepreneurial sense. The money they have acquired has been money which they have invested and used to look after families and this kind of thing. The Fraser Commission was very clear that if something specific were put in this legislation it would drive prostitutes into organized crime networks and connections. That is something about which we are very concerned. Evidence was brought forward in the committee and it was addressed at that time.

I am very disappointed that the Conservative Government did the royal cave-in to the banks. You can drive a truck full of money to a bank and unload it with no accountability as to where those proceeds came from. Even the administration in the United States that we on this side of the House have often criticized made U.S. banks accountable. It is a shame and a disgrace that the Government has not made the banks accountable for this kind of thing. Many things will be whitewashed if you cannot trace them through the financial institutions.

The Minister has not rushed with this Bill. We had first reading of the Bill in 1987. Here we are at the last minute in an extended session trying to pass the Bill. The Minister has had plenty of time to recognize that the banks should be held accountable.

In 1981 the Government asked that a study be done. The report to the Justice Department in 1983 said:

> —Without clear track and identify the movement of profits by sophisticated criminals, it will be hard for police and the courts to effectively use the—"freeze and seize" provisions.
>
> Without clear powers to identify and track the proceeds of crime, it is difficult to connect the proceeds to a particular offence or to a particular criminal.
>
> Given this obstacle, it follows that it would be equally difficult to apply provisions for freezing, seizure and forfeiture of criminal proceeds.

It will be very difficult to implement the objectives of the Bill before us. The senior counsel at the Bank of Nova Scotia said:

> We're efficient at what we do. As such we're a good target of money launderers.

The bank is admitting to laundering, yet the Government has chosen to do nothing about it and has not made the banks accountable. My understanding is that the banks objected to the large amount of paper work. If that is the kind of thing that we are accepting as a legitimate excuse to not make the banks accountable, we should be ashamed of ourselves.

For the record, Madam Speaker, I would like to quote Mr. Rocky Pollack of the Canadian Bar Association. The Bar Association was very concerned. Mr. Pollack said:

> I must say that everyone to whom I spoke, and it is not a representative population, was amazed that, as was reported I think in the paper last week, you can literally back up a truck to a Canadian bank, unload all those dollar bills in the back of the truck, and get a deposit slip, and so on, and it is all private and secret; nobody knows about it. That is rather amazing. That is my only comment.

We had the Hon. Member for Kitchener (Mr. Reimer) saying that he too felt strongly that the Bill had major loopholes and he wished the Government would amend it. When we get those kinds of comments from government Members, surely we must recognize that the Government has done a royal cave-in to the banks. Under no circumstances must the Government ask the banks to be accountable.

That is not the kind of thing New Democrats like to see in legislation. New Democrats believe that all Canadians should be accountable. We think it is very nice to draft legislation, but we will be unable to implement the intent of it because of grand loopholes like those found in tax reform.

The intent of the Bill is good. The goals and objectives are real. They are the kinds of things we like to see. We feel that the Bill is very inadequate when we cannot make the financial institutions accountable to the Government of Canada. We know that nothing different will happen. We know that the banks will still be the source through which people can launder money and remain attractive to criminals. I take exception to the Minister's comments that this is the Canadian way. The Canadian way is much more accountable and not becoming the protectors of people who want to launder money.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the third time and passed.

• (1700)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It being five o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S BUSINESS—BILLS

[*Translation*]

FOOD AND DRUGS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Thursday, June 9, consideration of the motion of the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) that Bill C-289, an Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act (list of ingredients), be read a second time and referred to a legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): When the House last considered Bill C-289, the Hon. Member for Scarborough East (Mr. Stackhouse) had the floor. Resuming debate. The Hon. Member for Kent (Mr. Hardey).

[*English*]

Mr. Elliott Hardey (Kent): Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on this Private Member's Bill, Bill C-289, which is intended to amend the Food and Drugs Act regarding the listing of ingredients. The most important aspect of Private Members' Business, of course, is the opportunity for Members of Parliament from all Parties to develop and promote new laws and ideas together or, if some choose, to speak and vote against them and to do so as individual Members regardless of what side of the House they sit on. It is certainly a refreshing exercise and one that we all look forward to participating in.

I want to compliment the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) for bringing forward this issue. It is a matter that I support. It is an issue of sensitivity which is receiving increased attention by health professionals and food regulators due to concerns raised by the public at large as well as the print and visual media.

I have noticed that previous speakers have referred to tragedies resulting from food sensitivity reactions in their ridings or in ridings nearby. I too witnessed the grief of a family who lost their nine-year-old daughter last October. Kelly Chinnick was allergic to nuts and she was unaware that peanut butter was in the icing of a cake she tasted at a Thanksgiving celebration at her school. The reaction was fast and no one could help her. I know first hand that this type of grief never really subsides. As a caring society, we must do everything we can to help the Chinnicks and other families who find themselves in such distress.

In order to be of assistance, at first it seemed that I simply had to research and assess this problem in a practical way and surely some answers would surface. As I began that research, I found that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) was not only aware of the increased prevalence of food allergy reactions but was also very concerned. He had already issued instructions to his Department to determine how much real increase in food-sensitivity reactions there had been, how much was perceived due to the availability of better instrumentation and diagnoses and how much was due to the population as a whole becoming more sensitive for one reason or another.

I found as well that the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare was already conducting a study on the feasibility of mandatory labelling of food products sold in restaurants and fast-food outlets. Non-medical components used as fill found in prescription drugs, both brand name and generic, were also under study, and representatives from the Canadian Restaurant Association and the Canadian Pharmaceutical Association as well as the Minister of National Health and Welfare were called as witnesses.

I also found that difficulties in assessing the problem also included documenting the specific incidents, determining if the adverse response was related to the consumption of foods in the first instance, and if so, to which food component. Health professionals have to play a detective game, the complexity of which would put any amateur sleuth to shame. They have to consider such things as age, sex, geographic location, racial origin, income levels, lifestyle, diseased state and much more to even properly assess the question. Of course, the question is, what is the rationale for labelling and what needs to be labelled.

The Government is seriously trying to wrestle with these problems in the face of pressure from individuals or groups proposing any number of quick solutions. The Government does not want to end up with an arbitrary system of disclosure that is patently and scientifically unsound. It is likely that a large proportion of food-sensitivity reactions are due to relatively few foods or food components. On the other hand, this is offset by the potential of almost any food to elicit a food-sensitivity response in an occasional individual.

The Government is thus looking for a system that will require disclosure of selective and known offending substances in order to discourage misinterpretation of information or proliferation of misinformation leading to unnecessary self-diagnosis or diagnosis by unqualified non-medical practitioners. This is a typical problem and it is essential that the consumer be informed in a way that is meaningful to all concerned.

In resolving a problem of this complexity, it is vital to solicit input from all affected parties. In fact, this is the approach being taken by the Health Protection Branch of Health and Welfare Canada, and to date, Health and Welfare officials together with our colleagues at Consumer and Corporate Affairs have had consultations with the Canadian Restaurant and Food Services Association and the Allergy Information Association.

Consensus has been reached that a chart identifying the foods served in an establishment and whether or not they contain the allergens on the priority list was the most suitable mechanism for providing information required by a sensitive consumer. In this context, the Health Protection Branch of Health and Welfare Canada will also seek advice and input from the medical community on the proposed priority list of allergens.

Yes, it is a complex issue and many heads are at work to help allergy victims so that we can do what must be done as well as create something which is enforceable. The Canadian Restaurant and Food Services Association is currently testing the use of a food chart in some of the larger food chains and restaurants. It has accepted that it has a responsibility to protect to the best of its ability the customers who are at risk to allergy, and I believe that this will prove to be workable. As well, it is very welcome news. I compliment the restaurant association for this generous and caring thrust.

I also wonder, however, if we are going quite far enough. That is why I support this Bill which, if passed to committee, will initiate further study.

We have technology to call on and I want to suggest that we use that technology to simplify the listing process in another area, the major chain fast-food outlets which could be required to computer list all the ingredients of foods offered.

Fast-food outlets are very popular and usually offer a very limited number of dishes. The main problem here is the practice of subcontracting of ingredients, either precooked or uncooked. By making use of a computer, ingredient lists could be compiled and also automatically added to or subtracted from when subcontracts of certain ingredients change. All outlets would have access to accurate information with a simple push of a button. Secret recipes involved would not be jeopardized as the ingredients would be lumped together for each packaged item, and I think suppliers would likely not hesitate to co-operate.

The thrust I have just described added to the charting method for restaurants now being tested would allow a tremendous breakthrough in the restricted lives that allergy victims find themselves living. That is what I want. I want to help severe food-allergy victims enjoy a fuller life without jeopardizing their safety.

Let me assure all Hon. Members that people who have this extreme sensitivity to certain foods do not want to shirk their own responsibilities to look after themselves and their loved ones. They know full well that preparing all meals and snacks themselves is certainly one way to guard against tragedy, but lifestyles continue to change. Everyone eats outside the home well over 50 per cent of the time and the trend toward restaurant and fast-food outlet consumption continues.

Surely all Canadians have the right to enjoy the same lifestyles in this wonderful country and not to be subjected to the frustrations of being denied the knowledge of what is in the food prepared for them in public outlets. We are not talking about convenience, we are talking about life and death when it comes to victims of severe allergies.

• (1710)

The Hon. Member who brought this Bill forward has admitted that it is not perfect and I will not dwell on that, but its intent is sound. It should be supported by this House and moved into committee for further study so that amendments can be developed. I believe the need to assist severe allergy victims in Canada is well established and we are capable of developing forcible solutions to address that need which consumers in general will accept.

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to say a few words on Bill C-289, to amend the Food and Drugs Act, presented by the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps). It gives us an opportunity to increase the awareness of Canadians about ingredients of food which could be harmful to them or members of their family.

I want to say at the outset that I do not intend to speak at any great length on this Bill. Just by presenting the Bill the Hon. Member has raised awareness around some general problems in the food industry which have been responded to very positively by the industry, particularly through the appearance of the Canadian Restaurant and Food Services Association before the Standing Committee on National Health and Welfare on several occasions. They were quite frank in recognizing that a problem exists and they desire to do something about it.

The Hon. Member also recognizes that her Bill will create some problems, particularly for small restaurant operators. Yet there is absolutely no doubt that the Canadian public wants to see some action along the lines proposed by the Hon. Member. Indeed, the Hon. Member who just finished speaking referred to the sentiments expressed by his own constituents and others.

I understand as well that a number of municipal Governments and organizations, such as the Consumers' Association of Canada, the Canadian Council on Children and Youth, the Canadian Association of Retired Persons, and a number of others, have written to the Hon. Member for Hamilton East to express their support for the measures proposed in her Bill.

I think the House and Canadians would be well served by having this Bill referred to committee as quickly as possible. There we can discuss any weaknesses in the Bill and perhaps amend it to cover the concerns expressed before the committee by the Canadian Restaurant and Food Services Association. Hopefully we can come out with some legislative proposals that would serve the Canadian public and at the same time protect the industry and satisfy the problem that exists with respect to ingredients placed in foods which in several cases recently have caused the death of some young Canadians.

We in this Party, without further debate, support this Bill being referred to committee in order to have those things taken into consideration.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec-Est): Madam Speaker, I will be speaking on Bill C-289, an Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act, as tabled by the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps).

Bill C-289 addresses the problems of persons who, in a restaurant, unknowingly ingest food containing ingredients to which they are allergic. The Bill tabled in the House would compel each restaurant to make available for public consultation a list, in English or in French, of all the ingredients in any food sold by it.

The Bill would also compel each branch restaurant to afix on the packaging of any packaged foods sold by it a list, in English and in French, of the ingredients in such food.

The problem which Bill C-289 was introduced to solve is really quite acute in Canada. There are many persons who suffer from allergic reactions to various foods, food products or ingredients. There have even been some deaths caused by severe allergic reactions.

The Hon. Member for Hamilton East has pointed the finger at a considerable problem, and I want to thank her for raising the issue here in the House.

However, the motion of allergic reactions and how they are related to the foods we eat and our daily habits is in most cases ill-defined. In children, we see specific reactions to certain foods, and it is possible to prove that these reactions are due to allergies. Most adults are well aware that certain foods or beverages will cause digestive discomfort or allergic reactions, and that although the discomfort or reaction may not be serious, it is nevertheless unpleasant.

The impact of the substances in question tends to be worse when people are tense, nervous, tired or ill than when they are healthy and relaxed. Not enough is known as yet about the actual mechanisms of such reactions, and they may depend far more on the characteristics of the person who consumed the allergy-causing product than on the product itself.

Consumers may suffer discomfort as a result of allergic reactions to substances used in the preparation of food, and this is even more likely to happen when they eat at a restaurant or eat food purchased from caterers.

By exercising a reasonable amount of care when shopping and cooking, a person can be reasonably sure of controlling the substances he eats in his own home. Thus, the individual who suffers from allergies will not be exposed to substances that may cause discomfort as long as he eats at home.

However, as soon as he goes to a restaurant or eats food purchased from a caterer, that control no longer exists. Anyone who eats food prepared outside the home has to assume the food does not contain any ingredients to which he could be allergic.

Madam Speaker, in the public mind, allergies may be related to the substances used in additives or preservatives, but that is not necessarily the case. For instance, allergies to basic foods such as nuts, seafood and dairy products are quite common. A person might order a meal in a French restaurant without knowing that a particular dish is prepared with a cream sauce, or in an oriental restaurant without being aware that the meal includes a peanut sauce. Some people are allergic to certain types of oil or certain kinds of flour.

• (1720)

Furthermore, today's foods are prepared in a very complex way or in recipes with many ingredients. Often, many additives and preservatives are used, which may produce allergic reactions in some individuals.

We know that various substances may produce different reactions in some people. There is no question here of casting doubt on some foods or wondering whether some restaurants use unsafe ingredients. Agriculture Canada and Health and Welfare Canada have published strict regulations regarding food safety and freshness and the nature of additives.

Additives that present a complex risk are banned or subject to very strict control, like sulphites, for example, on which the Government recently imposed strict control after it was shown that they caused too many allergic reactions. Health and Welfare Canada now prohibits their use on all fruit and vegetables sold or served fresh, except grapes.

When people who are subject to allergies consume certain substances, a whole series of physiological effects that may produce reactions occurs and therein lies the problem. This is a matter of information in general and health affecting all consumers. We must ask ourselves how to inform those subject to allergic reactions, who therefore cannot take the chance of consuming food made outside the home.

Bill C-289, although incomplete and imperfect, allows us to take a step forward by offering a possible solution. I am sure that officials at Health and Welfare Canada and Consumer and Corporate Affairs will carefully study it in detail, while continuing to protect the health and safety of Canadian consumers. I am also sure, Madam Speaker, that they will continue to discover ways to protect persons suffering from food allergies.

Mr. Fernand Jourdenais (La Prairie): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member for Hamilton-East (Ms. Copps) has tabled Bill C-289, an Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act. This Bill would compel restaurants to make available for public consultation a list in English and in French, of all the ingredients in any foods sold by them. This Bill, madam Speaker, would also compel caterers to affix on the packaging of any packaged food they sell, in French and in English, a list of all the ingredients they use.

The purpose of Bill C-289 is to protect consumers who may have allergic reactions to various foods or to the ingredients in such food. The Bill, madam Speaker, proposes to solve this problem by forcing restaurants to provide a list of the ingredients they use.

Madam Speaker, the problem is the same for consumers who buy food in food stores. Consumers may also in that case have allergic reactions and that must be taken into consideration. In so far as food purchased in food stores is concerned, the problem is partially resolved by the listing of ingredients as required by food and drug regulations.

However, the requirement to list ingredients on pre-packaged foods was not conceived with allergic persons in mind, but to give consumers a list, in decreasing order, of the various substances contained in the foods they purchase.

Madam Speaker, it is the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that has the responsibility of managing the labelling, packaging, and marketing of foods, pursuant to the Consumer Packaging and Labelling Act and regulations and the Food and Drugs Act. The Health Protection Branch of the Department of Health and Welfare advises the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs on the labelling and marketing of products that have any bearing on health.

Madam Speaker, various information is required on the labels of pre-packaged foods, such as the following.

1) The common name of the food;

2) The net quantity of the contents;

3) The name and address of the person or company that produced the food;

4) The list of ingredients;

5) The shelf life of the food and preservation instructions.

All this information must be provided, in French and in English. The only exceptions are the name and address of the manufacturer which may be printed in either of the official languages of this country. And I refer you to Bill C-72.

Madam Speaker, as we are now debating Bill C-289, it is important to mention that it is the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that was entrusted with the responsibility for these labelling requirements.

That is understandable as these measures were adopted to protect the consumer. The consumer must know what he is buying. He must be aware of the quality of the product and be sure it is not being sold on the basis of misleading advertising.

Madam Speaker, this is a very important point, and I want to make it clear that our present labelling requirements which have been in effect since the early seventies and are quite strict and effective, are above all aimed at protecting the consumer. However, while Bill C-289 is also aimed at protecting the consumer's health, its purpose is to protect the consumer against the possibility of allergic reactions to allergens in food consumed in restaurants. As I said before, neither the Food and Drugs Act nor the regulations on labelling were designed to indentify allergens.

However, Madam Speaker, the public is demanding specific information on ingredients and components of the food offered in restaurants and by suppliers.

Madam Speaker, Canadians are eating more and more meals outside the home. Every year, the percentage of our income spent on restaurant meals and on food purchased outside the home is increasing considerably, and the number and popularity of fast food restaurants is increasing as well.

Furthermore, Madam Speaker, a number of Canadians suffering from allergies is important. Canadians are concerned about their health and, according to public opinion polls, they are aware of allergy problems. The use of additives, preservatives and colouring agents is often challenged, especially if they contain allergens. That is why food processors often indicate on their labels the fact that their products do not contain such substances.

There are also certain whole foods that may cause allergies without containing additives or preservatives. We know that some people are allergic to nuts, fish, the gluten found in corn and wheat and to dairy products.

In the last few decades, Madam Speaker, food technology has made tremendous progress. Many foods and food products are subject to complex processes or combine a large number of ingredients. All this increases the complexity of our food and also increases our chances of having an allergy.

For all these reasons, Madam Speaker, Canadians who are at risk should be offered a margin of safety when they go out to a restaurant, especially since this is becoming an increasingly common social custom.

In concluding, I would say that Bill C-289 is a step forward. However, we must not forget that identifying ingredients is only one of the solutions to the problem we are facing today. This legislation will certainly be a first step, but there are other questions that remain to be answered.

For instance, publishing exhaustive lists would preclude any substitution, and so a chef would no longer be free to be creative. If there is a shortage of a particular ingredient, another ingredient cannot be substituted. Chefs would no longer be free to improvise and follow their inspiration. Restaurants that offer daily specials, and these are usually the smaller establishments, would have trouble meeting these requirements.

Bill C-289 is a good start, Madam Speaker. Many Canadians suffer from allergies, and we must consider the problems they may face when they go out to a restaurant. Bill C-289 would seem to suggest a number of solutions, but there is room for improvement. A start has been made, but what we need now is further debate and discussion that will lead to satisfactory solutions.

• (1730)

[*English*]

Mrs. Jennifer Cossitt (Leeds—Grenville): Madam Speaker, I rise to speak to Bill C-289 which has focused the attention of the House on the problems faced by many Canadians who suffer from various food allergies. This Bill would require the mandatory listing of the ingredients used in restaurant foods.

I want to compliment my colleague for introducing this Bill. It is important to make the Canadian public more aware of the problem. Indeed, I have spoken to a number of my constituents who have food allergies and they say that it is very necessary for restaurants to list food ingredients. I believe the House of Commons and the Government can find a solution to this problem.

Food allergies constitute a real problem for a significant number of Canadians. According to a recent report on Global News, 25,000 Canadians are at risk every day because of their food allergies. Other reports have stated that in Canada over the past two years at least 24 people have died from allergic reactions to food after having eaten in restaurants. This is a very frightening statistic to anyone with a dangerous food allergy.

There has been a recent precedent set in the area of food allergy and adverse reaction. In the early 1980s, sulphites, a group of substances that had been widely used as preservatives for years, received a good deal of public attention as the possible cause of a number of allergic reactions suffered by people eating in restaurants. In some cases the adverse reactions were severe enough to require medical attention and even hospitalization.

The health protection branch of Health and Welfare Canada has consulted with many expert sources on this issue. Meetings and consultations were held with groups such as The Allergy Information Association, the Canadian Society of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, the medical community, regulatory agencies from other countries, and the Canadian Restaurant and Food Services Association, which has resulted in a clearer picture of the problem.

We have learned that the use of sulphites on fresh fruits and vegetables in salad bars, for example, was the most common source of problems. Restaurants like to use sulphites to keep the salad ingredients looking fresh.

However, in further meetings with the Canadian Restaurant and Food Services Association, that organization took voluntary steps to discourage the use of sulphites by its members. In addition to that voluntary initiative, the health protection branch went further. It felt it prudent to enact regulations prohibiting the use of sulphites.

It also carried out a consumer education program on the use of sulphites through the use of fact sheets and brochures. Based on all the available information, these have been effective and the problem with sulphites has been minimized.

I have spoken about sulphites at some length because there is at least a rough parallel between the way that issue was handled and the way a solution to the problem of allergic reactions to restaurant food is emerging. As I said, a number of unfortunate and even tragic incidents have occurred, and the media has reported on this issue.

Members know that we are now in a period of discussion and consultation, not the least caused by the introduction of this Bill. The Standing Committee on National Health and Welfare has held hearings on the topic. Officials of both Health and Welfare Canada and the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs are actively seeking the best possible solution to the problem. Extensive discussions are being held with the allergy association, the medical community, and the Canadian Restaurant and Food Services Association.

In a very encouraging development, the private sector is again addressing itself to resolving a very serious problem. The Canadian Restaurant and Food Services Association is strongly encouraging a voluntary program among its 6,800 member companies. In fact, according to a recent report by Canadian Press, industry spokesmen have said that restaurant menus should warn consumers of ingredients that could lead to allergic reactions before they order a meal. The Vice-President of the Restaurant and Food Service Association was also quoted as saying that a system of warning charts could be introduced in quick service chains because they have highly centralized control over ingredients.

The consistency of the menus in chain restaurants, combined with the limited choices available, make the charts a manageable idea. According to the same Canadian Press report, the association has talked to 24 national quick service chains, and 22 of them have agreed to take part in the allergy chart idea.

This is good news. It shows that the food services industry is well aware of the problem and is more than willing to take steps to resolve it. It further shows that the idea of an ingredients list, if it can be fine-tuned and made manageable and practical, is indeed a good one.

However, there are some questions yet to be answered regarding ingredients list. What about the ingredients that went into the butter that is in the cake which is in the final product? Just how comprehensively would disclosure requirements be applied to sellers of food? Would they apply to owners of chip wagons and vendors of hotdogs at the Sparks Street Mall and at our ballparks?

The breadth and scope of the food service industry presents a very real challenge in this area. It is so diverse and widespread that any new programs must take these qualities into consideration.

Bill C-289 is serving a very useful purpose in getting the public to think seriously about the issue of food allergies and restaurant food. However, it leaves these and many other questions unanswered. It may very well be that the listing of restaurant food ingredients is the best way to tackle the issue. Indeed, present thinking by both industry and all of us concerned about allergies seems to be along these lines.

In the event that ingredients lists are the way to go, every effort must be made to see to it that the listing system that is adopted is the best possible one that can be put in place. In this area it does seem certain that Bill C-289 can be significantly improved.

It is essential that consumers get the information they need to protect themselves in the market-place and to make intelligent choices. This applies as much to allergy sufferers who dine in restaurants as it does to anyone else.

The Government is determined to bring about an effective solution to the issue. If that solution is to centre upon ingredients disclosure lists, the House can be assured that listing requirements will be applied in a manner that is effective, fair, and as cost-efficient as possible. I say this because some of the attraction in dining out, particularly at fast food or quick service outlets, is that prices are reasonable and obviously affordable to a great number of Canadians. We want to make sure that it stays that way.

We must adopt a system that affords the best possible protection to the Canadian consumer and allows greater freedom and safety for the sufferer of food allergies.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond): Madam Speaker, I shall speak on Bill C-289, an Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act, tabled by the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps).

Bill C-289 is concerned with the problems of those who, in a restaurant, unknowingly eat food containing ingredients to which they are allergic. The Bill tabled in the House would require every restaurant to make available to the public a list in French and English of all the ingredients used in the food sold.

The Bill would also require every branch of a restaurant and every restaurant chain to indicate on all packaging a list in French and English of the ingredients used in the food.

The problem that Bill C-289 seeks to deal with is really acute in Canada. Many people suffer allergic reactions to various foods, food products or ingredients. People have even died from severe allergic reactions. The Hon. Member for Hamilton East has put her finger on a considerable problem and she must be thanked for bringing it to the House of Commons.

The concept of allergic reaction itself, and its relationship to diet and daily habits, are unfortunately undefined in most circumstances. Children have particular reactions to some foods and it is possible to show that these reactions are due to allergies. Almost all adults know very well that some foods or drinks will disturb their digestion or cause allergic reactions, which, although not serious, are nevertheless unpleasant.

The troublesome substances cause even more problems when people are tense, frightened, tired or sick than when they are well and relaxed. How such reactions occur is still little known and may have much more to do with the characteristics of the individual who ate the product that caused the allergy than with the characteristics of the product itself.

Consumers may suffer from allergic reactions to substances used in food preparation and this is more likely to occur when they eat in a restaurant or eat food supplied by a caterer.

By being careful when shopping and cooking, someone can be reasonably sure of controlling the substances eaten at home. Thus, an allergic individual keeps away from troublesome substances when eating at home. But when he eats in a restaurant or eats food purchased from a caterer, the person cannot monitor things as closely. Thus, a person who eats food prepared outside his home must take it for granted that such food does not contain any ingredient to which he might be allergic.

Madam Speaker, public opinion has it that allergies may be related to substances used in additives or preservatives. But that is not necessarily the case. For instance, many people are allergic to such staple foods as nuts, seafood, and dairy products. One might easily order a meal in a French restaurant without knowing that a given dish comes with a cream sauce, or in an oriental restaurant without knowing that a meal will be served with a peanut sauce. Some persons will have allergic reactions to certain oils or to certain types of flour.

Furthermore, it must be said that today's foods undergo complex preparation or are made from recipes containing a multitude of ingredients. Often, many additives and preservatives are used, ingredients which may provoke allergic reactions in some people.

We know that different substances can produce different reactions in some people. Our purpose here is not to call into question the safety of certain foods nor to ask whether some restaurants are using dangerous ingredients. Agriculture Canada and Health and Welfare Canada have published strict regulations on food safety, its freshness and the nature of additives used.

When additives do present a complex risk, they are banned or subjected to very strict controls, as was the case for sulfites, on which the Government recently imposed strict controls, after it was shown that these substances were causing too many allergic reactions.

• (1740)

So, Health and Welfare Canada now prohibits the use of such substances on any produce sold or served fresh, excepting grapes.

When certain substances are consumed by individuals subject to allergies they trigger a whole series of physiological sequences that may result in reactions, and there lies the problem. This is a comprehensive disclosure issue, a health issue that involves all consumers. We must ask ourselves how we can inform people who may be subject to allergic reactions, but who for that reason cannot consume food that is prepared outside their homes.

Bill C-289 gives us an opportunity to make a step forward by proposing a possible solution, albeit incomplete and imperfect.

I am convinced that officials of Health and Welfare Canada and Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada will review the details in a careful way, while continuing to ensure the health and safety of Canadian consumers.

Madam Speaker, I am also convinced they will go on finding ways to ensure the protection of people with food allergies.

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil): Madam Speaker, Bill C-289 comes as a commendable effort to limit a serious consumer problem. It is aimed at providing the information they need to individuals who may suffer from allergic reactions to foods they eat in restaurants.

The current packaging and labelling Act and regulations work toward that goal by requiring disclosure of information on foods that are bought in food stores. Under that Act, most foods sold in food stores must be labelled in both official languages. That requirement covers both foreign and domestic products.

Canadian consumers are entitled to complete information in both official languages on the food they buy. As consumers, they must have an opportunity to make informed choices, and to that end they are entitled to get in the language with which they are more familiar information that will guide their choices.

The Consumer Packaging and Labelling Act requires certain compulsory information, and the regulations prescribe that information be supplied in both French and English.

Current requirements cover the common name of the food, the net weight of the product, the name and address of the relevant firm, the list of ingredients and directions as to the shelf life and preservation of the product.

Since its enactment in 1972, that Act has been working well: it is consistent, and both producers and entrepreneurs know it well. Suppliers know what is expected from them, and they provide on the labels bilingual information meeting the requirements.

With respect to the list of ingredients, most prepackaged food must have one showing either the decreasing order of ingredients or the percentage of their use. There are exceptions of course, and here are some of them:

—Repackaged products from bulk retail production;

—Prepackaged individual portions served with meals and snacks in restaurants;

—Individual portions prepared by a supplier and sold in vending machines or mobile canteens;

—Standard alcoholic beverages;

—Vinegar.

None of the standards specified in the Consumer Packaging and Labelling Act applies to food sold in restaurants or other similar establishments. In such places, people suffering from allergies might unknowingly run the risk of eating food or substances to which they are allergic. In some cases the ensuing allergic reaction is serious and, now and then, it may even be fatal.

Bill C-289 is a commendable effort aimed at eliminating such situations and providing consumers with the information to which they are entitled with respect to foods served in restaurants. It is a step in the right direction, but the motion of the Hon. Member is very brief. The question has a number of aspects with which the motion does not deal, and it can be improved in many ways.

For instance, the restaurant business has to be a very flexible undertaking. Various ingredients may be available to the chef today but not tomorrow. Many restaurants change menus regularly—every day, in some cases—to offer a better choice to their patrons and take advantage of what is available on the market. It would be next to impossible for a restaurant—or even an establishment which has printing facilities—to provide clients with the full list of ingredients used to prepare daily menus.

Think of the many ingredients used to prepare a French sauce, for instance, or any other food dish. Menus would be ridiculously bulky and practically illegible. Ethnic restaurants would have to deal with the added problem of translating the names of exotic ingredients without being in a position to guarantee that an allergy-prone customer would be protected against unknown ingredients. Such an excess of information might cause a real problem.

Moreover, customers suffering from food allergies might get a false sense of security with such a list of ingredients. The risk of error remains high. One single lapse in concentration and an additional ingredient in a recipe could have unfortunate results. Not even a minimal substitution or change would be allowed. In view of the very nature of restaurants, this is hardly a reasonable attempt.

Certain practical difficulties associated with the production and labelling of foods should be taken into account.

Madam Speaker, Bill C-289 deals with a problem which I feel is real and should be dealt with. I wonder, however, if this Bill is really the best possible way to protect Canadians suffering from food allergies.

For instance, some believe that we could require restaurant owners to provide upon request to consumers suffering from food allergies a verbal list of all their ingredients.

This would have the benefit of immediate effectiveness while relieving the restaurant owner of the obligation and costs of a printed menu. Good restaurants—I do not mean the most expensive ones—willingly provide such information. Fast food operators could have a list of ingredients which could be distributed upon request.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if such suggestions are likely to help solve the problem. But we must of necessity examine all proposals which could help us protect Canadians suffering from food allergies.

Through its committee responsible for warning labels on food and drug packaging, the House of Commons addressed this issue once before. On the other hand, the officials at Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada and Health and Welfare Canada continue to look for all possible ways to help Canadians suffering from allergies. There is no doubt that Bill C-289 will greatly help us solve this problem.

• (1750)

[*English*]

Mr. Barry Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak to this Bill very briefly as one who has had personal experience with an allergic reaction which necessitated my going to the hospital on three occasions, twice here in the national capital area, in fact to the Riverside Hospital, and once in Nairobi, Africa, where I took a severe allergic reaction to some foods that I had eaten. One instance, in fact, caused me to go into a very difficult breathing period when I thought I was going to pass out and die. I can relate very closely to this Bill from a personal point of view.

The Bill is entitled Bill C-289, an Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act. This Bill is designed to help Canadians with food allergies when they eat out at restaurants or places that supply fast foods. As you know, Sir, there are many within our country. We had a very unfortunate incident recently in which a young lady in the National Capital Region died from an allergic reaction to some nuts that she ate which she did not realize were in the food she had consumed.

The particular Bill here would have a dual effect. First, it would require every restaurant to make available for the public consultation, a list in English and French, of all the ingredients in any foods sold by it. The Bill would also compel each branch restaurant of a restaurant chain to affix on the packaging of any foods sold by it a list in English and in French of the ingredients in such food.

Many thousands of Canadians suffer from food allergies. They are described in some contexts as a nuisance. I guess I can describe my own as a nuisance because it did not persist for very long. However, for some Canadians they can be much greater than a nuisance, they can be deadly.

The CBC reported quite recently that in the last two years upward of 24 persons have died in Canada from severe allergies to foods. As things now stand, while most packaged foods sold in food stores have labelling requirements for ingredients and quantities, there are as yet no mandatory labelling requirements for restaurant food. Instead, individuals with food allergies have to ask the appropriate questions as to whether the ingredients in a restaurant food will trigger an allergic reaction. In other words, it is incumbent upon the person who goes to a restaurant to eat to ask those questions.

Therefore this Bill is performing a very valuable service in so far as it is causing a much greater debate on the subject, and in that it is raising the question of whether or not the present system is adequate. Certainly, Canadian consumers deserve the best possible protection, whether they buy food in a supermarket for preparation and consumption at home or whether they go out and eat in a restaurant, be that restaurant a very humble one or a very luxurious one.

The Standing Committee on National Health and Welfare has heard testimony recently on this issue from the Canadian Food and Restaurant Association and, in particular, Mr. Bill Dover, who is the President of Red Lobster of Canada which, in principle, is supporting the directions of this Bill. I hope that in due course the House will do the same thing.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 36(2), the order is dropped to the bottom of the list of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

• (1800)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) on a point of order.

Mr. Foster: Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Chairman of the legislative committee on Bill C-73, I would like to seek unanimous consent of the House to present the report of the legislative committee on Bill C-73, an Act to provide for the implementation of an agreement respecting Indian lands in Ontario.

Committee Report

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The House has heard the request of the Hon. Member for Algoma. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

INDIAN LANDS AGREEMENT (1986) ACT

PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Chairman of the legislative committee on Bill C-73, Bill C-122, and Bill C-123, I have the honour to present to the house the report of the legislative committee on Bill C-73, an Act to provide for the implementation of an agreement respecting Indian lands in Ontario, with amendments.

I might add, Madam Speaker, that we made good progress on this Bill. It is very important to a number of bands throughout Ontario, including five in Manitoulin Island, Nipissing, and Sarnia, because it provides for the negotiating authority for these bands respecting important land claims.

There is one amendment in the report. There is another one which we will be putting at report stage. I am pleased to present this report to the House now.

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

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-124, an Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, as reported (without amendment) from a legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): There are 18 proposed motions in amendment to Bill C-124, an Act to amend the Canada Labour Code. Four are in the name of the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Cadieux); two are in the name of the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy); and the remainder are submitted by the Hon. Member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan).

[*Translation*]

The first and second motions in amendment are proposed by the Minister and Mr. Kaplan respectively. They are of a technical nature to the French text of the Bill and are in order.

[*English*]

Motion No. 3, proposed by the Hon. Member for Churchill, seeks to oblige mine employers themselves to test air quality in the mines. I must regretfully rule that the motion in amendment is out of order, in that it is beyond the scope of the clause.

The purpose of Clause 1 to which the motion is proposed is to set out compliance obligations that employers must meet. These requirements involve compliance in working conditions set by the Coal Mining Safety Commission. A motion in amendment, placing an obligation on mine employers themselves to conduct air quality tests, is a different category of obligation from those set out in the clause. For this reason Motion No. 3 is out of order.

[*Translation*]

The fourth motion in amendment, like the first proposed by the Minister, is again of a technical nature. This motion seeks to make a change to the English language of the bill and is in order.

[*English*]

The sixth motion in amendment stands in the name of the Hon. Member for Churchill. It seeks to limit searches of employees by the employer for the purpose of preventing drinking or smoking in the mines. The motion in amendment is in order.

[*Translation*]

These four motions in amendment to clause 1 (motions 1, 2, 4 and 6) will be debated together and voted on separately.

[*English*]

Motion No. 5, in the name of the Hon. Member for York Centre, seeks to insert "technology" in the list of prescribed processes for which mining employers must meet safety standards. This is similar to Motion No. 12 which in this case is applied to Clause 3 of the Bill, rather than to Clause 1. Of a contrary intent is Motion No. 13, proposed by the Minister; it seeks to delete a reference to "technology" in another line of Clause 3. These motions will be debated together and the vote on Motion No. 5 will be applied to Motion No. 12, while Motion No. 13 will be voted separately.

[*Translation*]

All the following motions in amendment deal with clause 3 of the Bill. Motions 7 and 8 are identical and seek to modify the French text of the Bill by deleting an unnecessary reference to a previous sub-paragraph. Since the Minister's motion, numbered 7, was received first, it will be the one selected for debate and decision.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 7, 9, 10, 11, and 14 are all in order and will be grouped for debate, but voted separately.

[*Translation*]

Motions 15, 16, 17 and 18 are in order. For the purpose of debate, these four motions shall be debated together, but they will be voted on separately.

[*English*]

In summary, Motion Nos. 1, 2, 4, and 6 will be debated together and voted separately. Motions Nos. 5, 12, and 13 will be considered next. The vote on Motion No. 5 will be applied to Motion No. 12, and there will a separate vote on Motion No. 13. Thereafter Motions Nos. 7, 9, 10, 11, and 14 will be grouped for debate and also voted separately. Motions Nos. 15, 16, 17, and 18 will also be grouped for debate, but voted separately.

[*Translation*]

I suggest that the House should now proceed to debate motions No. 1, 2, 4 and 6.

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of Labour) moved:

Motion No. 1.

That Bill C-124 be amended in Clause 1 in the French version by striking out lines 16 and 17 at page 1 and substituting the following therefor:

"(c) *permet l'inspection et la vérification, au nom des employés, de la manière*".

Motion No. 2

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): On behalf of my colleague the Hon. Member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan).

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is there consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques) moved:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-124 be amended in Clause 1 in the French version by striking out lines 16 to 20 at page 1 and substituting the following therefor:

"c) *permet qu'on procède, au nom des employés, à l'inspection et à la vérification de la mine et des machines et appareils qui s'y trouvent, de la manière et aux intervalles maximums réglementaires;*"

[*English*]

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of Labour) moved:

Motion No. 4.

That Bill C-124 be amended in Clause 1 in the English version by striking out line 5 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"conformity with plans and procedures as".

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill) moved:

Motion No. 6.

That Bill C-124 be amended in Clause 1 by striking out lines 17 to 20 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"for the purpose of preventing articles for use in smoking from being brought in the mine,".

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is the House ready for the question? On debate, the Hon. Minister.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of Labour): Madam Speaker, concerning motions No. 1 and 2, after checking the wording of Motion No. 2, I suggest to withdraw Motion No. 1 and to vote in favour of Motion No. 2, because the wording of that motion is better than the wording of Motion No. 1. I am sorry I have to admit that, but it is true, and because the wording of Motion No. 2 is better and more appropriate, I suggest to withdraw Motion No. 1 and to vote in favour of Motion No. 2.

Concerning Motion No. 4, if I may, Madam Speaker, this is simply a technical amendment which had escaped those who drafted the original text, the word "as" being much more appropriate in the English version than the word "so". This being purely a technical amendment, I do not think there will be any opposition to that motion.

As to Motion No. 6, if I may, Madam Speaker, I should like to reserve my right to respond once the mover of that motion has put forward his arguments.

• (1810)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I would like to ask the House whether there is unanimous consent, first, for Motion No. 1 to be withdrawn and second, for the Minister to be recognized once the Hon. Member for Churchill has made his case on Motion No. 6.

Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 1 withdrawn.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few words on motion No. 2. As the Minister indicated earlier, he kindly accepted to withdraw his motion No. 1 in order to accept motion No. 2. Essentially, the amendment merely improves the Bill's wording, not its meaning.

Clause 1 proposes many things, for example, in paragraph *c*): *"permet qu'on procède, au nom des employés, à l'inspection et à la vérification de la mine et des machines et appareils qui s'y trouvent, de la manière et aux intervalles maximums réglementaires."* That is, in fact, the wording of the proposed amendment. It's about the same as in the Bill, except that it reads better in French.

If Molière were amongst us, he would be happy to see such an improvement in the wording of the Bill, not for the purpose of changing the substance of Bill C-124, but of expressing it in a more elegant or natural French. That is the sole objective of this motion which is moved by my colleague from York-Centre (Mr. Kaplan) and which I was happy to present on his behalf.

[*English*]

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising to find in Bill C-124, respecting the amendments to the Canada Labour Code, that we have a number of technical amendments at this time. It is amazing that the amendments are in the name of a Member who is not a member of the legislative committee. Usually members of the legislative committee make amendments. It is not unusual that we have this number of amendments, because committee study on Bill C-124 was a rush job. Government Members would not allow the committee to call any witnesses other than the Minister and his staff, nor would they allow a second meeting of the committee.

Let me refresh Hon. Members' memories. The committee met on May 9, 1988 at 3.38 p.m. The Minister and one of his officials appeared with him. I asked permission to contact members of the unions involved and the only employer involved in the case. The request was denied by members of the committee. I asked that there be a second meeting so that we could study the legislation. Again, government Members refused.

As a result of the process all the clauses of the Bill were passed by 5.07 p.m. The Bill was studied in committee for only one and a half hours. The Minister and his official spoke. We had a procedural squabble over the desire to have witnesses who would know what this legislation would do to them.

I said that we would not stall the legislation, that what we wanted was the right to have witnesses "one week hence", and that I was able to guarantee the legislation would pass committee stage that day or the following one. Conservative members on that committee, I believe on instructions from the Department, refused to allow any witnesses whatever.

This piece of legislation was allowed through second reading on the basis of one afternoon's debate. This was not legislation that the Opposition was stalling. This was not legislation that was even being opposed by the opposition Parties. We recognized that as Members of Parliament we had an obligation to allow people who would be affected to make their presentations, to explain what they believed should be in the legislation, but the request was denied and I believe Parliament failed in its duty in doing so.

Today, two months after the Government refused to have a second meeting of this committee, the legislation was brought to the House. Obviously any time during those two months we could have heard from witnesses. This was not a matter of pressing and urgent necessity. This was an example of government arrogance, an example of the Government refusing to listen to those affected, an example of the Government assuming that it knew better than any of those who would be affected.

The Minister has admitted that one of the opposition motions is better than his own Department's. He has withdrawn his own amendment. We have other amendments that are probably technically better than the Government's amendments. In addition, we have a number of what I would call controversial issues dealing with the work site which were never raised in the House of Commons. Motion No. 6 speaks to that.

Motion No. 3 was ruled out of order and speaks to a matter of controversy and concern to people in the workforce. As well, since this legislation was rushed through committee study, the Minister himself has received representations from one union, the Canadian Union of Public Employees whose members work at the plant. The union would like to see the committee looking at workplace safety being restructured so that it could include a representative of the union, but that will not happen.

I do not have much time to explain all these points because I am limited to speaking for only 10 minutes. However, I think what I have said sets the groundwork. This legislation is coming to the House flawed. The process that we went through was very objectionable. It denied us the advice of people who will be directly affected by the legislation. It prevents Parliament from resolving some of the difficulties of people who work in the mines at Cape Breton.

Some suggestions were made to the Minister, and he knows that. There is a conflict among the unions in Cape Breton, and the Minister also knows that. Had the committee had the opportunity in one afternoon to hear from a representative of each of the three unions involved, as well as from the management, perhaps we could have amended this Bill in a manner that would have met all concerns. I do not believe the issues were without any possibility of being resolved. Instead, the House of Commons committee refused to allow these problems to be resolved and, worse than that, the committee refused even to allow the participants any sort of a fair hearing.

This legislation affects only one employer. It affects only three groups of unionized workers. I do not believe the House of Commons was in such a rush that we could not have heard from them. I do not believe our agenda was so tight that we could not have heard from them. I find it very regrettable that Conservative Members refused to allow witnesses to appear. As a result the legislation will not meet the needs of all workers at that work site, particularly those of the Canadian Union of Public Employees.

The legislation we have is meant to prevent fires and explosions at the work site. We accept and support that, but for some reason the Minister and his officials have deemed it necessary to give the employer the right to search for drugs, alcohol, and other goods. If the purpose of the legislation is to prevent explosions and fires, then we should certainly allow for searches for those goods which would directly cause explosions and fires. Obviously smoking materials could do that and, therefore it would obviously be correct to search for those items. That is something to which the employees agreed as well.

• (1820)

I find it unusual that in this legislation we are granting an employer a right we do not grant any other employer who falls under the Canada Labour Code. I must ask the Minister why he is setting this precedent in this legislation. I believe that is why he has reserved his right to speak after me on this amendment. Why would he introduce this widespread power when the legislation is supposed to give an employer a very specific right to deal with a very specific problem?

I appreciate that you have given me some extra time, Madam Speaker, because of the complexity of the situation. While the Minister is on his feet, perhaps he could explain if this legislation granting this extraordinary right under the Canada Labour Code will set a precedent for other legislation that the Minister might be introducing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Cadieux: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Hon. Members who, by unanimous consent, granted me the right and the privilege to speak after the movers of the motion had done so.

As I said earlier, Madam Speaker, we in the Government intend to support Motion No. 2 for the reasons mentioned by the Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault), not for those invoked by the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy), who just said or who just tried to say that . . .

[*English*]

"If some amendments have to be brought at this stage it is because of a rush job". I think my hon. colleague will recognize that, on the contrary, this Bill is not the product of a rush job.

If the Hon. Member were to check with the unions involved, the employer, and even the federations such as the CLC, he would find and would have to admit that we have been consulting with the parties in the Cape Breton mine since 1985 with respect to the terms of this legislation. There was even one meeting which the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) attended dealing with this particular legislation.

When I am told that this has been a rush job, I take issue with that and I think it is wrong. It is unjustified at this time in the debate to try to take cheap political shots by saying that this Bill is the result of a rush job. It is not, and I think the Hon. Member would agree with that.

With respect to the Hon. Member's remarks about the committee, I doubt very much that the committee members, including the Conservative committee members, took any instructions from the Department of Labour, assuming such instructions would have been given. I can assure Hon. Members that this Minister and his Department did not give instructions to committee members to refuse to hear witnesses. Most of those witnesses had been consulted before the introduction of the Bill.

I admit that this Bill is not perfect in its drafting and that is why this Minister himself is proposing some amendments. It is to ensure that we have the best Bill possible, perhaps not perfect but the best Bill possible.

I have here some correspondence from the parties in Cape Breton who are concerned with this legislation. They wrote to me after the committee hearings saying that they were pleased that the Bill was passed without amendment. My hon. colleague probably has copies of these letters and, if he does not, it will be a pleasure for me to give him copies. I will not take the time of the House to read them but they are here.

I will turn to the specific amendment, Motion No. 6.

[*Translation*]

I simply want to add a comment on Motion No. 6, moved by the Hon. Member, which is aimed at eliminating searches for drugs and alcohol. The Hon. Member said that we would be creating a precedent, that this had never been done before, and that consequently, this could create a precedent so that the Government or governments might be tempted to introduce similar measures in other bills.

As for creating a precedent, Madam Speaker, I would like to say to the Hon. Member that he, as an expert, is probably aware that in Canada similar legislation exists in Ontario, Manitoba, Newfoundland, Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia. Outside Canada, we find similar legislation in the U.K. and the United States. Madam Speaker, requirements like the one for searches to detect the presence of articles for use in smoking, alcohol or drugs, constitute protection of the kind included in the safety regulations in effect in coal mines operated by the Cape Breton Development Corporation since 1967. Madam Speaker, the searches have been going on since 1967, and the reason is simply for the sake of the safety of employees working in these mines. The atmosphere in a coal mine is such that explosions can be touched off by sparks generated either by matches or articles used in smoking or because someone was working while under the influence of alcohol and drugs. All this could cause the mine to explode and with it the employees in the mines at the time. Even the miners support this measure because it is for their own protection in a very specific context and environment and, I might as well say it, a very explosive environment!

This measure, Madam Speaker, was requested by people who work in the mines in Cape Breton, by employers and employees, and it is necessary and indeed essential, considering the purpose of this legislation which is to protect the health and safety of employees.

As for whether this would constitute a precedent for subsequent federal legislation, I can give the Hon. Member the assurance that this amendment will not constitute a precedent for other industries where no such measures or procedures exist at this time, Madam Speaker.

[*English*]

Motion No. 2 agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The next question is on Motion No. 4 standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Cadieux).

Motion No. 4 agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The next question is on Motion No. 6 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Motion No. 6 negatived.

• (1830)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): We will now proceed to the second grouping. The first one is Motion No. 5 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan). The motion is withdrawn in the absence of the Hon. Member.

The second one is Motion No. 12 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York Centre. The motion is withdrawn in the absence of the Hon. Member.

The next one is Motion No. 13.

Mr. Pierre Cadieux (Minister of Labour) moved:

Motion No. 13.

That Bill C-124 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 33 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"of any mining method, ma-"

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Madam Speaker, I know that this was a rush job in the committee but the Minister is moving an amendment. He seemed to imply that it was a rush job prior to the legislation. However, I want to respond to some of the other remarks he made and I will use this opportunity.

The Minister waved some letters which he said were from workers on the plant site who said they wanted this legislation passed without amendment. He forgot to point out that he also had correspondence from people working at that site who wanted amendments.

I made only one charge against the Government, and that is that it would not allow witnesses to appear before the committee. That was based on the fact that we had at least one group of employees at that work site who had some concerns about the legislation and wanted an opportunity to present their case. That is what I said. I admitted in my presentation that there were other unions who liked the legislation. This was an interunion conflict. I never implied that it was all black or white. I said that there were some concerns which could have been resolved in a second meeting of the committee. That is what was not allowed.

Here we are with government Members who have no idea what the Minister's motion is about, and the Minister cannot even explain in one or two sentences what his motion does. They want a quick vote. I would hope that they would have enough interest in what we are doing in this House to get at least a one or two line explanation from the Minister. We do not oppose the legislation or the amendment in front of us. However, I believe the Government should at least have the decency to explain what the amendment is.

Mr. Cadieux: Madam Speaker, since my hon. friend wants me to speak on this motion, I will do so very briefly. However, I took it for granted that NDP Members, like Conservatives, know how to read. It is very obvious what the motion is about. It is on the Order Paper and anyone who reads it knows what it is. Perhaps contrary to the NDP, in this caucus there are some discussions with respect to legislation. Members on this side are well aware of what it is. As surprising as it may sound, when there is a question all Members have to do is ask. Our Members are very aware that if they have a question they can ask, which they do.

Again, it is self-evident. It is an amendment in order to comply with the other articles of the Bill, and I think my colleague is taking cheap shots. I suppose he is entitled to do that—it is a democracy—but we are dealing with the safety of workers. This Bill deals with the safety of those workers and even the subject to which my hon. friend was trying to allude, the interunion difficulty with respect to one element of this Bill, was discussed with the unions before and after study by the committee. I think my hon. friend is taking cheap shots for nothing.

Motion No. 13 agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): We will now go to the next group of amendments. The first one is Motion No. 9 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan). The motion is withdrawn in the absence of the Hon. Member.

The next one is Motion No. 10 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York Centre. The motion is withdrawn in the absence of the Hon. Member.

The next one is Motion No. 11 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York Centre. The motion is withdrawn in the absence of the Hon. Member.

Mr. Cadieux: Madam Speaker, this may sound strange, but with respect to Motion No. 10 I believe my friend, the Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault) wanted to move this amendment.

It is an amendment that will be useful in the sense that both texts, French and English, will be made to have the same wording. As Minister of Labour, of course, in order to make sure that the text of this legislation is compatible in both languages and is for the protection of workers in the mines of Cape Breton, I will definitely agree to the amendment as long as my friend is here to move the motion. If not, perhaps someone from the NDP will volunteer to move the motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Minister was talking about Motion No. 10, is that correct?

Mr. Cadieux: Yes.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): With unanimous consent, then, the motion will be moved.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (for Mr. Kaplan) moved:

Motion No. 10.

That Bill C-124 be amended in Clause 3 in the French version by striking out line 30 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"frais raisonnables de déplacement et de séjour entraînés".

Motion No. 10 agreed to.

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of Labour) moved:

Motion No. 7.

That Bill C-124 be amended in Clause 3 in the French version by striking out line 20 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"des employés et un".

Motion No. 7 agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): We now come to the next grouping. The first one is Motion No. 15 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York Centre. The motion is withdrawn in the absence of the Hon. Member.

The next one is Motion No. 16 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York Centre. The motion is withdrawn in the absence of the Hon. Member.

• (1840)

The next one is Motion No. 17 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York Centre. The motion is withdrawn in the absence of the Hon. Member.

The next one is Motion No. 18 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York Centre. The motion is withdrawn in the absence of the Hon. Member.

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of Labour) moved that the Bill be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Cadieux moved that the Bill be read the third time and passed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

CANADA-NOVA SCOTIA OFFSHORE PETROLEUM RESOURCES ACCORD IMPLEMENTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-75, an Act to implement an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Nova Scotia on offshore petroleum resource management and revenue sharing and to make related and consequential amendments, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): With regard to Bill C-75 there are four motions on the Order Paper offered in amendment to it. Motion Nos. 1 to 4 inclusive stand in the name of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Masse). I understand that the Hon. Minister had tabled identical amendments in the legislative committee, but that due to the infringement upon the financial initiative of the Crown by one of the amendments and consequential effects to other amendments they could not be dealt with at the committee stage. I have noticed that the Minister has obtained a new Royal Recommendation which satisfies the requirement as far as Motion No. 3 is concerned.

Since Motion Nos. 1 to 4 inclusive are related, I would suggest that they be grouped together for debate with a vote on Motion No. 1 being applied to Motion Nos. 2, 3, and 4. The House will now proceed to debate Motion Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved:

Motion No. 1.

That Bill C-75 be amended in Clause 47 by striking out lines 13 and 14 at page 27 and substituting the following therefor:

"the purposes of subsection 13(2), 25(3), 37(1) or 140(5), the government or Minister proposing".

Motion No. 2.

That Bill C-75 be amended by adding immediately after line 33 at page 57 the following:

"104. The interest owner of an interest in relation to lands situated in that portion of the offshore area that is described in Schedule IV is, in respect of those lands, exempt from the payment under section 81 of the Canada Petroleum Resources Act of any amount in respect of any period mentioned in subsection 140(1) or specified in a notice issued pursuant to subsection 140(7)."

Motion No. 3.

That Bill C-75 be amended by adding immediately after line 27 at page 82 the following:

"140. (1) No person shall, on or before January 1, 2000, in that portion of the offshore area described in Schedule IV, explore or drill for or produce, conserve or process petroleum or transport petroleum produced in that portion of the offshore area.

(2) A public review of the environmental and socio-economic impact of exploration and drilling activities in that portion of the offshore area described in Schedule IV shall be conducted by a panel that is to be established for that purpose, in accordance with this section, on or before January 1, 1996.

(3) The panel referred to in subsection (2) shall consist of not more than five members.

(4) Two members of the panel referred to in subsection (2) may be appointed by the Federal Minister and two by the Provincial Minister, and the chairman of the panel is to be appointed by both the Federal Minister and the Provincial Minister.

(5) Where the two Ministers fail to agree on the appointment of the chairman of the panel referred to in subsection (2) within sixty days after the first appointment of a member of the panel, the chairman shall be selected by an arbitration panel, constituted in accordance with section 47, within thirty days after the appointment of the chairman of the arbitration panel, unless at any time prior thereto the two Ministers agree on the appointment.

(6) A report containing the results of the public review conducted pursuant to subsection (2), including any recommendations of the panel made in respect of those results, shall be prepared by the panel referred to in that subsection and submitted to the Federal Minister and the Provincial Minister on or before July 1, 1999.

(7) On or before January 1, 2000, the Federal Minister and Provincial Minister may, after consideration of the report submitted to them pursuant to subsection (6), jointly issue a written notice prohibiting, for such further period as is specified in the notice, in all or any part of that portion of the offshore area described in Shedule IV, the exploration or driling for and the production, conservation and processing of petroleum and the transportation of petroleum produced in that portion of the offshore area.

(8) The Federal Minister shall cause a copy of any notice issued pursuant to subsection (7) to be published in the *Canada Gazette* forthwith after the notice has been issued."

Motion No. 4.

That Bill C-75 be amended by adding immediately after Schedule III at page 161 the following:

"SCHEDULE IV
(*Sections 104 and 140*)
LIMITS OF THE PORTION OF THE OFFSHORE AREA REFERRED TO IN SECTIONS 104 AND 140

(All latitudes and longitudes referred to in this schedule are determined according to the NAD 27 datum. All parallels of latitude referred to in this schedule are to be determined in such a manner that they are parallel with boundaries of grid areas as defined by the Canada Oil and Gas Land Regulations.)

COMMENCING at the intersection of latitude 42 degrees 30' 00"N and the geodetic line from point C to point D of the Single Maritime Boundary between Canada and the United States of America, at approximate longitude 67 degrees 27' 05"W, said Boundary constituted by the Judgement of the Chamber of the International Court of Justice at The Hague on October 12, 1984, said point C being at latitude 42 degrees 31' 08"N and longitude 67 degrees 28' 05"W and said point D being at latitude 40 degrees 27' 05"N and longitude 65 degrees 41' 59"W as shown in said Judgement;

THENCE easterly along latitude 42 degrees 30'00"to longitude 66 degrees 30'00"W;

THENCE south along longitude 66 degrees 30'00"W to latitude 42 degrees 25'00"N;

THENCE easterly along latitude 42 degrees 25'00"N to longitude 65 degrees 45'00"W;

THENCE south along longitude 65 degrees 45'00"W to latitude 42 degrees 20'00"N;

THENCE easterly along latitude 42 degrees 20'00"N to longitude 65 degrees 37'30"W;

THENCE south along longitude 65 degrees 37'30"W to latitude 42 degrees 10'00"N;

THENCE easterly along latitude 42 degrees 10'00"N to longitude 65 degrees 30'00"W;

THENCE south along longitude 65 degrees 30' 00"W to latitude 42 degrees 05' 00"N;

THENCE easterly along latitude 42 degrees 05' 00"N to longitude 65 degrees 22' 30"W;

THENCE south along longitude 65 degrees 22' 30"W to latitude 41 degrees 50' 00"N;

THENCE westerly along latitude 41 degrees 50' 00"N to longitude 65 degrees 30' 00"W;

THENCE south along longitude 65 degrees 30' 00"W to latitude 41 degrees 40' 00"N;

THENCE westerly along latitude 41 degrees 40' 00"N to longitude 65 degrees 37' 30"W;

THENCE south along longitude 65 degrees 37' 30"W to latitude 41 degrees 35' 00"N;

THENCE westerly along latitude 41 degrees 35' 00"N to longitude 65 degrees 45' 00"W;

THENCE south along longitude 65 degrees 45'00"W to latitude 41 degrees 25'00"N;

THENCE westerly along latitude 41 degrees 25'00"N to longitude 65 degrees 52'30"W;

THENCE south along longitude 65 degrees 52'30"W to latitude 41 degrees 15'00"N;

THENCE westerly along latitude 41 degrees 15'00"N to longitude 66 degrees 07'30"W;

THENCE south along longitude 66 degrees 07'30"W to latitude 41 degrees 05'00"N;

THENCE westerly along latitude 41 degrees 05'00"N to its intersection with said geodetic line from point C to point D, at approximate longitude 66 degrees 13'33"W;

THENCE northwesterly along said geodetic line to the point of commencement."

Mr. Jack Shields (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to propose to the House today, on behalf of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Masse), a package of amendments to Bill C-75 dealing with an issue of deep concern to Nova Scotians, the protection of the Georges Bank fishery.

There is no dispute that the Georges Bank fishery is an important economic resource for Canada, the Province of Nova Scotia, and the people of southwestern Nova Scotia in particular.

The Government was fully aware of the importance of the Georges Bank fishery. It was also very much aware of the environmental sensitivity of the Bank and of the concerns being expressed by the Government of Nova Scotia and by the people of region over the potential impact that petroleum activity could have on the Bank. Therefore, discussions were held with the Energy Minister and the Premier of Nova Scotia and others on how best to satisfactorily resolve the impasse.

It was agreed, following these extensive discussions and consultations, that there should be a full and open public review of the environmental and socio-economic issues related to petroleum activities on the Georges Bank.

There had also been the concern expressed that such an environmental review conducted under the auspices of the Oil and Gas Management Board would not provide the objectivity this important issue deserved. As a result, it was agreed that the review would be conducted by an independent panel rather than the new Offshore Oil and Gas Management Board.

The Georges Bank is a unique fishery resource, and unique measures are required in the circumstances to balance the interests of all concerned. The moratorium and public review process will provide assurances to all Canadians that the Government understands the seriousness of environmental concerns and how these relate to other major considerations in our lives.

An agreement was reached with the Government of Nova Scotia on an amendment package for Georges Bank which contains the following key provisions. First, a moratorium is to be put in place on oil and gas activity on the Georges Bank until at least the year 2000.

Second, prior to the year 1996 an independent review panel will be constituted to hold public hearings on the environmental and social impacts of drilling on the Bank. The panel will report to the federal and provincial Ministers of Energy on or before July 1, 1999. The Ministers will then jointly decide whether the ban on petroleum activity should be extended beyond January 1, 2000.

These amendments will bring the federal accord legislation into line with that of the Province of Nova Scotia whose legislature passed the Georges Bank amendment package on May 25, 1988. The decisions embodied in the Georges Bank amendment package represent a credible solution to a very sensitive issue, one which is widely supported as being in the best public interest. I am pleased that the Governments of Canada and Nova Scotia, working together in a climate of co-operation, were able to resolve this issue.

I am today asking this House to join with others in supporting these measures by giving the amendments its stamp of approval.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Madam Speaker, it is my opinion that these amendments merely mirror the legislation in the Province of Nova Scotia, nothing more and nothing less. I would like the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary's confirmation that that is in fact the case.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): With unanimous consent, the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary.

Mr. Shields: Madam Speaker, I can assure my hon. friend and other colleagues in the House that this is mirror legislation to legislation which has previously been passed in the Legislature of Nova Scotia.

• (1850)

Mr. Paul Gagnon (Calgary North): Madam Speaker, I wish to move an amendment to Motion No. 3. I move:

> That Motion No. 3 be amended by deleting from subsection 140(2) therein the date 1996 and substituting therefore the date 1990.
>
> That Motion No. 3 be amended by adding immediately after subsection 140(6) the following:
>
> "(7) Notwithstanding subsection (1), if the report submitted pursuant to subsection (6) concludes that the exploratory work or activity can proceed in the offshore area described in Schedule IV without undue risk to the environment or resources of the area, the Federal Minister and the Provincial Minister may jointly declare that the authorization of the work or activity is a fundamental decision for the purposes of this Act and may be granted on condition that any proposed development resulting from any authorized work or activity could not proceed without a further public review of the proposed development. And by renumbering the subsections following and by substituting in the renumbered subsection (8) a reference to subsection (8) for the reference to subsection (7)."

Basically the main motion would freeze what is commonly called the Georges Bank from all exploration activity until the year 2000. This is done in conjunction with the Province of Nova Scotia but very much in a unilateral manner.

There is no need to include such a freeze within the Bill. The board which will be established under Bill C-75 already has the power to halt all exploration or development if there is an environmental problem.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Before the Hon. Member continues, may I know who will second the amendment? It will be seconded by Mr. Clifford.

Mr. Gagnon: Madam Speaker, there was a lot of discussion in the committee. I was privileged to be a member of that committee, where we heard from the Canadian Petroleum Association, Texaco Canada, and Chevron Canada. Obviously they are not unbiased about this issue and have a point of view to express. They brought me a book written by Richard H. Backus, Chairman of the Department of Biology at Woods Hole. He is a well- known independent biologist who looked at the environmental situation. At the outset he was opposed to oil development but concluded that development should proceed. Let me quote what he wrote:

> My own opinion is that cautious development together with suitable monitoring should proceed, with no opportunity being lost during the process for learning more about the bank and its fisheries and thus about coastal marine systems in general.

I submit that the safeguards already exist. We do not need a 12-year ban. People who have considered the environmental situation believe that we should proceed in a very cautious manner.

Mr. Jack Shields (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Madam Speaker, I only have a couple of remarks on the subamendments moved by my friend, the Hon. Member for Calgary North (Mr. Gagnon). He indicated that the motions were put through in a unilateral manner. There would be nothing unilateral in sitting down and negotiating with the province which has an agreement with the federal Government that the offshore resources in Nova Scotia will be treated in the same way as the resources in western Canada and the western basin.

The people of Nova Scotia have decided on a moratorium until the year 2000. The people of Nova Scotia have said that they fear the environmental impact on Georges Bank, which is a very important resource to Nova Scotia.

The Member is asking us to take a unilateral position like that which was taken by a previous Government when it imposed on the western basin and western provinces the divisive National Energy Program. Had it remained, it could have broken the country in two.

I would not want to be party to imposing anything on the Nova Scotia people that they and their legislature did not want. Therefore I ask my colleagues to defeat the subamendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): As we have ruled earlier that a vote on Motion No. 1 would apply to the other motions, we shall deal with the amendment to Motion No. 3. The question is on the amendment of Mr. Gagnon. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Amendment (Mr. Gagnon) negatived.

Mr. Shields: Madam Speaker, for clarification, did we just vote on two subamendments?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Since the amendments dealt with two different parts of the same motion they were treated as one amendment, which has now been negatived on division.

The next question is on Motion No. 1 standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the yeas have it.

Motion No. 1 agreed to.

Mr. Hnatyshyn (for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved that the Bill, as amended, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Hnatyshyn (for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved that the Bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Jack Shields (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I introduce, on behalf of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Masse), final reading on Bill C-75, an Act to implement the Canada-Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Resources Accord. The Bill before the House will implement the Canada-Nova Scotia Accord that was signed on August 26, 1986, by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and by the Premier of Nova Scotia, John Buchanan. Lying at the heart of the legislation is a new shared management regime under which the province has an equal say in decisions. This will significantly improve on the arrangements contained in the 1982 agreement with Nova Scotia, pursuant to which the province had only an advisory role in a federally controlled system.

• (1900)

The legislation will create a new independent board to administer and regulate petroleum activities in the offshore on behalf of the two Governments. The board will have considerable autonomy on technical decisions but will be subject to the joint direction of the two Governments on any fundamental decisions.

The legislation will convert the $200 million offshore development fund created under the 1982 agreement into a grant. Above and beyond this, the Government of Canada will make available a new $25 million fund to Nova Scotia Resources Ventures Limited, to assist in participating in exploration and development drilling in the offshore area.

This legislation incorporates existing federal legislation, the Canada Petroleum Resources Act and the Oil and Gas Production Act, so that there will be consistency in the legal framework for oil and gas activity in all offshore areas of Canada. This is highly desirable, from both an industry and government perspective, in ensuring consistently safe and well understood practices to be applied in all coastal areas.

In conclusion, the legislation will assure the Government of Nova Scotia of its rightful place alongside the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador as an equal partner with the Government of Canada in the management of petroleum resources of the East Coast.

The legislation will set aside the question of which level of government has jurisdiction over the offshore resources in favour of a joint management regime under which these resources are managed together for the benefit of all Canadians and, particularly, those in Nova Scotia.

It will thus create a stable investment climate to encourage industry investment by eliminating the risk that jurisdictional disputes will delay important project decisions.

The Government of Nova Scotia has passed into law the provincial legislation implementing the Nova Scotia Accord. I would ask this House to join with Nova Scotia in sanctioning this important legislation, thereby taking Canada one more purposeful step forward in national reconciliation and full realization of the benefits that will flow from the accord.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to speak on third reading of Bill C-75, an Act to implement an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Nova Scotia on offshore petroleum resource management and revenue sharing and to make related and consequential amendments.

We have been in the process of passing this Bill for a good many months now and I think that we have a Bill that is going to be satisfactory to all of the people of Nova Scotia. For that, I am very pleased. I would like to thank the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Masse) for his co-operation in agreeing to this amendment, and also his Parliamentary Secretary (Mr. Shields) who was probably the one who was really instrumental in formulating this policy. I would like to thank him as well.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLellan: During the course of the legislative committee meetings it was brought to the attention of all the Members of Parliament on the committee that this Bill could be substantially improved by the addition of an amendment which would protect the bountiful fish resource of Georges Bank. Although this Bill was initiated with offshore petroleum resource management, it was made clearly evident by representatives of the Nova Scotia fishing industry that protection of the fishery was of equivalent importance to oil and gas resources and had to be given consideration within the framework of this Bill. I think that is rightly put forward.

I want to thank also at this point the representatives of the fishing industry who came before the committee and, particularly, the organization known as NORIG, for their very relevant and in-depth presentation and support given to all committee members.

According to the accord to which this Bill relates, which was originally signed on the August 26, 1986, one of its seven major objectives was as follows: "To achieve the early development of petroleum resources in the offshore area for the benefit of Canada as a whole and Nova Scotia in particular". This statement overlooked the fact that there is a traditional resource in Nova Scotia, and that is, the fishery.

To act for the benefit of Canada as a whole and Nova Scotia in particular, we have to give particular attention to the fishery. Georges Bank is the most prolific fishery grounds in the world. That is of tremendous importance to the Province of Nova Scotia. It is many times more prolific than any other fishing grounds in the world, and of course there are a great many good fishing grounds throughout the world.

Six thousand people in the Province of Nova Scotia depend on the fishing industry directly related to Georges Bank. If we did not heed the seriousness of drilling in Georges Bank then the quality of life in Nova Scotia could be set off balance as a result of petroleum exploration and development. As a result, we have this amendment, which places a 12-year moratorium on oil and gas exploration and development on the Canadian side of Georges Bank. We establish by this amendment as well a review panel which will report on the environmental and socio-economic impact of exploration and drilling activities in this specific area by January 1, 1996.

Bill C-75 acted as a catalyst to make the legislative committee in the House of Commons confront the needs of the region, ensure the best use of the offshore resources, including the fishery, and put in place a process which will provide an equal hearing to those with differing concerns on offshore resource management.

I think that sets up the framework that all Canadians would like to see. There are, of course, various interests that will not be satisfied by this, but I think that what has been put in place is fair, and certainly fair to the fishing industry of Nova Scotia.

The situation on the Georges Bank highlighted three factors which are relevant to making decisions about resource development and management; socio-economic concerns, scientific evidence, and the political objectives of the people.

This proposed legislation provides a viable process for federal-provincial co-operation on offshore petroleum resource management. As I mentioned in my speech during second reading, the process will have limited use as no resource development is currently taking place. The lack of a coherent energy policy by this Government has led to merely ad hoc initiatives which may or may not be in the long-term interests of Canadians. This is why we did not have these very important provisions in the original Bill.

Furthermore, the objective of the Government, "to protect, preserve and advance the attainment of national security of supply" of energy resources, will be superseded by the terms of the free trade agreement.

The development of offshore resources is more likely to be based on decisions by U.S. multinationals whose objective it is to supply U.S. markets rather than plan to meet the future needs of Canadians. I do not think that that is wrong. The energy multinationals have played a very important role in the development of oil and gas and energy needs of this country and they are to be congratulated and thanked by the Canadian public.

However, there is a limit. One cannot expect oil companies, multinational or otherwise, to act in the interests of the fishing industry of Nova Scotia. It just makes common sense that oil companies have their vested interests. Fishermen and the fishing industry have their vested interests. This is why it is paramount that the Governments of this country look at situations like this and come down on the side of the people, the best interests of the people and the region in which they live. This is being done with the amendments that have been brought forward here this evening in the House of Commons at report stage. I feel good about this Bill. It certainly has the support of my Party as amended.

• (1910)

The fact that the Government has failed the people of Canada on two counts is demonstrated by the response of the Nova Scotian community to the idea of oil and gas drilling on Georges Bank. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources failed to develop a national energy strategy upon which regional initiatives would be based to ensure a security of supply.

In addition, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon) and other members of the Government have not taken into consideration, or did not take into consideration initially, the needs of the fishing industry in Nova Scotia. It was really members of the fishing industry and the communities involved that brought to the attention of the Government the need for these amendments, both here and in the Province of Nova Scotia.

This is one of the finest examples we will see in Canada of people interested in a particular resource knowing that they could lose the very vital industry on which their incomes and their livelihoods have come to depend. They have reached out to the Government and made their presentation in a forceful and objective manner. They have succeeded in having the Government, all Members of the House of Commons, and all members of the Legislature of the Province of Nova Scotia, listen to their arguments and accept their validity.

To have shown a disregard and a lack of empathy for the needs of the people dependent on the Georges Bank fishery would have been a catastrophe. It would have been a very bad example to the rest of the country. It would have been devastating for the people of Nova Scotia. We now have these amendments which are the results of this positive process which was initiated by the people in southwest Nova Scotia.

In addition to serving the needs of Nova Scotians and Canadians, the amended legislation is playing a leadership role in gaining U.S. support to prohibit oil and gas drilling on its portion of the Georges Bank. In June, the United States House Appropriations Committee voted to extend the one-year moratorium on any sites less than 400 metres deep. Previously, this restriction was only on 60 metre sites. Thus, that committee has increased protection of the U.S. side of the Georges Bank to almost 7 million acres.

This is a direct result of the action taken by the Government of Canada and the Government of the Province of Nova Scotia to say that we are not going to be drilling on Georges Bank during the moratorium period of 12 years. Had we not listened to the fishing community in Nova Scotia and to the concerns of Nova Scotians in general, and had we allowed the possibility of drilling to occur on Georges Bank, then this would have set a precedent for the United States. It could very well have followed suit. Not only have we prevented the drilling on the Canadian side of Georges Bank, we have also prevented drilling on the United States side of Georges Bank.

Some people may ask why we should worry about the United States side. Primarily, it is because the current in Georges Bank goes in a circular motion. Any spills or debris that is thrown into the bank comes around on to the Nova Scotia and the Canadian side. Any debris, any spillage, any pollution of any kind not only pollutes the side on which it occurs but it pollutes both sides of the border.

Canada is establishing an admirable precedent with this legislation. We have decided that the fishery as a resource takes precedence over petroleum resources until it is proven that no damage will be incurred to the Georges Bank or to the quality of life in Nova Scotia.

All the politicians in the Province of Nova Scotia and almost all of the politicians in the House of Commons—certainly all the members of my Party—have decided that we will not risk sacrificing the fishery in order to promote oil and gas development, particularly since this country does not have a comprehensive energy policy. We would be throwing darts in the dark if we were to allow drilling since we would not know what exactly would occur from any commencement of activity on the Georges Bank.

In this instance, the democratic process has worked. Nova Scotians have affected the legislative process. It is my pleasure to tell the House that Liberals support the speedy passage of Bill C-75.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Madam Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak on this particular Bill. It is an area with respect to which I am not particularly well informed. However, there is a principle here which needs to be considered.

I have often wondered why it is that we think that all our non-renewable resources have to be spent as quickly as possible. That idea is the position that has been taken by much of the world's oil industry. It has been taken all over the world and, to a great extent, it has been supported by Governments around the world. In this case, the interest of companies in the Georges Bank and the development of the industry in that area ended up in a rather bitter fight between the oil exploiters and the fishermen of Georges Bank. It is good to know that in this particular situation a good look was taken at the responsibilities and the needs of both groups.

A moratorium is being imposed which gives both groups the opportunity to assure themselves that one will not hurt the other in any way when, sometime in the future, there is the possibility of development of the industry on Georges Bank. There are several attractive features in the plan which are being developed in this particular Bill by the Minister. These are positions which might be models for the future.

The previous Liberal Government took a similar type of approach in looking at the Mackenzie Valley as a source of gas and a pipeline which would have traversed all of Canada. It ended up making a recommendation, and following the recommendation which put that particular pipeline on hold. As it happens, the events have caught up to the pipeline. It now seems much less of an economic requirement. This might happen in the case of the Georges Bank as well.

The Bill establishes a model which might be used in the future with respect to the development of other resources and other conflicts that arise between industries. It is refreshing, and I must say unusual, to have the will of the people override the desire of large corporations to make more money. That is exactly what this particular Bill is dealing with, the desire of the industry to exploit the gas on Georges Bank, and it is against that group of people who think that perhaps it is not worth doing so. There are other examples of the use of resources to increase the value and the standard of living of part of the population. In some cases, that type of use of resources becomes worth-while. In other cases, development of resources can go in the opposite direction and do more harm to the population than good.

• (1920)

For example, in the development of its North Sea oil, Norway decided that the speed of development should be at the requirement of the country rather than at the requirement of the oil industry. Norway set a timetable which allowed the development to the extent that it did make for a real change in the life structure of Norwegians. Norway used the benefits from those resources to improve the lifestyle of Norwegians without a boom structure. The significance of that type of approach is very important, and it needs to be looked at and perhaps it can become a model for resource development or other industrial development in certain areas.

The previous speaker indicated that not only has it helped in giving opportunities to the fishermen and the people of Nova Scotia to decide on the direction of their lives and the type of lifestyle they want to live, but it served as an example to the United States. I have here a letter from possibly the next President of the United States, Michael Dukakis. He wrote to his Department of the Interior telling them that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts was extremely pleased that Canada was doing what it was doing, and suggesting that the United States take similar action in ensuring that the banks were not disturbed without knowing exactly what the effects would be.

It is refreshing to note that all political Parties here, and the two Parties in Nova Scotia, backed the idea and the Bill. I must express concern on the part of the fishermen that, although they appreciate the 12-year moratorium and the panel being put in place, they have a concern that at some time at the end of the moratorium drilling might start with the support and blessing of both Governments without an investigation into its effect.

We in the New Democratic Party also support the passage of this Bill right now.

Mr. Gerald Comeau (South West Nova): Madam Speaker, I take great pride and pleasure in saying a few words on this most tremendous achievement for the people of Nova Scotia, particularly the people of the western part of Nova Scotia which includes the south shore and South West Nova. My colleague, the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan), referred to the fact that it affected some 6,000 fishermen in Nova Scotia. It affects the 6,000 fishermen plus all the fish plant workers who depend on the products of Georges Banks, the lucrative scallops, the groundfish, and the lobsters that are caught in that area. There are hundreds of millions of dollars worth of landed fish values from that area taken on shore every year. Therefore, it affects thousands and thousands of people, for example, fish plant workers, cab drivers, and all the people who are directly and indirectly associated and dependent on the fishery.

It affects a great number of communities that I represent that have depended on the fishery for hundreds of years. In most of those communities fishing is all that they know, communities such as Argyle, Yarmouth, and Digby, and communities that I do not represent on the south shore such as Lunenburg, Shelburne, and Lockeport. All of those people can now rest assured that there will be no activity on Georges Banks involving drilling. After this Bill is passed those people will have a good nights sleep.

I wish to say a heartfelt thank you to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Masse) who had his ears tugged both ways. On the one hand fishermen and people like myself were approaching the Minister and stating that we do not want this to happen, and on the other hand the oil companies from the West indicated that they wanted to do some drilling on Georges Banks. The Minister had a difficult choice to make. There were no studies available that specifically stated that there should be no drilling. The Minister decided to do what was right. He went to southwestern Nova Scotia and communities such as Pubnico and Yarmouth. He met with the fishermen, and he met with people who depend on the fishery. He walked the streets of Pubnico and Yarmouth and talked to individual citizens and asked: "Should we drill on Georges Bank?" He received a resounding answer.

The point I am attempting to make is that the Minister decided not to listen to the people around him. He spoke to the people of the area. That is what is important. The NDP, the socialist Party, thinks that it has a monopoly on the concerns of people. That is not the case. The Progressive Conservative Party of Canada which now forms the Government is as concerned, and in some cases more so, because it actually takes concrete measures to go and meet with the people, and we are seeing the results. We are seeing the results of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources who was courageous and went against what would normally be called "the flow of things", and what would normally be called "the big company interest". He went with the people. The Minister showed leadership, and I certainly appreciate that leadership.

The Parliamentary Secretary referred to the previous Government's unilateral strategy of imposing a National Energy Program on the people of the West. I wish to remind my colleague, the Hon. Member for Calgary North (Mr. Gagnon), that the National Energy Program did much harm to his home province. Would he not feel the same way if people from Ottawa had gone to southwestern Nova Scotia and imposed a decision which they did not accept?

I wish to remind my colleagues from the West that sometimes the people of Atlantic Canada want to be a part of the decision-making process. The people of southwestern Nova Scotia have a great debt of thanks and appreciation to give to the Minister. On their behalf I wish to extend my full appreciation to the Minister and to his colleague, the Parliamentary Secretary, for having brought in this very significant and positive piece of legislation.

• (1930)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

ELDORADO NUCLEAR LIMITED REORGANIZATION AND DIVESTITURE ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-121, an Act to authorize the reorganization and divestiture of Eldorado Nuclear Limited and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): There are three motions in amendment on the Notice Paper for Bill C-121, an Act to authorize the reorganization and divestiture of Eldorado Nuclear Limited and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, standing in the name for the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow). Motions Nos. 1 and 2 cause the Chair some difficulty procedurally.

[*Translation*]

The Bill and, more specifically, Clause 5 are concerned only with shares and voting securities of Eldorado Nuclear and not with other matters related to Eldorado Nuclear's operations. Therefore, although these proposed motions in amendment may be of utmost importance I must regretfully rule that, procedurally, they are inadmissible in that they go beyond the scope of the Bill.

[*English*]

Motion No. 3 is acceptable and will now be put to the House. It is in the name of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North.

Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) to move the motion on behalf of the Member from Winnipeg North?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (for Mr. Orlikow) moved:

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-121 be amended in Clause 27 by striking out lines 21 to 24 at page 16 and substituting the following therefor:

"17. All sections shall come into force five years following proclamation by Governor in Council."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion sets the date for coming into force of this legislation five years after proclamation. That, perhaps, is not too surprising because we in the New Democratic Party feel that a lot in this Bill is not the kind of development that should occur. Our preference would be not to pass the Bill at all. We would prefer that Eldorado Nuclear and the Saskatchewan Mining Corporation remain in public ownership rather than becoming a private corporation. There are good reasons for that preference. First, the corporation has not come to a satisfactory agreement with the workers regarding their pensions and other benefits. That in itself is a good reason to hold off the effect of this Bill.

As a resident of Saskatchewan I am against this Bill because Saskatchewan got a very bad deal by accepting a tremendous amount of debt and gave away part of the company that was worthwhile having. The economic benefits are being passed on to the private corporation. The direct benefits for sales, particularly in the case of the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation, are being lost to the public.

There are many reasons that we should not be doing what is being suggested in this Bill. There is a need in dealing particularly with uranium to establish standards for occupational health and safety for the workers. Those standards are much more likely to be established at a high level if the corporations remain in the public domain for at least another five years.

When the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation was established and when the uranium industry developed in Saskatchewan, two large corporations along with the Government went into the development of uranium mining in northern Saskatchewan. The Government kept the major portion of shares in those cases. When the surface rights were signed for those corporations there was a requirement that at least 50 per cent of the workers had to be native northerners. A New Democratic Government and a Conservative Government in Saskatchewan made fair attempts to meet that requirement, but in 15 years or so that requirement has not been met. At the time there was much public policy input into how these corporations developed.

Because we are dealing with uranium, and I suppose this is true with almost any resource development, there is a real need to develop long-lasting and effective environmental protection structures. There are special problems associated with uranium mining. Control is more easily developed by public corporations than by private corporations. The bottom line is too important to the private corporation which has a tendency to cut as many environmental corners as it can. That is a standard approach which has been a problem in other resource development industries and other manufacturing concerns across the country.

We need to be involved with the industry to some extent. We need a window on the industry to give us some knowledge about what is happening, where uranium is being shipped, how it is being treated and whether it is becoming more of an environmental problem. These are some of the good reasons that we think that it would be much better if this legislation were not put into effect for another 5 years.

• (1940)

Summing up all these disadvantages, one sees a clear reason for putting the legislation off. In fact, one wonders why the Government persists with this Bill at all. It is not a good Bill for the people of Canada who are taking on the debt of Eldorado and it is not good for the people of Saskatchewan who are taking on the debt of the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation.

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I too am pleased to speak on the amendment standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) to the Government's legislation, which is to authorize the reorganization and divestiture of Eldorado Nuclear Limited and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

The reason we are in favour of a hoist on the proclamation of this legislation is that we believe that the Government has not really studied it. We believe that promises made by the former Minister of Privatization, the new Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mrs. McDougall), have not been kept. We believe that the native people of northern Saskatchewan are not adequately protected by this legislation.

I would like to spend most of my time speaking about the pension problem. In a statement earlier today, I pointed out that a promise made by the previous Minister of Privatization was that existing pension plans would be protected and would continue to exist. That promise has been broken by the corporation. In some briefings it gave to employees in the last couple of days, the new corporation has indicated that the status of the surplus in the pension plans will be distributed in such a way that the workers who are currently there will not have the same protection in the future as they have at this time.

The Minister made a direct promise in a press release. It was a direct promise that was again made by the company when it appeared before the standing committee of this House. Even before this legislation was brought back to the House for consideration at report stage, the companies announced that they have a new plan, which means that those people who are already retired will be protected and the surplus will be used to help them, but those workers who remain with Eldorado will not be covered by cost-of-living increases in the future, as would have been the case before the privatization.

I believe that for the sake of honour, the Government which made this promise when it said it wanted to privatize this company should look into what has happened in the last couple of days. As I indicated earlier today, we will not allow this legislation to go to third reading tonight because we want the Government to take this opportunity to investigate what we consider to be very serious charges which we made in the House of Commons earlier today. At 2.15 p.m. today, we made the Government aware of that intention. We believe it would be extremely foolish for this House to pass this Bill at report stage and third reading at this time without investigating this matter.

Time after time, those workers have been told that their present plan would be protected. That issue came before the committee as well. Motion No. 1 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North would have provided that any surplus in the pension plans of Eldorado and any subsidiary of Eldorado shall be used only for the benefit of current contributors and pensioners and their beneficiaries. We wanted in the legislation the protection that would ensure that that surplus would be used in such a way that those workers, past and present, would be protected.

The Speaker, in his good judgment, said that we could not introduce that motion because it went beyond the scope of the Government's Bill. It may be beyond the scope of the Government's Bill, and it may be technically out of order, but it does not go beyond the scope of the promise the Government made to those workers.

The use of surplus funds in pension plans is a very political issue in Canada. The employees, past and present, believe that they were promised that they would have the same protection now as they had before the effort to privatize Eldorado Nuclear. They believed that they had that assurance from the Minister. She said so in her press release, and she further stated it in a statement she sent to the employees.

This is an issue which deserves investigation. We cannot let this legislation pass until the Government has investigated this matter and assured the workers that that promise made by the Government will be kept.

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter that my colleague, the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) has raised in the House. It is not a matter that is new to the House either.

Several years ago, amendments to the Pension Benefits Standards Act were before the House. In those amendments, there was no mention at all of what would happen to surplus pension funds, more adequately and properly called excess earnings of a pension plan. For that very reason, I moved an amendment to the Pension Benefits Standards Act at that time which would have guaranteed that any excess earnings of pension plans would belong to the pension plans and that no employer had the unilateral right to claim those excess earnings as if they belonged to the employer.

The argument I made at that time, an argument which I think still holds true today, is that a pension plan, like any other benefit that an employee enjoys in an arrangement with an employer, belongs to that employee because it is deferred wages. It is deferred wages in the sense that a group of employees in a bargaining unit enter into negotiations with an employer for a collective agreement and there are certain elements in that collective agreement whereby the employees agree that rather than accept money on a weekly basis in the way of salary increases, they decide with the employer's agreement to defer some of that salary to pay for other benefits such as benefits paid under private pension plans.

That argument is one with which employers generally do not agree because they tend to view these excess earnings as a benefit that comes to them as a matter of right. That is an argument I reject, quite frankly.

Several years ago, one of the largest grabs that was ever made to a pension plan was made by Conrad Black in the Dominion Store employee case. This gave rise to a number of court cases. It was finally concluded about a year ago, I believe, that some if not all of that money did in fact belong to the employees, and Conrad Black was directed to pay those moneys back to the employees. That was done for the very same reasons that I argued here. Those moneys in the pension plan belong to the employee. They are deferred wages that the employee passed up in order to secure a benefit under the pension plan and therefore belong to them.

• (1950)

In this particular case, as I understand it, the employer is doing exactly the same. There are surplus funds in this pension plan and there has been absolutely no discussion and no attempt at negotiating with the union on behalf of the employees as to how those excess earnings should be used. Should they be used to increase benefits under the plan? Should they be used to provide another and different benefit to the employees? Nothing like that has gone on.

I am sure that in the transition period there will be certain disruptions in the workforce. It would not surprise me at all to find that many members of that workforce with 25, 30 or 36 years of service may find themselves on a scrap heap, so to speak. They deserve better. While I make the key argument that surplus funds in any pension plan belong to the employees, I would not be adverse to the employer sitting down with the union and attempting to negotiate the disposition of those surplus funds. However, the option has to be there. The employer has absolutely no right at all to take those funds and use them in any way be wishes.

This is a very serious matter, and I agree with what the Hon. Member for Churchill said. This Party will not agree to third reading of this Bill tonight. The Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mrs. McDougall) gave assurances to those employees and their union that those surplus pension funds would be protected, therefore the Minister has some obligation to reassure those employees and the union that those funds will be used on behalf of the employees concerned. That must be done before we agree to third reading. That is the Government's obligation at the very minimum.

In addition, I think it is high time that we took another look at the Pension Benefits Standards Act and amended it to make it illegal for an employee to treat a pension plan in this manner. Both opposition Parties supported my amendment in the House to that effect, and it should have been done two years ago. If it had been, we would not be facing this problem today. Neither would these employees, many of whom have long service with the company and are entitled to much better treatment than they appear to be getting today.

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to this amendment calling for a five-year delay in the coming into force of these provisions following proclamation.

As other Members have said, we would prefer that this privatization not take place at all. There are several good reasons for that, apart from the ones which have been spoken to such as pensions and protection of workers. Obviously, with the price of uranium today this is not a favourable time to be selling this company. To do so, the Government effectively has had to write off Eldorado's accumulated debt and excuse the corporation from anything but a very limited responsibility for the environmental clean-up. That is a very important issue and it should be studied and addressed more carefully over the five-year period that we are asking for in the amendment.

The environmental issues surrounding such industries as this one are extremely serious. We have just heard the results of the conferences held on the environment and the consequences of inadequate environmental protection. No longer, as we so clearly know, can one industry assume that the effect it has on the environment will not have important consequences, not only on local areas or a country but globally as well. Therefore, this issue really does require extended study.

Another area that I would particularly like to address is that of benefits to certain targeted groups. One thing that has been done, as a Member outlined previously, was an attempt to ensure that northerners and native people have access to these jobs. While it had not been accomplished totally, it was at least a principle that this Crown corporation was attempting to

implement. I think it is clear to all of us that a Crown corporation can have somewhat more latitude in this area and should indeed operate not only with the principle of making a profit but also ensuring that the objectives of its policies, both economic and labour, are in the interests of the workers and the country in general. Certainly making a profit is important, but management should have as one of its principles the taking into account of these other factors.

We have the example of other industries. The limestone project in Manitoba is one where local employment has proven to be extremely effective. Local workers have been hired. We have concerns about this in my own riding where we see the impending sale of the Northwest Telephone Corporation. We are attempting to ensure that the 400 NTC jobs which currently exist in Whitehorse will remain. While that number of jobs in a large urban area may not be a serious consideration, certainly in the smaller areas where mines such as that of Eldorado Nuclear are located there is a need to ensure that workers have either the ability to be retrained or they have an opportunity to participate in the workforce.

Certainly this issue was raised by several groups when they appeared before the committee. The steelworkers, for example, raised some particular concerns when they said, "We have learned the hard way to be wary of mergers. In this case we have received half-hearted assurances that there will be no job loss as a result of the merger. Our members deserve more. They deserve an ironclad commitment that there will be no lay-offs as a result of the merger".

The steelworkers' proposal was that the new company employ a minimum number of jobs at each local, making allowances for the fact that obviously uranium mining is a cyclical business. This proposal for a five-year delay in implementation would allow for the kind of adjustment that may be necessary and would take into account the cyclical nature of non-renewable resource development.

• (2000)

It does seem, however, that the major privatizations tend to favour management rather than the interests of workers. Management no longer has to meet the objectives of a Crown corporation or even set an example in health and safety conditions which are particularly important and necessary in an industry such as this one. As I mentioned earlier, over the five-year period there could be much greater study on both health and safety standards for employees and environmental consequences.

In this particular industry and others similar to it there is often very high unemployment. We have already addressed the commitment of the Government of Saskatchewan, which in its focus on developing non-renewable resources in northern Saskatchewan really attempted to develop a model for the integration of aboriginal people and other people living in those more remote areas. As we have seen by that example, it does require a commitment and a plan. The circumstances which led to the Saskatchewan policy were clearly well planned out and well thought out.

The proposed amendment would allow time to deal with these important issues which have long-term consequences for the workers, the environment, and the industry.

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to have an opportunity to speak on this very important amendment before the House tonight. I hope the Government will be inclined to support it. The people of Canada deserve a chance to comment on this proposition in a federal election. The proposal to unload at a fire sale price into the private sector the uranium industry in Canada makes very little sense from the point of view of most Canadians. They should certainly have the opportunity in an election to comment on the Government's performance and this proposition.

The Government is proposing to, for some $250 million, sell off the assets of the merger between Eldorado Nuclear and the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation and then assume $600 million in debt. To any reasonable taxpayer this must be viewed as a red hot deal, except that the taxpayer is being stung.

Second, a massive clean-up of some 880 million cubic yards of material will have to be dealt with by the taxpayers at an estimated cost of between $250 million and $660 million. If we take the worst case scenario and add the $600 million in clean-up costs to the $600 million in debt which the taxpayers will assume, the taxpayers will be $1 billion in the hole. I, as a taxpayer, would certainly want to comment on this proposition in the next federal election.

Of course, the question is why the Conservative Government of Canada would want to do such a thing. The only apparent reason is a philosophical fixation that nothing in the public sector is any good, a philosophical fixation of the Conservative Party, which is truly a contradiction when it comes right down to it, that the Government is bad. They have spent a period of time since September of 1984 proving to the Canadian people how bad a Government can be. There has been a litany of catastrophes from that date forward.

The one before us tonight, wherein the Government is proposing that the assets of the corporation be sold off and its debt and liabilities be assumed by the taxpayers, makes no economic sense. I guess the Government would prefer to act in a manner which is consistent with the philosophy that this Government is bad and go ahead with it. It is, however, my hope that the Government will adopt the amendment before the House tonight.

Another reason that we should wait for the period of time suggested in this amendment is that there will have to be a major clean-up and the technology and the mechanism for carrying out that clean-up have not been worked out. With regard to making nuclear waste safe, some time should be taken and this property should be held intact by the Government until such a decision has been made.

Another aspect for consideration is that there is a substantial amount of money in the workers' pension fund which we suspect will be raided by the company. This legislation should definitely offer an opportunity to protect those funds for the workers.

The fourth aspect is that the uranium market is extremely depressed. The prospects of that market improving over the next five years are pretty remote. There is talk of uranium being depressed under $20 a pound. If it remains at that price over the next five years, there will be some serious difficulties in the economics of that company.

Undoubtedly in future the people of Canada will have to make a contribution to the survival of this industry if they wish to continue with it. The taxpayers will pay again, thanks to the Conservative Government. That payment will be made to individuals in the private sector rather than toward maintaining a public corporation.

It is surprising that the New Democratic Party is the only group in the House tonight that will take a position to try to defend the workers in this industry, to try to protect the pension plan of those workers. The New Democratic Party is the only organization in the House speaking out on the issue of nuclear safety. Tonight we are speaking on the rotten economics of this proposal put forward by the Conservative Government. It is surprising that other members of the Opposition are not attempting to defend the Canadian people against such an outrageous proposal.

The five-year amendment makes a lot of sense. If that amendment were in place, the first thing that would happen is an election. The outcome of that election is clear in the minds of most Canadians. The Conservative Party of Canada will not form the next Government. I hear the odd snicker and sounds of regret around me in the House. This is truly false bravado. It is very difficult for someone facing annihilation to be able to admit the faultiness of his or her ways, even in the eleventh hour.

To reflect on Canadian history, the time of the depression was very similar to the eleventh hour of this Government. At that time another famous Canadian Conservative, R. B. Bennett, led the country down the drain. In the eleventh hour he recognized the wrong-headedness of his approach and attempted to change it all.

• (2010)

Unfortunately, I do not think Members opposite would recognize the merits of the proposition in that amendment which would provide Canadians with a safety valve. Perhaps other Members who are coming into the House will rise to speak in support of this common sense proposal for a delay of five years before this legislation becomes law. Canadians need more time to consider this. I urge the House to support this very reasonable approach.

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, the amendment that has been accepted by the Chair would defer the proclamation of the Bill for the privatization of Eldorado. There are other issues that we had hoped to address with our amendments but which have not been accepted by the Chair.

It seems that Eldorado did not realize the Bill had not been passed because in the last couple of days it has submitted a radical change in the pension plan of Eldorado employees, which at the very least is not in good faith in terms of commitments that were made by the company during the course of the discussions on privatization.

The Minister of State for Privatization indicated: "I can confirm that pensions are protected by this agreement". She said in her press release that existing pension and benefit plans would be adopted by the new company.

I am not sure what kind of games are being played, but the existing company, before being privatized and merged with the Saskatchewan company, is changing the pension plan radically. I cannot give all the details because we are only just absorbing them ourselves, but the detailed information which has been sent to the workers in the last few days gives them next to no time to analyse what will happen and judge whether or not Eldorado's proposals make sense.

It appears that in order to sweeten the deal as far as Eldorado's sale is concerned, the company will be allowed to strip $12 million in surplus from the existing pension plan. It is called a residual surplus. The successor company will be allowed to use that residual surplus to offset employee and employer contributions for approximately four or five years.

If I understand that correctly, it means there is a substantial sweetener which reduces the cost of acquisition of Eldorado when it moves into the private sector. My colleagues have already mentioned that this is not a good deal, at least for the taxpayers of Canada. In return for getting about $250 million, we are absorbing some $600 million in debt plus taking on the obligation for clean-up in Port Hope, which could cost another $200 million to $600 million.

The workers in the Eldorado properties in many cases are longstay employees who made a commitment to the company. They have been there for some 20 to 30 years and had been relying on an indexed pension. That was one of the benefits and one of the reasons they stayed with the company. Now, instead, they are being offered a number of different options.

I must confess that the information here would probably be Greek to an average pension consultant. It is certainly difficult for a worker in Saskatchewan or a worker in Port Hope to grasp easily. The workers are being told that they have an important initial decision to make about either a deferred pension option or an improved benefit entitlement option. In either case, they are becoming members of the new money purchased pension plan. The only option is how they dispose of their existing rights under the plan that have accrued in the last several years.

This has not been done with the consent of the workers. While the workers pay half the cost, the decisions are made entirely by the management of Eldorado. One commitment that was made was that the workers would be protected in retirement if there were serious inflation. Now they will get a money purchase plan. The company states: "When you retire, the money accumulated in your account is used to purchase a life annuity, a contract that guarantees that you will receive a regular monthly pension based on the amount of money in your account and the interest rates in effective when you retire".

This means that the pension of those workers on this new pension plan could be worth half as much as they expect, if interest rates happen to be low. If they strike it lucky, or the Bank of Canada squeezes the economy dry and interest rates become particularly high, perhaps they will do better and have a pension that is greater than they anticipated. However, that is not the kind of security people look to. When people retire, they do not want to play a speculative game of chance with their monthly pension. They want to know what their pension will be.

Furthermore, when the workers retire at age 60 or 65, hopefully their health will not be too badly eroded from the industrial pollution at Eldorado. Today, people can expect to live from 12 to 25 years after retiring at age 60 to 65. Even if inflation is at 4 per cent or 5 per cent, the value of the pension without indexing drops to half its purchasing power every 15 years. This means that the worker who retires at age 60 will see his pension halved in value at age 75. While their expenses for care, nursing, and so on will go up, the value of the pension will continue to drop if this money benefit plan is not changed.

In its haste to privatize Eldorado, the Government has broken faith with the workers of Eldorado. Perhaps the workers at Eldorado should have known, but the Conservatives have broken their promises on indexed pensions. The Conservatives, who have broken promise after promise to the Canadian people in the last five years, are breaking another promise.

The Minister of State for Privatization said that existing pension and benefit plans would be adopted by the new company. The new company has not even been formed, and the existing company is changing radically the kind of pension benefit plans that those workers had. Shame on the Government; shame on the Government for that kind of treatment to workers who have given their lives to this company. That is the kind of shoddy treatment people have come to expect from the Progressive Conservative Government.

In the course of the next election, the credibility of the Progressive Conservative Party and the Government will be first and foremost among the issues facing the Canadian people. They will want to know whether they can get a Government that has integrity and is honest and fair.

The few hundred workers at Eldorado who are affected, many other workers, and other people know that the Government can be judged on its treatment of the workers at Eldorado as much as it can be judged on its treatment of other people, such as the old age pensioners who were subjected to the threat of deindexed pensions in 1985.

I recall that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) promised exactly the opposite in the 1984 election campaign. He has eroded and degraded political promises to the point where a Small Claims Court Judge in Kitchener warned the public not to believe anything they hear from politicians. I must say that is unfair to the New Democratic Party. We keep our promises. The Progressive Conservatives have systematically broken their promises one after another. They cannot be trusted and in this Eldorado case, when they took away pension protection from the Eldorado workers in the course of privatizing the company, it once again demonstrated that this is not a Government which can be trusted.

• (2020)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and President of Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I listened with close attention to the comments of the Member of the socialist Party on Motion No. 3, the purpose of which is to defer the privatization of Eldorado Nuclear for five years. Firstly, the privatization of Eldorado Nuclear will be effected over a period of seven years. As far as privatization is concerned, the Bill itself stipulates that the privatization provisions will be applied over a period of seven years.

The policy of the New Democratic Party, as I understand it, is to make a decision today, but to apply it five years later. I would judge this to be a fairly unusual practice in management or administration.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) and the other Members of the socialist Party have also spoken on the importance of the employees' pension fund. They have said that the employees' pension fund was completely—that what was being done was disastrous.

[*English*]

With regard to the pension fund for the employees, Eldorado Resources Limited has sent special bulletins to the employees.

Mr. Cassidy: Could you explain it to them on the basis of that information?

Mr. Grisé: They have the option to take the pension they have earned to date in the current pension plan, which will be paid to them on their retirement, or to take the value of their earned pension benefit under the pension plan and transfer this lump sum to the Eldorado money purchase pension plan. I could go on. They have had some organized meetings. They had meetings in Port Hope on July 7 and July 8, Blind River on July 14, and in Ottawa on July 18.

We listened to the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) but he never listens to anybody but himself. He is such a great Member. He won in 1984 by a very strong majority of 32 votes, but we know where he will be after the next election. The words from the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre tonight are exactly the same as the ones he said about the privatization of de Havilland and Canadair. I listened to the western members of the New Democratic Party. They want to defend Saskatchewan.

Mr. Cassidy: What about defending the workers?

Mr. Grisé: How can you defend Saskatchewan? What happened with de Havilland? Was it bad for Toronto? What happened with Canadair? Was it bad for Montreal? Do you or do you not want something good for Saskatoon? The Member should go and tell the employees of Canadair and de Havilland that they have had a bad deal since they have been in the private sector.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, once again it is quite clear that only . . . and I want to congratulate the Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan) who supports privatization, and who earlier supported quite actively a bill concerning energy in Southern Nova Scotia. That is the type of Bill that will allow us to continue to help the Canadian economy and to obtain the assistance of the private sector; we have tangible evidence: take de Havilland, and Canadair, for instance. But of course, the socialist Party can only accept control by the state, by Shirley Carr, by Bob White.

Madam Speaker, they will only tolerate private enterprise in the Oshawa riding. For some strange reason, in the riding of Oshawa, private enterprise becomes acceptable, foreign investment becomes acceptable! But elsewhere in Canada, Madam Speaker, we are not to help private enterprise, everything must remain public to help the socialist Party progress.

Madam Speaker, this Government has put forth a valid privatization program that has provided exceptional results up till now, and we will continue to apply it; we will privatize Eldorado, we will privatize Air Canada, and people will have better service. Employees have better guaranties, there is more activity in private concerns, employees have better security, and we will continue our application of these programs.

[*English*]

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Madam Speaker, my remarks will be relatively brief. I have sat here tonight, on my duty night, in complete incredulity of the position of the New Democratic Party.

What does this motion mean? This motion means that the New Democratic Party is clearly against the Province of Saskatchewan. This Party has an opportunity to vote in favour of the establishment of the largest integrated uranium company in the world with headquarters in Saskatchewan. It should be ashamed of itself. This will not be forgotten by the electorate of Saskatchewan in the next election. What do its members say? I will summarize their argument.

They want to postpone this for five years. That has the effect of killing the deal. They know it and we know it. We are not bumpkins out in Saskatchewan. We understand from where the New Democratic Party takes their orders. The union leadership tells them where to march and they march, ready, aye, ready, as soon as their union leadership—Shirley Carr and the group—tell them where to go. Let me just simply tell New Democratic Party Members that they are not going to fool the people of Saskatchewan in the next election.

Mr. Cassidy: With the barons of Bay Street—

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I am talking about promises. The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) is a man who makes promises. The man got up on behalf of the New Democratic Party and said: "Elect a New Democrat and we will move the frigates from New Brunswick to Montreal, ready, aye, ready". That is the New Democrats—ready, aye, ready when the union leadership speaks.

The people of Saskatchewan are not going to forget this. I am a great admirer of the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) who wants to run in the riding of Saskatoon—Humboldt. What has he to say to the people of Saskatoon when they are awaiting the head office of this new gigantic corporation to be opened? It is an opportunity for value-added, for us to take our natural resources and develop them under the control of the people of Saskatchewan.

What are they going to say about a Member who comes into this House and tries to crush this Bill and bring to a halt this new development for Saskatchewan and things that we want to do out West? We want to develop our resources and have control over our resources in a way which is fair and equitable. They want to hoist this for five years because they are concerned about the pension plan. This Party believes that everything should be run by the Government. They believe that Crown corporations should be established for every conceivable operation in this society.

• (2030)

Members of that Party are telling us that because Eldorado is carrying on a Crown corporation function, and there is some concern with respect to pensions, we as a Government should move in and have a heavy hand and a political influence on Crown corporations. J. S. Woodsworth would roll over in his grave if he heard these people talking now. Imagine. It is a terrible insult they are paying to the concept of Crown corporations which are supposed to operate in the public interest without political interference. Now all the New Democrats, Shirley Carr, and union leaders should say: "Political interference. We want to control everything in society".

I will now sit down because I think I have made my point. The New Democratic Party is against Saskatchewan. It is against the interests of the people of that province. Shame on them. This will be remembered.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Call in the Members.

And the division bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 13(4)(a), I have been requested by the Chief Government Whip to defer the division until a later time.

Accordingly, the division on the question now before the House stands deferred until Monday at 6 p.m., at which time the bells to call in the Members will be sounded for not more than 15 minutes.

* * *

AIR CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-129, an Act to provide for the continuance of Air Canada under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares thereof to the public, as reported (with amendment) from a legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): There are 10 motions in amendment on the Notice Paper for Bill C-129, an Act to provide for the continuance of Air Canada under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares thereof to the public. I am now ready to make my ruling concerning the grouping for debate and voting.

[*Translation*]

The amendment contained in Motion No. 1 having been adopted by the legislative committee, the motion therefore will not be put to the House.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 2 and 7 are acceptable and will be debated together but voted upon separately.

[*Translation*]

Motions Nos. 3 and 5 are in order. They will be debated together but voted on separately.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 4 and 6 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan) and the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) provide the Chair with some difficulty. That part of Motion No. 4 which attempts to insert a new paragraph (f) and Motion No. 6 may appear to go beyond the scope of the Bill, in that the Bill envisages the issuance and sale of shares of Air Canada to the public but does not delve into matters of what Air Canada itself may do with its shares, nor with what matters Air Canada should be required to maintain in the future. However, after careful consideration I have decided to give the Hon. Members the benefit of the doubt and allow the motions to be put. They will be grouped for debate and voted on separately.

[*Translation*]

Motions Nos. 8 and 9 are in order. They will be debated and voted on separately.

[*English*]

Motion No. 10 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North attempts to amend the title of the Bill. Paragraph 1 of Beauchesne's Citation 780 states that the title may be amended if the Bill has been so altered as to necessitate such an amendment. Nevertheless, I am not convinced that the Bill has been or, even if all the proposed amendments were adopted, will be amended in such a manner as to warrant a change to its title. Therefore, I will not put this motion in amendment to the House.

[*Translation*]

The House will now consider Motions Nos. 2 and 7.

[*English*]

Mr. Cassidy: Madam Speaker, I rise on debate on Motions Nos. 2 and 7. I regret your decision, although I accept it, not to allow Motion No. 10 to be considered. That was the motion which seeks to change the title of the Bill to the Canadian Public Ownership Termination Act. I felt that was particularly apt—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): If I may, I now realize that the Hon. Member is on debate. It would be proper for me to put the motions to the House.

Both motions stand in the name of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North who is not in the House. Therefore I need unanimous consent for the motions to be moved by another Hon. Member. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): May I have an indication from the New Democratic Party as to who will move the motions?

Mr. Cassidy: I will, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Mike Cassidy (for Mr. Orlikow) moved:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 6 by striking out line 27 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"those votes to not more than five".

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 8 by striking out line 18 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"shares of the Corporation up to a maximum of forty-five per cent of voting shares."

He said: Madam Speaker, these two amendments which have been grouped go to the heart of the Bill. The first amendment is designed to limit foreign ownership in Air Canada shares to 5 per cent of the voting shares instead of the 25 per cent which is being permitted in the proposal put forward by the Government.

The second amendment which is contained in Motion No. 7 asks for, in effect, a limitation of the number of shares which the Minister can sell or dispose of to 45 per cent. The reason for this amendment, if I can begin with it, is very simply that we are trying to keep the Government to its promises, even if only partly to its promises.

You will recall, Madam Speaker, that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) himself, after meeting with the president of the Québec Federation of Labour, back in January, 1985, gave assurances that Air Canada was not and is not for sale. In order to try to keep the Prime Minister from appearing to have failed to have spoken the truth, the Government decided to sell only 45 per cent of Air Canada, a decision which seems to me probably gives us the worst of both worlds. Madam Speaker, may we have order in the House, please?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Order, please.

• (2040)

Mr. Cassidy: The Government then decided that government shares would not be voted, but that effectively the owners of the 45 per cent of the shares that were to be sold to the public would be able to dictate the future of Air Canada, and there would be no voice at all for the 55 per cent of the shares left in public hands. On top of that, the Government designed a Bill which does not embody the 45 per cent pledge. Madam Speaker, with respect, the Hon. Member for Duvernay (Mr. Della Noce) insists on wishing to have the floor. I am not sure if the rules would give him the floor, but I would suggest that order be called again, or the Members who wish to have conversations take them somewhere else.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Order. There are many conversations going on, and it makes it very difficult for the Chair to hear the Hon. Member who has the floor. I know that it is getting late, but the Chair would appreciate a little more discipline in the House, if at all possible. The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy).

Mr. Cassidy: I did not necessarily expect to have the full attention of members of the Government, but I was finding that your attention was becoming distracted, Madam Speaker, by these other conversations. As a matter of fact, I will speak to some of my friends from Québec.

[*Translation*]

I will speak to my friends of Quebec who are colleagues but belong to the Progressive Conservative Party. They supported the Bill which is aimed at selling 45 per cent of Air Canada shares but which will lead to total loss of control over the company because the shares held by the Government will not be votable shares, nor will they impart any sense of direction at all.

Madam Speaker, the proposition here was to make sure that at least the Government would not be allowed to sell off the whole company, that the sale would be restricted to 45 per cent of the shares. The oral promises of this Government inspire precious little confidence because they have so often been broken.

Madam Speaker, the credibility of the Government is on the line. Therefore we need legislation to make sure that if the Government says that no more than 45 per cent of the company is to be put on the block, then the sale of shares will indeed be limited to 45 per cent.

[*English*]

I would also point out that there is a very real danger that the control or the direction of the company will be taken by an American airline which will decide that Air Canada will become a junior version of Air America. There will be bases and maintenance in Canada and some type of head office operation in Montreal, but if 25 per cent of the ownership is allowed to fall into the hands of foreign owners, what is to stop a foreign airline from integrating Air Canada's operations with its American operations to the point where Montreal becomes a weigh station on a hub and spoke organization of air routes around Syracuse, New York, rather than around Montreal and Toronto; where Minneapolis or Denver become a spoke rather than Calgary or Edmonton? This is the type of thing that I fear we may see with the allowance of foreign ownership up to the level of 25 per cent.

Yesterday we saw the sell-out of the country by the Government in the free trade agreement that the Prime Minister struck with his good friend, Ronald Reagan. I note with interest that the last good friend of the Prime Minister's good friend, Edwin Meese, has resigned under yet another cloud of scandal and—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grisé: A point of order, Madam Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary on a point of order.

Mr. Grisé: Madam Speaker, I would suggest that the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) is straying far off the motion under consideration which has to do with the privatization of Air Canada.

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Considering the danger that Air Canada may be Americanized because the Government's Bill provides that 25 per cent of Air Canada shares may be acquired by Americans, our amendment to Motion No. 2 sets a 5 per cent limit on the maximum number of shares which may be bought by foreigners and non-Canadians.

Madam Speaker, I am moving that specific amendment because this Government puts more faith in President Reagan and in all the Washington Republicans, it puts more faith in those people than in the men and women of Canada.

We New Democrats believe that Air Canada must remain under full Canadian control. It is a good company which has been providing outstanding service in this country for 50 years. As we see it, there was no need to privatize, particularly such inefficient privatization in terms of—we are not talking about a cat or a mouse—owing to the fact that only 45 per cent of the shares will remain in the private sector but that full control will be in the private sector.

What is the point of the Government hanging on to 55 per cent of Air Canada if it does not have the kind of managing authority which under normal circumstances any owner of 55 per cent of the shares of a company would have?

[*English*]

Those are some of the concerns that we were trying to address with this particular amendment. We want to take the Government at its word and ensure that, if the Government is not selling more than 45 per cent of the shares, there is a legislative assurance that the people of Canada will retain majority control. We as a Government would be prepared to use that majority control when we become the Government, which I hope will be in the next election.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cassidy: I would say to my friends and erstwhile colleagues from the Progressive Conservative ranks, "look to your seat-mate because one of the two of you will not be in the House of Commons after the next election".

An Hon. Member: You won't be around.

Mr. Cassidy: I will be around, Madam Speaker. I undertake that Ottawa Centre will remain as a New Democratic seat, and I will stay there. The Liberal Party is so anxious that it has put two candidates up against me and it can only run one. It does not realize the old rule of politics.

I would also point out that the partial privatization, as its called for—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Member for London Middlesex (Mr. Clifford) on a point of order.

Mr. Clifford: It is very clear that the privatization of Air Canada is something on which the Government has acted very wisely and the people of Canada and, most important, the employees of the firm want. I wish the Hon. Member would stick to that particular argument.

Mr. Cassidy: No one in the House, Madam Speaker, not even I, could recognize the intervention of the Hon. Member as a point of order.

Apart from the airline pilots, the unions at Air Canada representing the workers have not supported privatization. In fact, they have opposed the privatization. The only group that is for privatization is those workers whose average incomes are two or three times that of any other group of workers in Air Canada. They are entitled to their views. I believe that they should look at the situation of the sale and deregulation of airlines in the United States. In the airline industry it was thought that this might be a benefit to the employees. In fact, there have been sharp cut-backs in salaries and working conditions for the workers. Many workers have been laid off. Some of those airlines which have been around for 40 or 50 years have been merged and have now disappeared.

Mr. Clifford: Are you talking about Air Canada?

Mr. Cassidy: I am talking about the airlines that have gone through the process of deregulation in the United States.

Mr. Clifford: Let's talk about Air Canada.

Mr. Cassidy: I would point out that the same thing that happened to the airlines in the United States is what is liable to happen to Air Canada. The two British airlines now merged have together lost almost half of their workforce. I do not think the employees of Air Canada would like to see a sharp drop in jobs and job security or a reduction from jobs that currently are decent jobs to jobs that pay $7 or $8 an hour. The Conservatives may think that this country can prosper when every worker in the airline industry is paid $7 or $8 an hour. Workers at that salary level cannot buy goods and services. We are going to take our country down with this kind of proposal.

• (2050)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Member for Portneuf (Mr. Ferland) on a point of order.

Mr. Ferland: Madam Speaker, I feel the NDP Member is pushing a bit too far this evening, and shows no respect for Air Canada workers.

Air Canada workers clearly stated they supported privatizing Air Canada, they were all for becoming owners.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Order, please. That was not a point of order. That was debate. The Hon. Member will have an opportunity to enter into it later on if he so wishes.

The Hon. Member's time has expired.

I now recognize the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Hudon).

Mr. Hudon: Madam Speaker, I would invite the Hon. Member opposite to join his group outside, those who oppose free trade, who walk around with small umbrellas, small chinese shoes, woollen socks, who oppose—

I am beginning to understand why last month Madam Speaker—this was one of the few Bills I kept for my election campaign—when an Hon. Member proposed to enshrine property rights into the Canadian Constitution, they all voted against that. They will have to explain that at some point in time, because that is what they are afraid of.

Those people are strict supporters of nationalizing almost everything. When he suggested earlier that private sector corporations, former Crown corporations that are now in the private sector, were thriving corporations, it is because they were feeding on Government money. They were feeding strictly on Government money, and today Air Canada as you very well know has come to a crossroads, because if it is to expand, it will need huge investments that will have to come from Canadians. That will belong to Canadians. But they absolutely oppose all private ownership. Very soon, we will have to ask them if they feel that even bank accounts or what-have-you should belong to the State.

Madam Speaker, those were recorded votes and all NDP Members who will run under that banner in Quebec will come and explain that to Quebecers. I will write articles on that, I will fight my election campaign on that. Common property belongs to all. They are here strictly to undermine other people's credibility, Madam Speaker.

There is a lockout in my constituency, at the Expro Company. For some four months an NDP backbencher has been simply destroying the credibility of that company, because they want it to belong to workers in order to do the same "ruddy" business. They are destroying—

Mr. Cassidy: And rightly so!

Mr. Hudon: Go and ask workers at the Expro Company tomorrow morning if they are ready for the NDP diversification plan. No way! They won't have any part of it. They are going to vote now to go back to work because a settlement is underway, and don't worry, you won't have them on your side. Because you have been undermining and wasting their livelihood day after day, without proving to the Secretary of State any of the allegations.

But you, because you speak in the House of Commons, you assume nobody is listening. In the end they will know what is being said in the House of Commons. They are not idiots. Expro workers are not idiots. Canadians and Quebecers who support private ownership are not idiots either.

Go and join your small Chinese shoe wearers opposite! Go out and shout for an election! We are ready to fight an election campaign on free trade.

[*English*]

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Madam Speaker, I want to say a few words on Motions Nos. 2 and 7.

With respect to Motion No. 7, let me point out that I can see the merit in the motion put forward by the Member from Winnipeg. In the announcement of the privatization of Air Canada, the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) said that only 45 per cent of the shares would be sold. This was trumpeted as being a headline item in the Government's announcement, yet we see nothing about it in the Bill. The Government is being somewhat hypocritical by saying in its announcement of Air Canada's privatization that only 45 per cent of the shares would be sold while in the Bill, which is the governing vehicle for the actual privatization, there is nothing mentioning that all.

With respect to Motion No. 2, the motion is not exactly as stated by the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy). The amendment as put forward does not actually refer to the percentage of shares to be held by non-residents. That is in another subclause of the same section. The amendment mentions when the voting takes place and how many non-resident votes will actually be counted.

I can sympathize with the position taken by my colleague from Ottawa Centre. However, our Party feels a definite obligation to the Government in one particular way. The Government did not include any provision in this Bill originally to indicate when the votes take place at annual meetings of the corporation how many non-resident votes will actually be counted.

The situation is that 25 per cent of non-government votes of Air Canada could be held by non-residents. The problem is that at an annual meeting the 25 per cent held by non-residents could be 50 per cent or more of the actual votes that would be cast at the annual meeting.

My amendment to the Bill in Motion No. 1 provides that at the annual meeting of the corporation no more than 25 per cent of the votes actually counted would be non-resident votes. This means that at the most only one-quarter of the votes counted at an annual meeting can be votes of non-Canadians. It prevents non-residents actually winning the day at the meeting. Because the Government agreed to that motion, I feel we are honour bound to go along with it. We feel it may not have been the best provision but it is one the Government accepted. It is somewhat in keeping with the provision in Bill C-121, and it is much better than not having the motion at all.

In that regard we feel the Bill has been improved considerably. Therefore, we are not going to ask for a further amendment.

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox—Powell River): Madam Speaker, the debate has certainly taken an interesting turn tonight. Before we head out we should recognize that Air Canada is one of the finest airlines in the world, one of the safest, and one of the best to fly. It is a source of enormous pride to Canadians. That probably resulted in the statement by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) that Air Canada was not for sale. It is certainly with regret that I as a Canadian and other people now find that it is on the block. Air Canada is on the block in a very difficult way, in a way that many people do not understand. There is an option for Americans to purchase it as well as other non-residents.

There is quite a long history to privatization of Air Canada. When the previous Government was in power, a committee studied the deregulation process in which the privatization of Air Canada came up and was quite widely supported by that Government. Things have now come full circle. The present Government now intends to sell Air Canada. In my opinion this Bill should have been called "an Act to make Max Ward happy" or "an Act to make PWA happy".

Throughout the history of the discussion of the privatization of Air Canada it is key that no other airline can operate effectively in this country unless it hobbles Air Canada. It is such a powerful, effective competitor in the market-place that it dominates the airline business in this country. People who have been here for a number of Parliaments have heard airlines protest that they must hobble Air Canada to get a fair share of the market. The sale of the shares is a very disturbing item and that is what this amendment comes to. This very prestigious airline was built by the people of Canada and operated on behalf of the people of Canada. It is internationally recognized as a tremendous airline. This airline is now up for sale. Instead of being held by all Canadians, it will be held by a small number of Canadians. In fact, a majority of the actual controlling shares could be held by Americans, and that is extremely disturbing. It does not make any sense.

• (2100)

I would urge the Government to reconsider its position. What is the point of selling those shares in the United States market and jeopardizing the control of that airline? This must be stopped.

The other irrational aspect of this sale is that 45 per cent of the shareholders, not the 55 per cent owned by the people of Canada, could wind up being very closely held shares. Those closely held shares could in fact control the company. I wonder what would happen if others who have interests in other airlines in Canada were to purchase substantial blocks of those shares. Again, that would make a very interesting proposition that has to be considered.

What is the state of Air Canada? Air Canada is a very large airline. It has a great mix of airplanes. Canadian Airlines International rationalized its fleet into DC-10s, 737s, and a new 767. However, Air Canada will likely have to cut back on airplanes. It will likely have to rationalize its equipment and downgrade it so that it can reduce its enormous stock and its costly overhead and training programs.

Of course, the end result of that in private hands will be an enormous loss of jobs. That will happen, whether it will mean fewer people in the cockpit or fewer people doing maintenance on a limited variety of aircraft. Indeed, this will become a very lean airline. It only makes sense that if it is cut free in the private sector in a deregulated environment, a lot of people will lose their jobs. That is the reality of the structure of the airline.

What is the market in which the shares will be held? Air Canada will be competing in the private sector against two other major airlines as well as many regional airlines. It will have trouble selling the shares. The employees may want to buy them, but look at the stability of the situation in which they will be buying them. This Parliament will change and it will be a very different Parliament after the next election if we read the trend of the polls correctly. I suspect that there will be a majority of Members in the House who will want Air Canada held as a national carrier. The people who are buying shares in that kind of environment will be very concerned about the stability of the shares.

Market conditions for airlines change. The fluctuation in the number of people flying is enormous. As interest rates go up, profits will be eroded. Airline travel will drop and there will be fewer people flying, fewer profits, and a great deal of uncertainty. Those shares will be likely to drop substantially in value when they hit the market.

Another area of concern is the directorship of Air Canada. I personally believe that this Government has hobbled the Board of Directors of Air Canada and has limited its ability to function rationally in the airline market-place. I think it has inflicted great harm on that company to date, and I along with other people certainly regret that.

Again, the prognosis is that the airline will cut its number of aircraft, it will cut its routes, it will cut its employees, and it will cut its inventory. Down the road, we will see a much smaller operation with a great number of people losing their jobs. Again, this airline will lose its position as Canada's national carrier, and it will lose its position and reputation in the world community.

The Bill before us tonight is downgrading a thing of great pride to Canada. It is turning a major public asset and utility into the hands of very few people, to the detriment of the transportation system of Canada and indeed to the detriment of Air Canada's reputation.

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Madam Speaker, Air Canada has served this country for over 50 years. It has been an extremely reputable airline, as the Hon. Member who spoke previously said, and it has certainly provided a standard in aviation services to which many of its competitors have aspired. More important, Air Canada has been a symbol of a public commitment to the provision of air service to a country which has a very diverse geography and through which air travel is extremely expensive and difficult. Air Canada certainly was the pioneer.

It is with sadness that I participate in this debate today. I do not think Air Canada should be privatized nor do I think any part of it should. This rather peculiar arrangement of having 45 per cent of the shares sold and 55 per cent held by the Government is not necessarily one which, in my view nor in the view of my Party, will serve the interests of Canadians.

The two motions before us now are obviously attempts to preserve some integrity in this Bill at least with regard to Air Canada's shares. The motions deal with the percentage of shares that can be held by non-residents, as well as with the percentage of shares to be disposed of in the public market.

On the matter of foreign ownership, it is extremely concerning that not only is this a move by the Government to privatize this airline but in fact it is a move to de-Canadianize it in a very specific way. It de-Canadianizes it by allowing the number of foreign-owned voting shares to be up to 25 per cent. This motion proposes that that figure should be reduced to 5 per cent to prevent the eventual takeover of Air Canada by non-residents.

The Government has indicated that 45 per cent of Air Canada's shares will be sold and that the remaining 55 per cent will be voted passively by the Government. In essence, the shareholders of the 45 per cent will dictate to the 55 per cent what will be done. The 25 per cent of foreign-owned or non-resident owned shares will be a part of that 45 per cent. Clearly, it is not in the interests of Canadians to have our national airline, the people's airline, controlled by foreign interests.

The 25 per cent limitation exists because, as I understand it, that is the limit the United States puts on foreign ownership of its airlines. However, the 5 per cent proposed in this amendment would be reasonable and would greatly improve upon this legislation, because it would ensure that we do not run the risks that were outlined in committee by Professor Fred Lazar, a transport economist at York University. He pointed out several areas of concern. Eventually, with the high percentage of non-resident ownership, we could see diversions of flights that might serve particular areas of Canada.

As we have seen with deregulation in the United States and as we are beginning to see in Canada, a diversion of services is often a diversion away from the less profitable areas, the more remote areas of Canada, those areas where air transport in some cases is essential or in some cases is the only mode of transportation. That would be the case for some of the far northern areas.

Those of us who live in more remote areas of Canada are very sensitive to the possibility of seeing the principle of serving the entire country including more remote locations undermined by having control taken away from the public sector and also by having potential control over the airline by non-residents who would obviously not have the interests of Canada—

Mr. Redway: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As the Hon. Member knows, the Bill deals with the privatization of only 45 per cent of the shares of Air Canada and 55 per cent will be retained by the Government. Therefore, the comments of the Hon. Member with respect to foreign ownership and control of Air Canada are completely out of order and irrelevant to the issue at hand. I would ask you to rule that the points being made by the Member are out of order.

• (2110)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In a Bill as complex as this one a ruling on the question of relevancy is rather difficult. Many Members have spoken on different aspects of the Bill, and I am sure that if the Hon. Member wishes to enter debate and disagree with what an Hon. Member is saying, he can do that a bit later.

Ms. McLaughlin: Clearly, Madam Speaker, what is being discussed here is the incremental aspect of a percentage of foreign ownership. The motion clearly suggests that this potential would be drastically reduced if the percentage were reduced to 5 per cent of the shares. That is the crux of the argument. I well understand, as I have already said, that it refers to the 45 per cent of the shares held by the public.

Another aspect of this Bill that I would like to comment on is Section 8 which leaves the percentage figure as it stands now entirely open. It could be 1 per cent or 50 per cent. The amendment would hold the Government and subsequent Governments to the promise that only 45 per cent of the shares would be sold. Of course we heard initially that Air Canada was not for sale. Now half of it is for sale or it will be partially privatized, but what is important about our amendment is that it simply confirms the statements the Government has already made. The 45 per cent would be specified in the legislation.

If the Government is going to control actively its 55 per cent as proposed and place its majority of directors on the board, then Air Canada's management will still have to respond to the public policy agenda I referred to earlier, which most Canadians want from a Canadian airline that serves all areas of the country. Unfortunately, I feel that under privatization we are going to lose that.

I think it is extremely important that this House think carefully about what is being done both in limiting the amount of foreign ownership, as Motion No. 2 proposes, and in specifying the 45 per cent public ownership in the Act as well. Therefore, I urge this House to support these very reasoned amendments.

I suppose for most of us they are second choice amendments because they are still directed to privatization. However, they would greatly enhance the Bill and ensure that at least some part of Canada's airline would remain under control of its people.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Madam Speaker, one of the difficulties with duty night is that I have to sit and listen to representatives of the NDP. Do people understand what they are saying here tonight? The Liberals used to have a truth squad. Maybe they would like to reconstitute that organization to follow the NDP around. These people are giving out misinformation. When I am not on duty I can get up and shut off the television and do important work, but here I am on my duty night faced with a steady diet of these people telling us untruths.

Let me just set the record straight. What is this whole thing about foreign ownership? Let me understand what they are saying. Possibly we can get these people into a little seminar and bring in someone to explain the provisions of the Act. A maximum of 25 per cent can be foreign owned under privatization. Where is the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), the transport critic for the NDP? I am sure he would bring this to their attention if he were in the House. Airlines in Canada must be controlled by Canadians.

What is the basis of this amendment? They talked about the idea that somehow this privatization poses some threat to our national airline. Quite the contrary. This privatization will ensure a stronger, more vital airline to serve all Canadians. This has nothing to do with whether it is owned by the Government or the people of Canada. We will still have the same strong airline.

Mr. Skelly: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The truth somehow affects New Democrats in a very strange way.

Mr. Skelly: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Chair could instruct the Minister that giving misinformation in this House is a very serious matter. When he uses the facts and figures that he is using, that is misleading the House. With 25 per cent, a single American purchaser would control the airline under the terms laid down in the legislation. Could the Minister please give the correct information in the House?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I think the Hon. Member is starting to debate again, which he did very artfully a little earlier today. He might want to do it later but this is debate.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Madam Speaker, I want to get on to the question of safety and the NDP suggestion that somehow privatization will negatively affect the safety of airlines, specifically Air Canada, I suppose. What kind of suggestion is that? Are they not aware of the fact that this Government brought in revisions to the Aeronautics Act? Are they not aware that for the first time in 62 years this Government updated and brought into legislation brand new regulations for all airlines?

Mr. Skelly: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, this is again a matter of a reputable member of Cabinet providing Members of the House with precise information. The new regulations are in effect, but the Government has cut the staff of people who enforce those regulations and the industry is not safe—

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): That is a joke.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): My comments are the same as they were 30 seconds ago.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Madam Speaker, I never correct the Chair, but you said something about an artful intervention. I do not believe it is artful; it is an intervention purely and simply without foundation.

I want to point out to the Hon. Member and the House that all airlines are controlled by rigorous regulations under the Aeronautics Act. This is not a question of privatization. That is totally irrelevant to the question. I would have thought that the NDP, who march to the orders of union leaders in this country, would want to listen to the employees of Air Canada, members of unions. They are overwhelmingly in favour of this Act. They understand the flexibility, the new dimensions, and the new opportunities it gives the company.

• (2120)

Canada is not acting alone in its privatization program. The socialist friend of the New Democrats, Mr. Mitterrand in France, presided over a substantial number of privatizations. I did not hear New Democratic Party Members standing up on statements and motions, beating their chests, and denouncing President Mitterrand and the socialists in France for not stopping the privatizations in that country. Why the double standard?

We are trying to do something sensible and reasonable here. We should defeat these amendments with alacrity, if not sooner.

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Madam Speaker, I always thought it was the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) who told jokes in this House.

The intervention of the Minister was rather remarkable, but not in a very favourable manner. First, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said that Air Canada was not for sale. After a few years he decided that that promise was no longer operative and said that they would only sell 45 per cent of it. This Minister has now stood in the House and said that if only 25 per cent is foreign owned it does not mean that it is foreign controlled. If we trust the Prime Minister's word, only 45 per cent is going to be sold. If 25 per cent can be foreign owned, by most people's mathematics five-ninths of the shares that will be offered to the public could be in the hands of a foreign group. The Government itself has set up this arithmetic.

In addition, the Government has said that for the time being the 55 per cent that will remain in the public domain, again if we trust the Prime Minister, will be in a silent partnership, that it will follow the lead of the other 45 per cent.

I realize that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) has never been the Minister of Finance, probably for good reason. Perhaps the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) can get up later this evening and explain why 25 per cent is not a majority of 45 per cent and why that 25 per cent cannot do as it wishes with the shares it has. The problem of the poor Minister of Justice is probably that he has not done very well in math over the years.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: It was my best subject.

Mr. Murphy: That is something I would not admit. The Government is trying to pretend that what it put in the legislation and what it said to the public are not what it put in the legislation and what it said to the public. It is obvious that foreign domination of Air Canada will be possible. The Government has set that up by its very statements. That is very obvious to anyone listening this evening. Why would the Government pretend otherwise? Why would the Minister of Justice try to pretend that that is not what is in the legislation and that that is not the result of the various ministerial statements, including those of the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) and the Prime Minister on this very important issue?

We are putting our amendments forward and explaining why they are important to us. We know full well that our amendment provides for the limitation of foreign ownership to 5 per cent. We do not pretend that it says anything else, yet the Government pretends that what it has in the legislation is not there. There is something very sad about that approach.

It is very logical to me that, if the Government means what it says and is going to allow only 45 per cent of the shares to be privatized, as the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister have said, it should say it in the legislation. We believe that the legislation should say what the Government says it means to do.

We find it very ironic that every attempt of the New Democratic Party to put the words of the Government into legislation is refuted by the Government. Is it afraid of its own words, or does the Government once again not mean what it is saying? Three years ago it was not selling any of Air Canada. Now it is selling only 45 per cent. However, it will not allow that to be put in the legislation because it might be forced to live up to its word.

We are trying to help the Government by putting the words of the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Bouchard) in the legislation. Our position is that we do not want to privatize any of Air Canada. However, we recognize that due to the numbers in this House the Government will eventually get its way on this legislation as it does on most. Therefore, we at least want the safeguard of having in the legislation that which the Government has promised.

We feel the same way with regard to foreign ownership. We have been assured that there will not be foreign control of Air Canada. The Minister of Justice has just used his convoluted math to explain why there will never be foreign control. Yet, the very fact that 25 per cent of the shares would be allowed to go into foreign hands means that there would be effective foreign control. Again, if the Government means what it says, why does the legislation not say that?

The pensioners heard one thing in the 1984 election campaign, and the Minister of Finance broke that word only a few months later in the spring of 1985. One must wonder whether the pensioners would like to see legislation which contains what the Government says. They would have loved to have seen the promise made during the 1984 election campaign that the Conservatives would not deindex the old age pension in legislation. They know that less than nine months later the Minister of Finance, with the support of the Prime Minister, broke that promise.

Earlier tonight we dealt with legislation dealing with the privatization of Eldorado. The workers of that company were told by the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mrs. McDougall), the then Minister responsible for privatization, that they would not lose any of the pension benefits they had before Eldorado was privatized. Only two days ago we received information that that was no longer the case, that the new corporation would not guarantee the pension benefits which workers had prior to the privatization despite the words of the Minister of the Employment and Immigration.

Motion Nos. 2 and 7 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) are in amendment to the legislation to privatize Air Canada and do not attempt to do something revolutionary. We are only trying to ensure that the Government lives up to what it said, that there will be no more than 45 per cent privatization and no foreign control of Air Canada. I find it amazing that the Government is afraid to put into legislation the words it has uttered in this House.

• (2130)

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to support the amendments moved by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow). Air Canada exists for a very good reason. One does not have to fly from Newfoundland and Labrador to Victoria to understand why Air Canada exists. It exists for exactly the same reason as the CBC. It is one of the structures in Canada that is necessary to hold the country together and provide services which would not be available to Canadians if it did not exist.

Canadians understand that perfectly. Not long ago I had an opportunity to travel to Sydney and Cape Breton. I was quite surprised to learn that there was no longer an Air Canada DC-9 service from Halifax to Sydney. Instead, I believe there was a Dash-8 service in its place, which creates horrendous problems for many Canadians with mobility difficulties. I thought there was unanimous agreement in this House that no Member on any side of the House wanted to see a reduction in services for disabled Canadians. A key issue which arose in the Special Committee on the Disabled and the Handicapped and was reflected in the recommendations made in the *Obstacles* report that Members on all sides of the House supported was that it was absolutely demeaning for an individual who required a wheelchair to gain access to an aircraft only to have that access by a fork-lift truck.

Mr. Redway: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This is the debate on report stage, not second reading debate on the principle of the Bill. I hope you will draw the Hon. Member's attention to that fact. His remarks should be relevant to the amendments before the House rather debate on the question of principle that was dealt with at second reading.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I realize that the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway) has sent a message to everyone in the House. However, the Chair has been fairly lenient tonight as everyone has gone a little beyond the scope of the motions.

However, I would still ask the Hon. Member to keep his remarks as close as possible to the motions before the House. The Hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Young).

Mr. Young: Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway) has made so many interventions that he may as well have made a 10-minute speech. The House would have found that to be of much more value than his interventions.

I believe I am talking to the amendments because they clearly indicate that if they are not accepted by the House, the privatization of Air Canada will mean a reduction of services to Canadians. There is absolutely no question in my mind that if this Bill is not amended according to these proposed amendments reduction in service will occur. I believe my comments are entirely relevant. Of course, I accept your admonition that I should be a bit careful in order not to attract the wrath of the Hon. Member for York East, but I think the problems that this Bill will create without those amendments will mean tremendous hardship for a substantial number of disabled Canadians who require a wheelchair in order to have accessibility.

I have no idea why the Hon. Member for York East would object to our talking about the problems that that segment of the population will face if these amendments are not adopted by the House. Furthermore, the refusal of these amendments will also affect the issue of the one fare policy that has been with the Government for some time now. That is a policy whereby the CTC made a commitment to allow an individual who was unable to travel alone to have an attendant travel with him for the price of one fare. I suspect that this policy issue is being held up by the CTC because it wants to see this Bill passed. I further suggest that without the adoption of these amendments I doubt very much we will see that policy established at Air Canada or any other air carrier in this country.

I repeat that Air Canada exists to be a unifying force across Canada. If it is privatized, I suspect that management will cut out routes that may not be profitable because they cannot make a dollar. That will affect many communities in Canada.

The other day I spoke to a person who told me that it was more expensive to travel from Toronto to Newfoundland than from Toronto to Florida. Air Canada told me that it was more expensive because the volume of people travelling between Toronto and Florida was greater than from Toronto to Newfoundland. When management begins making decisions based on private enterprise rather than on public policy, one can well imagine what will happen to airline traffic in many communities that are now served by Air Canada because other private operators will not service them.

According to Angus Reid polls the majority of Canadians support Air Canada. As a matter of fact, the figures are quite dramatic. Angus Reid found that 63 per cent of Canadians believed Air Canada was well run, as opposed to 20 per cent who thought it was not well run. The same kind of popular support applies to CBC for exactly the same reason. The CBC is a unifying force in Canada and provides a service to many communities that is not provided by private networks.

The Hon. Member for York East asks about Canada Post. Seventy-two per cent of the respondents said that Canada Post is not well run. Angus Reid did not need to ask Canadians about that. He could have simply asked Members of Parliament, who would tell him that Canada Post is not well run.

Mr. Skelly: The Tories are running that.

Mr. Young: The Tories are running Canada Post. Imagine what will happen with Air Canada.

Mr. Redway: They run Air Canada too. That is why it is so popular.

Mr. Young: I want to give the Hon. Member for York East an opportunity to give us the benefit of his wisdom rather than sit there chipping away at other Members. I am sure the Hon. Member for York East will want to look good back home and, given the nature of his constituency, will want to be critical of what the Government is trying to do to Air Canada. If he knows what is good for him, in the next election he will oppose what the Government is trying to do to Air Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Garneau (Laval-des-Rapides): Madam Speaker, I wish to speak on the two motions now under discussion, No. 2 and No. 7, which deal with the percentage of Air Canada shares that the Government could sell and with the percentage of voting shares that could be held by non-residents, respectively.

Madam Speaker, with respect to the amendment proposed by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North limiting the shares that the Government could sell to 45 per cent, I wonder why the Government Members did not agree right away to this amendment, since it is in complete conformity with what the Deputy Prime Minister said in documents issued by the very Government presenting this Bill, saying that the intention was to sell only 45 per cent. If that was the intention, why not put it in the Bill? Madam Speaker, this is all utter hypocrisy. Because the Leader of this Conservative Government had promised not to privatize Air Canada, he had to find some way to get out of his commitment without losing too much face. And what did they find? They came up with this discrepancy between the Bill and the press releases. The press release said that it would be only 45 per cent and for that reason, the Prime Minister could say that he did not lie to the people, he did not privatize Air Canada, he only sold 45 per cent. But the Bill presented by this Government allows the Minister to sell 100 per cent. So I would just like to ask the Government and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) to put their money where their mouth is.

• (2140)

If it is true about the 45 per cent, why don't they put it in the Bill? And if it is not true, why not admit it? Anyway, Madam Speaker, I think this whole debate about 45 per cent of private ownership versus public ownership, as well as the 5 per cent vote instead of 25 per cent, is a tempest in a teapot, because this Parliament and this Government have presented and passed on second reading Bill C-130, where it is said in section 8, and I will read it to you, Madam Speaker, in order to show you how foolish this Government is. Section 8 of Bill C-130, passed on second reading, says:

> 8. (1) Notwithstanding anything in any other Act or law, in the event of any inconsistency or conflict between
>
> (a) this Act, or any regulation made under this Act, or the Agreement, and
>
> (b) a provision of any other Act of Parliament or of any regulation within the meaning of section 2 of the *Interpretation Act*, other than a provision as enacted or amended by Part III or IV of this Act . . .

Mr. Grisé: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I am sorry . . . The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary on a point of order.

Mr. Grisé: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We have no doubt that the member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau) can read at a relatively fast pace. But I don't see why it is relevant here to read sections of Bill C-130 on free trade, an excellent Bill by the way, initiated by our Government, in relation with amendments 2 and 7.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): If the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary can be patient, I am sure the Member for Laval-des-Rapides will show us the connection.

Mr. Garneau: Because the length of speeches is limited to 10 minute maximum, Madam Speaker, we have really very little time to say anything. However, if the Hon. Member paid very close attention and followed my explanation which may be a little difficult for him to understand, I suppose he could see the connection between what we are doing and what we are debating, even the unamended clauses in Bills C-129 and C-130. The clause I have just read is practically a constitutional clause which invalidates any legislation which may have been passed before this one, so that when Bill C-129 is read a third time and finally adopted, we might as well throw it into the waste basket, because clause 8 of Bill C-130 which was given second reading and which is now in committee invalidates all provisions which might be inconsistent with other adopted legislation.

Madam Speaker, Part IV which amends the Foreign Investment Review Act will allow investments up to $150 million in 1992, and the Government will not be able to control these investments. Because the equity of Air Canada may vary, in view especially of the very complex indexation formula, this could reach much more thant 25 per cent of the total shares of the new privatized Air Canada which could be held by non residents. So the Government, both in Bill C-129 and the legislation concerning Eldorado which was considered earlier, is pulling our legs, because this other legislation will erase all that.

They showed great understanding for Canadian interests by saying: There are clauses in there—the clause which limits to 25 per cent the number of votes by non residents, and a little later, as soon as they pass the steamroller on Bill C-130, they will stand up and say that all these clauses meant absolutely nothing. Madam Speaker, the House should adjourn as soon as possible to prevent this Government which has no respect for the basic values developed in this country over the past 100 years from making further blunders such as this.

Mr. Grisé: Madam Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on what was said by members of the socialist Party and my colleague the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau). The Hon. Member for Comox—Powell River (Mr. Skelly) said that, in the event of privatization, Air Canada would lose its pride. We were also told that . . .

[*English*]

There will be a loss of jobs. I would like the Hon. Member for Comox—Powell River (Mr. Skelly) to remember what the NDP said. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) is in the House right now; he is the greatest Minister of Finance that Canada has ever had or will ever have.

An Hon. Member: What about Mr. Crosbie?

Mr. Grisé: When the Minister of Finance issued his first Budget, the NDP said that we would lose 200,000 jobs in Canada with the first Conservative budget. Well, so far the Government has created 1.3 million jobs.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

. . . 1,300,000 jobs, and that's not all, Madam Speaker.

Those who say that privatization of Air Canada will lead to a loss of jobs should also refer to previous cases of privatization. How many jobs were lost at de Havilland, Canadair and Bombardier?

An Hon. Member: Good work, Richard, you're getting on their nerves!

Mr. Grisé: That's privatization, but the socialists are against it.

The Liberal-NDP coalition is slowly emerging. It is a wonderful sight, Madam Speaker.

The National Transportation Act states very clearly:

[*English*]

The National Transportation Act requires an airline to be 75 per cent Canadian owned and to be Canadian controlled in order to obtain a licence.

[*Translation*]

The National Transportation Act clearly states that Canadian airlines must be 75 per cent owned by Canadians.

I was listening earlier to the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) who is having some trouble with his calculations since he figured out that 25 per cent of 45 per cent of shares is five-ninths. I don't understand how . . . Since the Minister of Finance and a finance critic are in the House, they could maybe explain to me . . .

[*English*]

How can 45 per cent be a majority? It would come up to five-ninths like the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) said a few minutes ago. I have a little problem with that.

An Hon. Member: That is only one of your problems.

Mr. Grisé: You have more problems than I do. I am not talking to you, Madam Speaker. I am talking to the Member for—

An Hon. Member: That is unparliamentary.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Maybe the Hon. Member was not speaking to me, but he should.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grisé: Madam Speaker, I will continue to address my comments to the Chair, of course . . .

Mr. Gauthier: In a more clever fashion, I hope.

Mr. Grisé: I beg your pardon. Especially after the day we went through yesterday, going third reading, to Bill C-72 which remains an historic event and one which all the people in my riding of Chambly support just as the Bill authorizing the privatization of Air Canada.

I was listening to NDP Members . . . Madam Speaker, I am not allowed to refer to this—but how many of them attended the legislative committee on the privatization of Air Canada? Did they hear the comments made by Air Canada management? Did they hear the comments made by Bob White's colleagues? Of course they heard of them, Madam Speaker—but they didn't really hear them, they read them, because all the comments made by the socialists in tonight's debate are a rehash of the comments made by the representatives of certain unions and Bob White's allies on the subject of the privatization of Air Canada.

• (2150)

On the other hand, no mention is made of the Air Canada Employees' Committee on Share-Buying which appeared before our Committee. And how many of them are in favour . . .

Some Hon. Members: Name them!

Mr. Grisé: . . . they have confidence in their Parliamentary Secretary, Madam Speaker, which is why Ministers can get away from their job.

[*English*]

The Ministers have confidence in their Parliamentary Secretary being able to manage the House for the time remaining.

[*Translation*]

No, no, he's a good guy. The Member from Châteauguay (Mr. Lopez) is an excellent MP, of course, just like the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark), the Minister in charge of political functions on the South-Shore and in the Montérégie region.

I could also make a few comments on motion No. 7 in the name of the Member from Winnipeg.

[*English*]

The motion as presented is defective. The corporation issues shares and, once issued, by definition 100 per cent are owned by the shareholders who purchase them. This is the case whether 10 shares or 20 million shares are issued. To be operative the motion would have to identify a specific group to which the limit would apply, i.e., for example, non-residents.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, I would also like—when they talk about the famous 25 per cent they forget to mention that this is 25 per cent of shares not held by the Government; we are not talking about 25 per cent of all shares but 25 per cent of unheld shares. In other words, 25 per cent of 45 per cent. Not bad, it works out to between 11 and 12 per cent. So it is very unlikely that anyone holding 11 per cent of the shares would gain control over a company. Is that what they are trying to tell us?

One thing for sure is that the socialists are scared stiff of foreign investment. They will not have foreign investment . . .

[*English*]

No foreign investment in Canada, except in Oshawa! There can be hundreds and millions of dollars in foreign investment, U.S. investment—what a shame for the socialists—but it is not welcome in Canada, except in Oshawa!

Mr. Cassidy: The Hon. Member wants to sell Air Canada to the Americans.

Mr. Grisé: With respect to Motion No. 2, what could result is that 25 per cent would be owned by non-resident interests but only 5 per cent of the shares could be voted. Therefore, non-residents would be denied the fundamental right of share ownership, the right to vote.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, in both instances I strongly suggest that the House reject these two amendments.

[*English*]

Mr. George Baker (Gander—Twillingate): Madam Speaker, I have a couple of words to say with respect to the motions before the House. I do not know why the Government will not accept the principle of these amendments. As the representative of the Official Opposition pointed out a few moments ago, they represent only what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) had promised. It was only what the Government had promised prior to the announcement that we see in this particular legislation.

We have to be very careful of the Government of Canada. It is comprised of the very people who said: "No, no, we are not going to sell Air Canada". It is just like they said that they would not close down the Newfoundland railway. They also said: "We are not going to do anything to all your marine services in eastern Canada". Yet, what did they do? They introduced a Bill similar to this one here today creating Marine Atlantic.

We were not careful enough when that Bill went through. We were not careful enough because now, today under Marine Atlantic, one cannot even get a cabin crossing the Gulf from Newfoundland to North Sydney, Nova Scotia. The reason for that is that there is not one on the boat. One has to be very careful when one deals with a Bill presented by the Government of Canada, especially when we talk about shares, controls over what happens to a Crown corporation, and what happens to the service after it is disposed of.

The Government has sold the hotels that one could stay at. It has closed down the Newfoundland railway. It is selling the tracks to Venezuela. It has changed the CN service to Newfoundland so that there is no ferry in the middle of the night. It is now selling the telephone company. It is selling Terra Nova Telecommunications.

The Hon. Member here in the back will also be able to say that it is selling the telephone company in northwestern Canada on bids. This is a part of the privatization policy of the Government of Canada with no concern for the people using these services at all. There was no Bill introduced into this Chamber with respect to selling the telephone company. It just passed it along to some friends it might have in CN and said to CN: "You select some people to sell the company concerned". What does one do? The company cannot be rolled over within three years. In other words, it cannot be sold within three years by the successful bidder.

That is no protection at all for the communities or the people who are using that particular service. That is quite a record, is it not, Madam Speaker? It closed down the railway in Newfoundland. The tracks are being transported, presumably, to Venezuela eventually. It changed the marine service so one cannot get a cabin on the night crossing. It has sold the hotels that one used to stay at. That was all done within a four-year period. It is now selling the CN telephone company. We now have a Bill before the House which would authorize the sale of the airline company.

What else is there left to sell? The Government has sold everything in the air. It has sold everything on the ground. It has sold everything on the water. After it has sold the telephone company. What is there left to sell?

The people of Canada will make sure that with the next election there will be no more sales by this Government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask whoever is representing the Government House

Leader at this point to tell us what the legislation will be for tomorrow. I understand that there has been some change in the proposed legislation to be offered by the Government already this evening. If I could have some information, it would be helpful to all sides of the House.

[*Translation*]

So if the Government spokesman would give us some information concerning the House business for tomorrow we would be very grateful.

Mr. Grisé: Madam Speaker, I take note of the question of the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray). I will immediately advise our Deputy House Leader and he will be getting in touch with the House leaders of the other Parties at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Prud'homme: It does not make sense!

[*English*]

Mr. Cassidy: I rise on a matter of privilege. I want to say how my privileges have been expanded and enlarged in the House tonight by the unusual presence of spectators from all across Canada who came to see us in action, and I want to say "thank you" to them.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre is not new to the House and should know that the Speaker is the only one to recognize people in the gallery.

Mr. Lewis: As I was about to say before I was so rudely interrupted, we have discussed matters with Members respecting Bills that are very important to the West. Tomorrow we will do the appropriate stages of Bill C-92, report stage; Bill C-131 to committee; and Bill C-112 to committee.

• (2200)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It being 10 p.m., I do now leave the Chair until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 10.03 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, July 8, 1988

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

[*English*]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has divided Bill C-103 into two Bills as Bill C-103 Part 1, an Act to increase opportunity for economic development in Atlantic Canada, to establish the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts, and Bill C-103 Part 2, an Act to establish the Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts and . . .

[*Translation*]

. . . and that it has passed Bill C-103, Part I, without amendments.

[*English*]

For the benefit of Hon. Members, copies of the two parts of Bill C-103 are available at the table.

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wish to address a brief point of order to the Message from the Senate. I advise the House that the Government, and I think every Member in the House, should take exception to the proceedings in the other place which are reflected in the message you just read.

First, the message which you have just put before us contains not the Bill that this House voted to send to the Senate but two Bills by virtue of the fact that the Senate split the Bill. To me, that means that there are two Bills originating in the Senate rather than one Bill being sent to the Senate and a reply being sent back addressing the one Bill.

There are financial provisions in the Bill that was sent to the Senate. I suggest that it is unconstitutional for the Senate to send Bills to us which have financial implications.

I suggest that the Royal recommendation which was contained in the original Bill sent to the Senate has been breached by the Senate majority. I also suggest that the Senate amendment to split the Bill, by not having an accompanying recommendation which is a constitutional impossibility, breaches our Standing Order 87 which states that the Commons alone can grant aids and supplies, not the Senate.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, in your position as our Speaker, to indicate in a ruling, if you will, your position on this matter. It is no longer hypothetical, it is very real. If you would do so, the minute you do so, we will then be guided by your wisdom and will be in a position to take action in the House.

That is the procedural argument. I cannot let this go without saying that I feel that it is not beneficial to Atlantic Canada to have the Senate interfering in this way. The Western Diversification Agency deals with four provinces and it was passed by the Senate as one piece of legislation. This piece of legislation deals with the Atlantic Provinces and the Senate is excluding one particular area. For that reason, we are unable to go ahead with the legislation.

I think that what the Senate has done is an affront to Atlantic Canada. It is an affront to the House of Commons. I think it is an affront to every taxpayer in Canada. I ask you, Sir, to rule on this as soon as you can.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, the affront to which the Deputy House Leader referred has been made by the Government, not by the Senate. This Government tried to attach to a Bill that was to be primarily for the financing of important regional development projects in Atlantic Canada a portion that had absolutely nothing to do with the development of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. The Bill for the development of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency is for the development of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and should not involve any other subject. Yet the Government put in a completely separate section to do away with the industrial development division of the Cape Breton Development Corporation. That was completely separate from what it wanted to achieve with the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency.

• (1010)

This is an affront to Atlantic Canadians. The Government chose to put a rider on the financing of the projects that Atlantic Canada deserves. It said that if Atlantic Canada wants this Bill, then it has to do away with the development division of the corporation. That is not fair. The people of Atlantic Canada cannot accept that rider because it is devastating to an area that needs assistance most of all.

The Government said that if the development division is done away with another agency will pick up the slack. That is not the case. Yet the Government maintains this Bill should not be separated. The Bill has to be separated because it is two separate subjects. It is not a question of new financing for the development division provisions at all. We are doing away with that division. The Government is not providing something new, it is doing away with it.

Mr. Boyer: It has already been passed as a single Bill in this House.

Mr. Speaker: I am going to ask the Hon. Member to complete his remarks in a moment, but I want to make it very clear to Hon. Members and the watching public what I have been asked to do here. A Bill has gone from this place to the Senate. The Senate, for whatever reason, and it is not my place to comment on that, certainly not at the moment anyway, has decided to split that Bill. That, I understand, is historically speaking unusual to say the least. What I need to know from Hon. Members is their argument as to whether it is procedurally appropriate for the Senate to do so. I have been asked by the Government to comment on whether or not it is procedurally appropriate to accept a split Bill back from the Senate, and I would like some argument directed to those two points.

I am not saying at the moment I have any particular opinion on it one way or another except to say this is certainly something unusual. The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys could perhaps help the Speaker.

Mr. MacLellan: Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly acceptable for the Senate to split this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacLellan: What the Senate is saying is that it wants the people of Atlantic Canada to have the benefit of the provisions governing ACOA.

Mr. Boyer: What is your procedural argument in support of your position?

Mr. MacLellan: Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have the nincompoops howling, I am not going to be able to make the point that you want made.

Mr. Speaker: Without necessarily accepting the description of the Hon. Member, I will ask other Hon. Members to be quiet and hear the Hon. Member out.

It seems to me that because the Bill originated in this place, the question of whether it should be accepted back as split by some other place is the issue I have to face. The substantive arguments, which I know are very important to Hon. Members on both sides, are not helping the Chair very much.

Mr. MacLellan: Mr. Speaker, I think essentially the principal point here is that there is nothing in this Bill which has come back to the House that was not in it when it was passed by the House initially. Nothing.

Mr. Boyer: Then why split it?

Mr. MacLellan: The Senate wanted to send back the provisions relating to the title of the Bill. The benefit intended under the Bill has not been changed in any sense. All the Senate has done is delete the portions related to the Cape Breton Development Corporation which have absolutely nothing to do with the spirit of ACOA. Nothing whatsoever. It was a complete red herring. It was an attempt by the Government to try and piggyback the destruction of the development division of the corporation onto this Bill, believing that Atlantic Canada wants regional development assistance so much that they would accept the devastation of the corporation as well. It was a catch-22 situation that the Government tried to perpetrate on the people of Atlantic Canada.

The Senate is saying that we should call it what it is, a Bill for the development of ACOA, nothing more. The provisions governing the spirit of the Bill have not been violated. All that has been taken away is the clandestine aspect of the Government's intention to devastate the Cape Breton Development Corporation.

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the sentiment of the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan) with respect to what the Senate is trying to do and the concerns that the people of Cape Breton have over the Government's ill-conceived move. Having said that, I must state that we cannot accept any move by the Senate to fundamentally alter legislation in a procedural way which destroys the ability of this House of Commons to make decisions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Murphy: Despite the applause from across the way I am going to continue.

If the Senate is allowed to do this, we could be stuck with legislation in the future where the Senate has decided to split it into 15 or 20 or 30 different pieces in a way that would completely hamstring the House of Commons and democracy. I suggest to the Speaker that the Government should just move back to its original Bill, have the motion come back to the House, and then send it back to the Senate again.

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants): Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with my hon. friend from Churchill (Mr. Murphy). I am absolutely amazed my hon. friend from Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan) whose geographical base has obviously blinded him to any sense of reason. The House of Commons makes the laws. We democratically decide to put things in Bills or remove things from Bills. We had Bills here yesterday which did not find favour with all Members. This is the House of Commons and these things are done here. We do not go to the place down the hall

and hide behind the skirts of the Senator from "Lake Anno", or whatever you call that lake up there in Cape Breton. I am just absolutely shocked as a Nova Scotian that this could happen. I was hoping that the ACOA legislation would be in place before the bureaucracy and administration has to close down and thus put in jeopardy many of the applications which will provide jobs in Atlantic Canada. That is what will happen if the Senate keeps playing tic-tac-toe with Bills from this House, especially this Bill.

I have the highest respect for my hon. friend from Cape Breton personally, but for him to stand here on a Friday morning and suggest that the Senate can do anything with the Bills that this democratically elected place sends it and then hide behind the skirts of the Leader of the Liberal majority, the Senator from "Lake Anno", was too much. I could not believe my ears.

Obviously the Hon. Member for Churchill is completely correct. We do not accept something back from the Senate in a half-baked way. Let MacEachen play his little games. His myopia over Devco has put in jeopardy the whole ACOA program for Atlantic Canada and even he should not be able to get away with it and we should not condone it for one more minute.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1020)

Mr. MacLellan: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to supporting the Hon. Senator from the other place up by the lake, but I certainly would not want to support the Hon. Member for Annapolis Valley—Hants (Mr. Nowlan) who, as evidenced by his arguments, is up the creek.

The arguments of the Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) and the Member for Annapolis Valley—Hants go to the very foundation of the Parliament and the Constitution of this country. When the Constitution was first developed it called for two Houses of Parliament, the House of Commons and the Senate. The Senate was set up to look after the regions of this country. The seats in the Senate were allotted in accordance with the regions of the country.

There is no better example of the Senate acting in the interests of a region of this country than the Bill which we are presently discussing. To say that the Senate cannot split this Bill is to say that the Senate cannot act for the regions of the country and that the Senate and Senators from Atlantic Canada cannot act for Atlantic Canada. To say so would be in violation of the Constitution of the country.

Mr. Speaker: I will ask the Hon. Member to assist the Chair further. Is the Hon. Member saying that having split the Bill, as the Senate has apparently done, this House must accept it in the split form? Is that the suggestion?

Mr. MacLellan: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am saying that this House does not necessarily have to accept the second portion. However, I submit that the House should accept the portion which has been returned to the House because it is in complete agreement and complete fidelity with the intention of the Government in proposing this Bill initially.

The Government presented this Bill in order to set up the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. That has not changed. The provisions relating to the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency have not changed one iota. All the provisions which the House passed have been returned intact by the Senate. The intention of Bill C-103 was to provide the vehicle for the operation of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, and that has not been changed.

What has been taken out of the Bill is the clandestine attempt by the Government to jeopardize and devastate the Cape Breton Development Corporation, which was not the original intention of the Bill. That is not a fundamental principle of this Bill.

Whether the House should accept the second portion, if there is a second portion returned to the House, remains to be seen. That depends upon the content of that second portion, upon whether that second portion relates to the Cape Breton Development Corporation. We will not know that until we see that second portion. However, this portion is in complete agreement with what the Government intended when it presented this Bill to the House of Commons and I think it should be accepted.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member. The Hon. Member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby).

Mr. Howard Crosby (Halifax West): Mr. Speaker, I will begin by reflecting on your own suggestion to Members of the House that this was a matter of process and procedure, that is to say, we have to be certain that the proper procedure was followed in the House and in the Senate in dealing with the Bill approved by the House of Commons. I will address that point and then indicate how it reflects on other points.

When the Bill was before the House of Commons Members of this House, including the Members in the Liberal Opposition, and especially the Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan), had the opportunity to seek the approval of the House for any amendment they wanted to make to the Bill. If Members of the Opposition in the House of Commons, or indeed government Members, thought the Bill dealt with two separate matters, thought the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency ought to be separated, they could have taken the appropriate action. If they had taken such action it would have been voted upon. The answer would have been given in this House of Commons and the House of Commons would have spoken on the matter.

The House of Commons, having approved the Bill in that form, having decided that it dealt with one and the same matter and was in proper form, presented it to the Senate. What right do the people in the other place have to say to this House of Commons: "You have done the wrong thing, you

have not followed proper procedure, you have not followed the processes of Parliament"?

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, those in the other place do not have that right under any statute of which I am aware, including and especially the Constitution of Canada. They are exercising a political judgment which is not given to them to exercise by the Constitution of Canada. I am as shocked as is my colleague from Annapolis Valley—Hants (Mr. Nowlan) that the Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys would endorse that political action by the Senate of Canada.

He sought the vote of the people of Cape Breton. His colleague, the bard of Lake Ainslie, did not. He elected not to seek the vote of the people of Cape Breton to send him to the House of Commons. He opted to accept an appointment to the Senate of Canada. Yet, he still wants to govern and influence policies of this House of Commons from that place. It is time he was exposed.

You have to deal with processes and procedures and with the technicalities, Mr. Speaker, but you should know that behind this is the ill motive of people in the other place who seek to undo the work of this House of Commons. They seek to destroy the initiative of the Government in developing the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and a similar agency for industrial development on the Island of Cape Breton. They are jealous of that initiative and seek to destroy it. They are hiding behind technicalities which you, Mr. Speaker, must reject out of hand.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys for a final reply.

Mr. MacLellan: Mr. Speaker, in reply to my friend from Halifax West, the Senate is not seeking to destroy anything. The Senate is taking the provisions of this Bill which relate to the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and putting them in a Bill which relates to the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and does not include other subjects. It is putting in a separate Bill the subjects which were inappropriately and wrongfully included in this Bill, those subjects relating to the Cape Breton Development Corporation.

We have seen in the portion of the Bill that has been returned to the House that the sections relating to the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency have not been changed, amended, or in any way misconstrued. How can that possibly be construed as changing the Bill? It has merely put it in the form in which it should have been originally.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether, through you, I could pose a question to my friend from Cape Breton—The Sydneys who says that there has been no change, that they have just divided the Bill. The Member fully appreciates the state of this House and fully knows what happens to Bills when Houses are dissolved.

We have been thrown back from the Senate and Lake Ainslie a Bill which has split the two functions of one Bill which we have democratically passed. That will cause delay in getting the Bill concluded, passed, and proclaimed in order that we will have a legislative framework to do what the bureaucrats are doing now and which is being put in greater jeopardy the longer it remains without a legislative framework. If we move on one part of the Bill and leave the other half alone and this House dissolves, does the Hon. Member not believe that could result in a fundamental legislation change?

• (1030)

If the Bill is divided to deal separately with Cape Breton Corporation and ACOA, and the House dissolves, the legislation will be fundamentally dead. My friend is trying to pretend that that is not a fundamental change to a Bill that was passed by a majority of this House.

Mr. Speaker: Ordinarily, the Chair probably would not extend this discussion any longer, even though a very experienced and much respected Member has asked to put a question to another Member through the Chair. However, this is a unique and very interesting point. I will exercise my discretion and hear the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys, but very briefly.

Mr. MacLellan: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your latitude in this matter. The Hon. Member for Annapolis Valley-Hants has asked a very important question. The answer is straightforward.

The Government presented a Bill to set up and structure the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. The Senate studied this Bill and considered the intent of the Government to set up this agency. It took that portion of the Bill relating to the agency, dealt with it very quickly and returned it for consideration of this House as fast as I think could possibly be expected.

The Government wants to set up the agency. Presumably, it wants to help regional development in Atlantic Canada. It now has the portion of the Bill that will accomplish that. Nothing has been taken from the Bill that would frustrate the Government's wishes in that regard.

I think the Senate has acted responsibly. We will adjourn shortly for the summer and the Senate has given us that portion for passage. I think it has acted very responsibly.

Mr. Gerald Comeau (South West Nova): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I served on the committee that travelled throughout the East Coast of Canada. We went to St. John's, Newfoundland, Cape Breton, Halifax, Summerside and New Brunswick. Throughout all the meetings, one Liberal showed up in St. John's, Newfoundland, to hear from people of St. John's. We went to Cape Breton. One Liberal—

Mr. MacLellan: A point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for South West Nova may be relating events exactly as they occurred, but I think I am

anticipating the point of order of the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys when I say that I must point out that that is going beyond the procedural matters I have to consider.

I will consider this matter very carefully. I believe there are several issues I have to consider. One is whether or not it is even for the Speaker of the House of Commons to rule on what takes place in the Senate. The second is to look carefully at the obligations of the Speaker in a case like this with respect to the integrity of legislation which is passed in this place and leaves here for the Senate. I will be considering carefully the implications of a situation in which it was acceptable for the Senate to split Bills that leave this place after the Government and this place have decided to deal with them in the form in which they were presented.

The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys has put forth a vigorous argument on the substantive aspects of the situation. Those are arguments that no doubt took place here and may take place again if this place is considering the Bill further.

However, I have to consider the procedural implications of what the Senate is trying to do.

The Hon. Member for Annapolis Valley-Hants raises a very interesting aspect. It is one thing for the Senate to split a Bill in half, but if it can split a Bill into pieces and this House has to deal with it in that form, the effect on the time that would be taken is, of course, clearly evident.

Those are matters that I shall consider. I will return as quickly as I can to try to give some guidance to the House. I thank all Members for their interventions.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

AIR CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Thursday, July 7, consideration of Bill C-129, an Act to provide for the continuance of Air Canada under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares thereof to the public, as reported (with an amendment) from a legislative committee, and on the motions of Mr. Orlikow:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 6 by striking out line 27 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"those votes to not more than five".

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 8 by striking out line 18 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"shares of the Corporation up to a maximum of forty-five per cent of voting shares".

Mr. Speaker: I should advise the House that we are debating Motions Nos. 2 and 7. I will recognize Members for debate.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak to Motions Nos. 2 and 7. There is no doubt that Canadians want a national airline. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) knew that before the last election when he said that Air Canada was not for sale. The drafters of this Bill also knew that is what Canadians wanted because the Bill only allows 55 per cent of the shares to be sold.

However, the Government is using smoke and mirrors and trying to play a shell game with Canadians. While the Government will keep 55 per cent of the shares, it will vote in accordance with the wishes of the 45 per cent private shareholders. Furthermore, 25 per cent of those private shares could be controlled by foreigners, leaving a real possibility that Air Canada could be controlled by foreigners.

Consequently, Motion No. 2 seeks to establish that foreign ownership of Air Canada shares be limited to 5 per cent rather than 25 per cent. The Government has only mentioned 45 per cent, and Motion No. 7 would require the Government to put that figure in the legislation so that we know what it means.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The question is on Motion No. 2 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 7 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 14(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

• (1040)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The next two motions are numbers 3 and 5. They will be voted on separately. May I have consent that the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) can move the motions for the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow)?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Mike Cassidy (for Mr. Orlikow) moved:

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 6 by striking out line 34 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"sauga, which centres shall maintain their staffing levels equal to those attained in the 1987-88 financial year; and".

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 6 by adding immediately after line 37 on page 33 the following:

"(f) provisions specified that the six bases for Air Canada flight attendants at Montreal, Halifax, Calgary, Winnipeg and Toronto be maintained with the staffing levels of each equal to those of the 1987-88 financial year as a minimum standard."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if it is possible by consent to add the word Vancouver in Motion No. 5 but there was a drafting error when this motion was submitted. I would like to at least register the fact that the amendment was intended to refer to the six bases for flight attendants at Vancouver, Montreal, Halifax, Calgary, Winnipeg and Toronto that should be maintained. Only five were specified whereas the number six was used. It would be understood that the amendment was intended to include Vancouver as well.

The purpose of Motions Nos. 3 and 5 is to seek to be more concrete about guarantees with respect to employment and to the bases for flight attendants. We have been told the 55 per cent government shares will not be voted but will be passive, and, therefore, the decisions will be made by the new private owners. Under those circumstances even though there is a reference to the maintenance bases in Winnipeg, Montreal and Mississauga being maintained, there is no guarantee that the employment at those bases will be maintained.

The airline is now anticipating the large purchase of new airliners. It is understood those may well be Airbus planes from Europe. If that is the case, not only do we not know whether there will be any Canadian production as a part of that or a condition of that would be the case with Air Canada being publicly owned, but there is a strong likelihood that the maintenance requirements will shift. It is quite open to Air Canada to keep five or six mechanics with a couple of wrenches working in Winnipeg and say that is the Winnipeg maintenance base, basically shut it down and concentrate the maintenance in Mississauga or in Montreal upon the purchase of these new airliners.

At the very least, reference to the maintenance bases is made in the Bill but with respect to the bases for flight attendants there are no provisions at all that those bases be maintained.

We know, for example, that Canadian Airlines International, formerly CP Air, has closed its flight attendants base in Montreal. Canadian Airlines International is shifting its base because of the view held in the airline industry that Montreal is not a good place to have attendants based. It may be more efficient just to have flight attendant bases in Vancouver and in Toronto, but it also means that the prospects of working for the national airline, if it is privatized, will be best for people living within 75 miles of Toronto or Vancouver.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, this may particularly affect young men and women in Quebec who want to work for Canada's national airline, Air Canada, but who will find that they will be asked to move to Toronto or Vancouver. If we want Canada's national airline, Air Canada, to continue to reflect the variety and diversity of our population, including the fact that we are a bilingual and bicultural country, it will be much more difficult if Air Canada decides to shut down its flight attendant base for the men and women who work on its planes. That also concerns us.

[*English*]

It was suggested yesterday, and wrongly, that the unions are supporting the privatization of Air Canada. That is not so, Mr. Speaker, except for the pilots who have indicated some support and who belong to the smallest of the unions representing workers with Air Canada. It is also the case that certain employees have talked about the possibility of shares, but that is on the understanding that if Air Canada is to be privatized they would have as employees a chance to have some share

ownership. That does not mean that collectively they want Air Canada to be privatized.

I have the brief submitted from the Canadian Automobile Workers representing some 3,200 employees. They note that Air Canada has already been trying to replace $14 an hour Air Canada employees having 20 years service with brand new $6 an hour employees for its non-unionized regional carriers. Many of the CAW employees are ticket agents and most of them work at reservation offices in airports and communities across Canada. These people are good, efficient, and part of the very fine service that we have come to expect from Air Canada, 75 per cent of whom are women. The contract they have has no provisions for job security and there are no provisions for job security in this Bill. They are worried that Air Canada has plans for base closure but as long as Air Canada is a public airline, and in danger of public outcry, it would back off. If Air Canada is privatized, they suspect that many of these bases will have reduced levels of service. As well there is the prospect of unstable schedules and loss of income to the community.

The machinists union representing some 7,000 or 8,000 workers, 8,500 in maintenance, ground service and accounting are also categorically opposed to this move. They found it particularly repugnant that Air Canada's senior management has been running a million dollar campaign to convince its employees, the members of the union, of the dubious merits of privatizing Air Canada. For all the money and effort Air Canada is expending, all it can offer its workers are big promises and equivocal denials.

The third union is the Canadian Union of Public Employees. CUPE represents some 3,500 flight attendants at Air Canada. They will be affected if Air Canada decides to closes the flight attendant bases. They say that they stand opposed to Bill C-129 and its underlying philosophy and say that it is bad legislation and bad policy.

On behalf of those three unions, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure how unequivocal or how much more definite they can get. For members of the Government to say the employees want that is simply not the case. With respect to job security, which is the issue addressed in one of the two amendments we are debating right now, CUPE points out that while some maintenance bases are guaranteed, there is no guarantee of the volume of work or the number of jobs at the maintenance centres. A private board of directors is in no way restrained by Bill C-129 if it decides to transfer large numbers of employees from its Montreal or Winnipeg bases to Toronto. This is inevitable as Air Canada decides to buy aircraft of a completely new generation from a different manufacturer.

[*Translation*]

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is even possible that half of the Montreal maintenance base will be shut down and that the work will be transfered to the Mississauga base close to the Pearson Airport in Toronto.

[*English*]

For flight attendants, there are no guarantees in the legislation for any of our bases. As one New York based investment analyst has said, it is only a matter of time: "Eventually Air Canada will have to address the question: Does it need as many employees as it has?"

Just as has happened with British Airways, Air Canada employees who run a good, efficient airline, a profitable airline and a competitive airline are saying: "What is going to happen?" We will get American style airline management coming in, bottom-line management, cut, chop, slash maintenance bases stripped of everything except their name possibly in Winnipeg and in Toronto, flight attendant bases being shut down and the level of service being degraded overwhelmingly. The Americans, 10 years after doing it in the United States, are saying that their service is worse. People are fed up with the delays and the quality of service which is much less. The same thing is likely to happen here.

When the unions oppose this deal, when they seek guarantees on behalf of their employees they are trying to maintain a quality of service to which Canadians have become used. Anyone coming back from the United States knows what a pleasure it is to return here and what a pleasure it is to have the standards of quality and service that we have on Canada's airlines, both public and private. People know that is something worth valuing rather than something to be thrown away the way the Government is doing.

• (1050)

I very much hope that these amendments which are designed to preserve not just job security but quality of service for the passengers of Air Canada will attract the support of members of all Parties.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of these two motions. This is our chance in the House of Commons and in the country to safeguard a great many of the employees of Air Canada who quite possibly will be losing their jobs in great numbers if privatization goes ahead. That point has been made with respect to the maintenance base in the city of Winnipeg. It is mentioned in the Bill that this base will be maintained. However, I think it has to be accentuated that this base not only has to be maintained but maintained in its present strength, and that there should not be just a corporal's guard of employees in the city of Winnipeg in this facility. That has to be made known to the Government. It has to be emphasized. As Canadians we must have the assurance that this will take place.

Also in the city of Winnipeg is a very valuable and very smooth operating financial centre which is not guaranteed in this Bill and which should be guaranteed in it. The people of Winnipeg and western Canada have the right to expect that that financial centre will remain in the City of Winnipeg.

It has been the history of Air Canada to maintain six crew bases throughout the country in Vancouver, Calgary, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal and Halifax. This is something which was done by Air Canada while a Crown corporation. The staff members and crew members on the airplanes have come to rely on Air Canada maintaining these six bases. If Air Canada decides to close these bases, which it very well might, then imagine the disruption this will cause to these people who have been living their working lives in the cities that will no longer function as bases for Air Canada. There is quite a prevalent rumour that Air Canada will close four of these six bases leaving only the bases in Toronto and Vancouver.

[*Translation*]

It is necessary, Mr. Speaker, that Air Canada obtain the assurance of the Government of Canada and of the general population that it will stay in Montreal, which is a base for Air Canada employees, and that there will be no staff cuts so that that base can continue to function normally. Those are obligations that Air Canada must respect.

[*English*]

In all of the cities in Canada where these bases exist we are not only talking about the bases themselves but about the employees who work on them. I believe that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister is sincere in his determination that these bases will remain. I give him full credit for that. I commend him on his attitude because I know he feels as I do and as most Members of the House do that there are obligations to people.

My only concern is that this message be loud and clear and that the obligation be inviolate as far as Air Canada is concerned.

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I also want to speak for a few minutes on these two amendments and explain the importance of them. Especially in the city of Winnipeg the need to maintain a maintenance base is very important to the economy of that city. As you know, Mr. Speaker, in the past there have been moves to take away a lot of business from Winnipeg by the previous Liberal Government with respect to the maintenance base. That had a devastating effect not only on the economy of the city but on many families who either lost employment or who were forced to move.

I would also like to explain how important these amendments are in light of what has happened in other situations in which the Government has maintained operations without closing them down. I will give a very dramatic example of the military base at the community of Churchill in my riding.

Before I was born there was a very strong military base at Churchill with thousands of people employed at that particular site. What happened over the years is the Government said: "No, we are not closing down the base." But the operational strength went down to 300 people. A few years later it went down to 200 people. Eventually, it went down to a situation in which there were only 12 people at the military base in Churchill. The Government could say: "We did not close down the base at Churchill." Obviously, it was keeping a skeleton crew there which was not able to do the regular maintenance.

The Government has said that it will keep operations in these various cities, whether it is with respect to flight attendants or the maintenance operations. However, there is no guarantee that these maintenance people will be doing anything more than cleaning up the seats and, perhaps, doing some very minor work.

If the Government is sincere in its commitment that these communities will maintain the maintenance and overhaul facilities and maintain the staff components for the flight attendants, then we want that written into the legislation. As we know, a promise was made in 1983 in which it was expressed that we would not even sell Air Canada. That became a different promise by 1985 when the Government said that it would sell only 45 per cent of Air Canada. Who knows what the Government's situation will be two years from now and how good a verbal promise is.

If the Government is sincere in its promises to the city of Winnipeg and to those other cities, then why not put it in the legislation? I hope that the government Members will stand up for the words of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) and put their words into the legislation to secure the jobs of those people.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The question is on Motion No. 3. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 5. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed to the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

It being 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 19(4) the House will now proceed to Statements by Members pursuant to Standing Order 21.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—POLLUTION CLEAN-UP

Mr. Jean-Luc Joncas (Matapédia—Matane): Mr. Speaker, on June 3, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) announced an action plan with a budget of $110 million to clean up the St. Lawrence. This plan covers four areas: conservation, protection, restoration and environmental technology. Today I would like to say a few words about the restoration aspect. To restore the St. Lawrence, our Government intends to clean up contaminated federal sites and rehabilitate certain wetlands. For this purpose, the Government has budgeted $21 million that would be spent more specifically on upgrading dredging technology in federal areas and rehabilitating certain wetlands along the St. Lawrence which are threatened by pollution.

Mr. Speaker, after years of neglect by the previous Government, the present Government is taking a dynamic approach to cleaning up the St. Lawrence River and making it the kind of river Quebecers and all Canadians want.

• (1100)

[*English*]

AIRPORTS

PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—INCINERATION OF AIRCRAFT GARBAGE

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, there is a thread which links Pearson International Airport to garbage and the Commissioners Street incinerator in Metro Toronto. The incinerator was ordered closed by July 1 because of fears it was spreading deadly pollutants, including lead, mercury, and dioxins. But Metro's executive committee moved to keep the incinerator open to burn the 25 tonnes of garbage that incoming planes bring daily to Toronto. Citizens for a Safe Environment are asking why they should be exposed to toxic air pollution and want the old incinerator closed.

The airport management had known of the proposed closure of the incinerator for some time but failed to come up with a waste management plan which would sort out what can be burnt and what should not be burnt. More important, airlines must play a role in reducing their refuse. A considerable step would be to replace plastic with reusable serving dishes and related food equipment and supplies.

Pearson International Airport is the place to start a sensible waste management policy. Scarce landfill sites and the effect of incineration on human health are of paramount importance!

* * *

CANADA POST CORPORATION

VIEWS OF REVIEW COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, the Minister responsible for Canada Post has set up an interim committee to consult with Canada Post on rates and services. We can clearly see the direction that this new board will take. Although the Minister says that the board will be entirely independent, as chairperson he has chosen a man with Conservative ties, Mr. Alan Marchment.

It is clear that the principal interest of Mr. Marchment and his committee will not be in providing postal service. He has said that the committee will be "sensitive" to the public. However, we have already seen a good example of his sensitivity. Mr. Marchment is of the view that a good level of postal service is dependent upon where one lives.

In a recent statement he said that while urban Canadians want door-to-door service, rural citizens are happy if they do not have to travel more than 25 kilometres to get their mail, and up North people are happy if mail is delivered once a week.

I have news for the sensitive Mr. Marchment, Mr. Speaker, and for the Government. People in the country and up North

want to get their mail regularly and daily just like the rest of Canadians. Good, basic postal service is a right for all Canadians. But I do not think we should hold our breath waiting for it from this Government.

* * *

YOUTH

GOVERNMENT'S TRADE AND LANGUAGE POLICIES—OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH

Mr. Terry Clifford (London—Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, my statement pertains to the momentous steps taken by our Government this week. A clear signal has been sent to Canadian people, particularly youth, regarding free trade and Bill C-72. The vote on the Free Trade Bill illustrated our Government's commitment to Canada's growth as a major world trader. Our businesses and workplaces are alive with innovation to meet Canada's new economic frontiers in the U.S.A. and the world.

Bill C-72 demonstrated, just as clearly, our Government's commitment to fostering the full recognition and use of both English and French in Canadian society. This is a powerful Bill which offers a great deal to Canadians and demonstrates a uniqueness of Canada to the rest of the world. The youth of today must be made aware of what their future will demand and the unique role language and trade will play in this future. Only then will the greatest good be achieved from the free trade Bill and Bill C-72.

In London—Middlesex I will work together with all Canadians to make sure that the policies and programs emanating from these Bills achieve their deserved lofty status as 21st century landmarks for Canada and its youth.

* * *

PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

PRICE OF DRUGS

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, the central reason why the Liberal Opposition fought the Conservatives' pharmaceutical legislation to the bitter end was to maintain drug prices at a reasonable and affordable level. In defence, the Government promised that drug prices would not increase. Yet, since the passage of the legislation, we have had nothing but evidence to the contrary.

Just today I received a letter from Mrs. Hollis Newman of Toronto, who listed the significant price increases that she and her family have had to absorb on a number of pharmaceutical products in the last few months: 43.9 per cent on Albalon-A Eye Drops, 50.9 per cent on Tinactin Athlete's Foot Cream, 31.6 per cent on Phisoderm Skincleanser, 68 per cent increase on Labello Medical Lip Care, 134 per cent increase on Polysporin Antibiotic Ointment, 131.2 per cent on Dristan, and 50 per cent on Maalox.

In summarizing these dramatic and inflated increases, Mrs. Newman suggests that these increases are "totally criminal". I believe most Canadians agree with her.

And as an opposition Party it is not satisfying to be proven correct because, as a result, average and low-income Canadians and senior citizens are now paying dearly for the Government's indifference and insensitivity. If the Government had any moral fibre, would roll back these unjustified increases.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ECONOMY

LES ENTREPRISES LETEL—FREE TRADE ERA

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec Est): Thanks to the federal Government's Regional Development Program, a business in my riding can now offer consumers a new food product, in response to a new trend in eating habits in North America.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, by setting up a plant for the production of fresh pasta—the pasta is refrigerated, will keep for a long time, is of superior quality and is sold in individual portions— Letel Enterprises has created twenty-five new jobs and will eventually be able to compete on the biggest markets in the world.

With these programs the Conservative Government has shown it is consistent, since with government assistance, businesses like Letel will be able to enter the new era of free trade and free markets without fear.

* * *

[*English*]

HERITAGE

PUBLICATION OF *CANADIAN WOMEN: A HISTORY*

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, the history of our nation has been a history told by men, and all too often the achievements and contributions of women have been overlooked in the telling. It is important that we recognize these contributions, for women's experience of history may be very different from the experience of men.

An understanding of that experience deepens our understanding of the development of our nation. This month marks the publication of the first comprehensive study of the history of Canadian women. Entitled *Canadian Women: a History*, the book is a result of collaboration between six women teachers and researchers.

I rise both to applaud the collective efforts of these women and also to express my concerns for the future of this kind of historical textbook under the free trade agreement.

Under the Mulroney trade agreement we no longer will be able to promote and encourage our cultural industries through Canada Council grants and subsidies and Canadian content regulation. What a tragedy it is to find the history of Canadian women, only to lose it again under the trade deal.

* * *

RAILWAYS

CARRIAGE OF DANGEROUS GOODS—SPEED LIMIT REDUCTION URGED

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, one year ago, on July 14, a train carrying hazardous material derailed in my constituency. Yesterday, one year later, I received the report of the Canadian Transport Commission investigation into that accident. The report indicated that at the time of the accident the train was travelling within the 65-mile an hour speed limit. It made no mention of the fact that just a short distance away the speed limit is only 25 miles per hour. It also made no mention of the fact that the train carried dangerous goods.

This one accident resulted in damages of almost $1.5 million. Surely it is time to reduce the speed limit for trains carrying dangerous goods through densely populated communities.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

OPINION POLL RESULTS ON EXPENDITURES

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, the Reagan plan to absorb Canada economically through the Reagan-Mulroney trade deal is now revealed to include full military integration. Southam News yesterday revealed the recommendations of a high-level Canadian task force for Canada to join the U.S. with closer defence ties and a common defence economic market.

Two-way military trade reached a staggering $3 billion last year and the task force recommended 20 specific ways to accelerate and to increase integration and continental military orientation. The Conservatives recommend an increase in defence spending of $185 billion over the next 20 years.

In May of this year Angus Reid conducted a national poll for the Canadian Peace Alliance on whether Canadians would rather spend their tax dollars on military purposes or on improved social services. By a margin of two to one Canadians prefer improved social services.

• (1110)

On whether Canada should allow foreign warships that are nuclear armed to enter Canadian waters and dock at our ports, only 27 per cent approve and 67 per cent are opposed.

Seventy-one per cent of Canadians have a positive opinion toward candidates in the up-coming election who will emphasize the importance of peace issues.

The Conservative task force recommendation to "eliminate national boundaries" in the areas of defence is not supportable. The task force blames a "strong nationalistic, protectionist, domestic, and political orientation" for restructuring the free flow of guns—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Drummond (Mr. Guilbault).

* * *

[*Translation*]

TEXTILES

POSITION OF NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, the NPD cannot decide if it wants more or less protectionism.

Tariff barriers are now an outdated way to protect the domestic market. They restrict trade and protect our industries less and less. This policy is taken from Resolution B.2.1 of the 1961 Convention and it was reconfirmed in October 1986. Thus the NDP has contradictory commitments on textiles.

An NDP candidate speaking to textile workers can say, "We will impose restrictions on textile imports in order to protect our share of the Canadian market." This is Resolution A.2.11 of the 1983 Convention.

The next day, at a conference on the Third World, he can say, "We will abolish restrictions on textile imports in order to help developing countries. This is our policy that was adopted at a convention and published as Resolution B.2.4 in 1977."

In conclusion, it is clear that the NDP is somewhere between protectionism and expanding our markets abroad, between illusory socialism and false democracy.

* * *

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SMALL BUSINESSES—BANKING FEES

Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard—Anjou): Mr. Speaker, when he announced the policy on bank charges on June 30, the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Hockin) spoke only of personal accounts and did not mention small business accounts.

S. O. 21

Mr. Speaker, this very vital sector, which creates the most jobs, was completely excluded. At the present time, small business is penalized by the banks, which charge a penalty if their customers pay with a bad cheque. Why does the Government, which uses small business in its public relations announcements, always forget them when it comes to policies to help them? Why does it always leave them out?

How long do Canadians have to wait? How many times must Canadians suffer this discrimination from the Canadian Government?

I call on the Minister to act immediately to correct this situation.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

FATAL HELICOPTER CRASH IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, the people of Kootenay West join me in expressing our sorrow and deep regret to the next of kin of the two members of the Armed Forces who died yesterday in the tragic crash of their military helicopter during a military training exercise while en route to Nakusp, in the Upper Arrow Lakes district of my riding of Kootenay West.

I have spoken to the Minister of Defence (Mr. Beatty) who has assured me that a full investigation will be undertaken, and that the results of that inquiry will be made public.

* * *

NATIONAL GALLERY OF CANADA

SPONSORSHIP OF DEGAS EXHIBITION

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): Mr. Speaker, large corporations often use sponsorship of the arts to improve their corporate image. The National Gallery has shown courage by displaying Hans Haacke's work on the relationship between Alcan's support of the arts and its implicit support for apartheid by operating in south Africa.

How ironic therefor that the Gallery's first major show, a Degas retrospective, is sponsored by United Technologies Corporation, the second largest military corporation in the United States. Its subsidiary, Pratt & Whitney Canada, has been the number one recipient of government aid under Canada's Defence Industry Productivity Program and has received $460 million since 1969.

Pratt & Whitney engines have ended up in hundreds of military aircraft sold to repressive regimes around the world.

International military contractors deal in poverty, hunger, torture, and death, for the sake of corporate profits, and no amount of arts sponsorship can make them good corporate citizens. The National Gallery should show better judgment in its choice of sponsors.

* * *

[*Translation*]

RAILWAYS

CN-DERAILMENT OF CHLORINE CAR NEAR CHAPAIS

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, yet another train derailment has occurred in Abitibi! Last July 5th, at mile 26.8 of the Chapais subdivision, north of Senneterre, a car carrying chlorine derailed. The population was not warned. CN issued no press release. All of these derailments, be they major or minor, increase the anxiety of the population and of CN employees, and they are due to gaps in security caused by the most recent staff cuts in 1987.

Mr. Speaker, these derailments are continuing. CN will have to review its security policy immediately, to improve its security checks of railway cars before a catastrophe occurs.

* * *

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—ONTARIO GRAPE GROWING INDUSTRY

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian grape growers have been sold out in the Mulroney-Reagan trade deal. They have been totally sacrificed both in the Okanagan and in the Niagara escarpment area. We learn that the adjustment program that the Government is putting forward is only $70 million in Ontario, which is less than half of what is needed for an adequate adjustment program. That is based on Ontario putting up half of that money, approximately $35 million.

Since Ontario is not a party to the agreement and is opposed to the Mulroney trade deal, it means that the farmers will receive less than a quarter of an adequate adjustment program.

If the Government is going to continue with the trade deal, I call upon it to provide an adequate adjustment program for those farmers who are facing the loss of their farms.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

POSITION OF MEMBER FOR OTTAWA—VANIER

Mr. Paul Gagnon (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, during Question Period on Wednesday the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) attacked my plan to take a Minister to court over discriminatory hiring and promotional policies.

The same Hon. Member voted for Bill C-72, not only on Wednesday but also on Thursday.

Clause 39 of Bill C-72 outlaws the kind of discriminatory practices that I find so abhorrent. The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier cannot have it both ways. Either he supports non-discriminatory employment and advancement, as stated in Clause 39 of Bill C-72, or he supports preferential treatment. Which is it? That Member should make up his mind.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

LAKE MICHIGAN—PROPOSED DIVERSION OF WATER IN UNITED STATES

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to either the Acting Minister of the Environment or the Acting Minister for External Affairs. I would like to point out that, on a day when most of the country is sweltering in above 30 degree weather, and from one end to the other most of the country is wracked with serious drought, the dramatic importance of water as an essential resource is uppermost in every Canadian's mind, yet the Government is contradictory and confusing in its responses and answers.

We would like to pose some questions to determine exactly what the position of the Government is on the very crucial issue of the proposed Great Lakes water diversion. Yesterday we heard from the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs that the Government had made representations, yet External Affairs officials cannot tell us what those representations are.

I would like to direct the following question to whomever is in a position to answer. At the ministerial level, the level of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, or the Prime Ministerial level, will the Government immediately contact the U.S. administration and clearly state that Canada will not give concurrence to any diversion whatsoever of water from the Great Lakes basin, and nip this whole proposal in the bud, and make it unilaterally clear on our side that there can be no diversions of Canadian water or water affecting Canadian rights as proposed under the Great Lakes water diversion?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member

for that question. As was stated in the House yesterday, Canada's position is, by virtue of a number of treaties, that no diversion of water can take place from the Great Lakes system without our consent. That is categorical and straightforward.

With respect to the position taken by the Government, again it was pointed out yesterday that representations have been made to American officials in Washington on behalf of Canada, outlining our concerns in this regard. I am able to report to the Hon. Member that today our Ambassador to the United States is delivering to the State Department a specific reiteration of Canada's position in the most basic terms so that there can be no misunderstanding by any person on either side of the border with respect to our position.

We have been very cognizant of our responsibilities, and we will maintain Canada's position and make it quite clear with respect to any possibility, any plan, any tentative plan, or any project which might involve water diversion.

• (1120)

CANADIAN POSITION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the fact that the Government, by today at least, has taken the action requested yesterday in the House by having the Ambassador make representations.

Considering the precedent established in 1983 when the then Government filed a reference with the International Joint Commission stating that not only was Canada to be consulted but that there could be no unilateral decision, can the Minister tell us if the note being delivered by the Canadian Ambassador makes it very clear that Canadian rights that are essential in this project must be recognized and honoured, and that there should be no consideration of this project whatsoever by any American authority because Canadians are saying no right now?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, the fact is that this is a proposal—I think it is fair to describe it in that term—with respect to diversion. I think the representations we have made today will indicate that we are very firmly of the view that nothing can happen without our consent and there is no consent forthcoming. It is as simple as that. There is no further bottom line required.

The Minister of the Environment yesterday made reference to his view of the proposal. I think we have given a categorical statement to the American authorities, and all Canadians join with the Government in our position that this is a very serious question, one about which the Government of Canada should give a very strong message to the United States.

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—REQUEST FOR SPECIFIC WATER EXEMPTION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, while the Minister is in the mood to issue strong

statements, let me pose this question to him. We are all aware of the conference that was held in Toronto last week which clearly outlined the emerging problems of climatic conditions that will cause droughts in large parts of North America. We also know that this proposed Lake Michigan diversion is only one of a whole series of efforts, attempts and initiatives by the United States, when it runs into water shortages, to export its problems to border states, whether it is Mexico or Canada.

Taking into account that we can be expecting more and more frequent attempts by the United States to solve its water shortage problems by having transport, export or diversion of water, would the Minister not now agree that it is time that he and his colleagues clearly recognized the problem? Because of the proposed agreement with the United States on trade which includes water as part of its terms, should we not ask specifically to have water exempted as a clause in that agreement so that there could be no ambiguity and no confusion in the minds of Americans that we control our water resources?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, let me say in the strongest terms of which I am capable that we control our resources. We will continue to control our resources. The question of our ability to control water policy in Canada transcends any agreement.

It has in fact been pointed out to the Hon. Member on a number of occasions that the agreement has no impact whatsoever with respect to the water resources of Canada. This is a matter which is so fundamental to our policy that we have given leadership that previous Governments have not given. I remind the Hon. Member that his Leader was the first one to raise the prospect of selling water to the United States. He should talk to his Leader, not lecture us.

MINISTER'S STATEMENT

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the appropriate Minister and has to do with the statement made yesterday by the Minister of the Environment in Question Period. He said that a diversion from Lake Michigan has nothing to do with the diversion of Canadian water or inter-basin diversions. Everyone who knows about the water system of North America knows that Lake Michigan draws its water from the Great Lakes which in turn are boundary waters. Will the Minister admit that the Minister of the Environment was wrong in making such a statement yesterday in the House?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister referred to the project as—I am not sure of the word he used—insane. Does the Hon. Member understand the meaning of that word?

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, he sure does, and that is why we think that the Minister was wrong in making the statement he made. This diversion has to do with the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes are shared waters and therefore the Minister has either to retract his words or to admit that he was wrong.

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT OF TRADE AGREEMENT

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): In the meantime, Americans are claiming that water is on the table and is part of the free trade agreement. Will the Minister indicate to this House that the Government is coming to its senses and will amend the Bill before the House to include water as one of the items that is not part of the agreement?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals should not applaud that question because the basis of the question is simply false. Who are these people they are talking about, who are these Americans who imply that the free trade agreement in fact includes water resources? This is the kind of incorrect premise of a question which allows me to say that not only are Canadians opposed to this diversion but indeed a number of senior American governmental officials are opposed to it.

The Governors of Ohio, Wisconsin, and Minnesota are very much opposed to this project. On both sides of the border there is a unity with respect to this proposal which says to any diversion project that this is unacceptable and not on the books.

This is a matter for which Canada's consent must be obtained by virtue of treaties that have been signed over the years. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the free trade agreement, and the only reason the Hon. Member raises the question is because it is Friday and he cannot think of anything else.

* * *

FUR TRAPPING INDUSTRY

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT—PETITION TO INTRODUCE LABELLING OF CANADIAN FURS

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, on June 1 this House held an emergency debate on the British proposal to label furs which may have been caught in leg-hold traps. The House held a unanimous position in recognition of the devastating effects this could have on the 105,000 employees in the Canadian fur industry, having seen what happened to the seal industry.

Prior to the Economic Summit and the visit of the British Prime Minister, the British order was withdrawn. I learned last night that Canada was had. The British really gave us the old one-two.

Speaking last night to Canada's Ambassador to the European Parliament, I learned that that Parliament has already gone through the first stages, having secured over 260

signatures, the signatures required to petition the European Parliament to pass a similar regulation to label furs. This obviously has much more devastating consequences in that it involves 12 European countries.

My question is for the Acting Prime Minister. What has the Government done to inform Members of the European Parliament about the unanimous position of this House regarding such fur labelling?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Hon. Member for her question. I can assure her and all Canadians, especially those people who are involved in that industry, that we will make as vigorous a representation to the European Community as we have to Britain. In no uncertain terms, the European Community will know our position here in Canada. This can be done in many ways, but as the Hon. Member knows, the European Community has a representative here in Ottawa and representations will be made to that representative initially, informing the representative of this Parliament's, not just this Government's, feeling on this particular situation. We will fight it in every avenue open to us.

DIPLOMATIC ACTION—POSITION OF U.S.A. AND U.S.S.R.

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, what is important to recognize is that this is a serious situation. When I talked to the Canadian Ambassador last night in Brussels, he confirmed that this is an extremely serious situation. This is an emergency situation which we cannot simply leave to discussions over a long period of time. We have to do something now.

What specific steps are we prepared to take? I understand that we will make our views known. We in the House have done so in the past. The Minister of Indian Affairs said that he would boycott some stores. I am sure that will terrify the Europeans, but we must have some plan for specific diplomatic measures with respect to the European Parliament.

• (1130)

Can whoever is responding to this question tell the House what we have done to combine our efforts with the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., the other two major fur producers? Will the Government enter into discussions with those two countries so we can present a united front to the European Parliament?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member tries to make it sound like this Government does not take this matter seriously. We do not minimize the seriousness at all. It is a very important issue. My colleague, the Hon. Member for Timiskaming, led the charge on this matter here in the House, together with the Hon. Member. We had a debate and Parliament unanimously supported our position.

In my answer to the first question I referred to the action this Government is prepared to take at present. The NDP would like to blow the whole wad right off the bat. There are diplomatic ways to handle this initially. If they do not work, there are other measures we can examine. Let us go the proper route first and not just throw everything out at once.

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT CONTACT ALLIES ON ISSUE

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, this is an emergency and we need a timetable for what the Government is going to do. The European Parliamentary Commission has the ability to make a decision about this regulation which will then become law in twelve countries.

Is the Government prepared at least to contact some of our allies, and why has it not done so already? Denmark, for example, is one of our allies in this matter. Is the Government prepared to say it will contact that country about this situation now?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the actions of this Government in the past on this matter show that we have been very successful in the measures we have taken. We will take all measures necessary to get our point across to the European Community about the importance of this issue. Our Prime Minister has probably established a better relationship with that Community than any other Prime Minister of this country. He has many colleagues and friends in that Community with whom he can confer. There are all kinds of avenues open to us.

I can guarantee to the Hon. Member and the people of Canada, especially those in this industry, that this Government will stand up for them in every way possible.

PROPOSAL HOUSE FORWARD RESOLUTION TO EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. John A. MacDougall (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the Parliamentary Secretary on the same issue. Would he be prepared to work with the other two Parties in the House to come up with a resolution by this House directed to the European Parliament, in addition to the one passed in June, stating firmly this Parliament's commitment in support of the fur industry and the thousands of workers involved?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Hon. Member for Timiskaming led the charge on this issue in the House, together with other Hon. Members. I give full credit to everyone. I appreciate the question. I think it is an excellent idea. I am prepared to discuss the matter with my House Leader with that view in mind.

Oral Questions

AGRICULTURE

DROUGHT IN SOUTHWESTERN ONTARIO—REQUEST FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture. He knows that southwestern Ontario is facing its worst drought in 50 years. The losses in corn and other crops are expected to amount to over $1 billion. Earlier this week the Ontario Minister of Agriculture sent an urgent letter to the federal Minister of Agriculture asking the federal Government to provide to those farmers in southwestern Ontario assistance similar to that provided farmers in western Canada a few weeks ago.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary respond on behalf of the Minister today and give a clear signal that such assistance will be provided to those Ontario farmers who are facing similar drought conditions?

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, certainly we on this side of the House are very proud of our record of consultation and co-operation with and support for the farmers in western Canada who were stricken by drought. As you know, there was an initial announcement of some $12 million under PFRA with respect to the supply of water. There was a subsequent announcement of $100 million to assist cattle producers who have in some cases been devastated by these drought conditions. Of course, there was an additional $53 million with respect to the production of greenfeed. All this was a result of a process of consultation and co-operation with provincial Governments and farm organizations in western Canada.

We are quite prepared to enter into the same strategy with respect to farmers and farm organizations in the areas of Ontario stricken by drought. In fact, a meeting is scheduled for Guelph on July 28 with farm organizations. In addition, there will be a meeting with provincial Ministers of Agriculture in Toronto next Tuesday and Wednesday.

We are of course willing to co-operate with the Ontario Minister of Agriculture. I note what the Hon. Member has said but I also note that the Hon. Jack Riddell has said "it is still too early to talk about that", referring to the drought and what should be done. "We are still unsure what our losses will be so there is no point in developing a program if you do not know what is needed."

CROP INSURANCE PROGRAM—REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF ENROLMENT DEADLINE

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary outlined the assistance that was provided for the disaster in western Canada of $76 million. That was exactly half of the assistance provided in the Lac-Saint-Jean by-election when the Government was facing a political disaster. That shows exactly the kind of priority that the Prime Minister puts on a natural disaster facing agriculture producers.

Yesterday the Minister said they were on top of this issue. Corn producers, whose losses are amounting to an additional $20 million a day, have asked that the crop insurance program be improved on the basis of the recommendations of the Canada-Ontario review committee last year. Will the Parliamentary Secretary, on behalf of the Minister, give a commitment right now to extend the enrolment period until the end of August so that these farmers facing losses of hundreds of millions of dollars will have an opportunity to enrol in the crop insurance program for this year?

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member refers to a certain political disaster which occurred in the Lac-Saint-Jean area in the recent by-election. I would have thought it was his Party, or perhaps even more the NDP, which suffered a political disaster in that by-election.

Mr. Grisé: That was an NDP drought.

Mr. Lewis: A moral victory.

Mr. Clark (Brandon—Souris): I would also note that the figures the Hon. Member used with reference to that by-election should have properly been attributed to the entire province of Québec because that is where they were directed.

With respect to the question of crop insurance, I would remind Hon. Members of the meeting taking place on Tuesday and Wednesday in Toronto. I believe crop insurance is on the agenda for Tuesday morning and I am certain it will be dealt with at that time.

NATURAL DISASTERS—REQUEST FOR LONG-TERM EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and it refers to the annual meeting of Ministers of Agriculture in Toronto next week.

Western farmers have been devastated by drought, as have farmers in Ontario and Québec.

• (1140)

Given these natural disasters and the promise by the Government three years ago to deal with them on a more permanent basis, will the Minister be recommending a proposal to his provincial counterparts which will establish a long-term emergency assistance program so that farmers will know where they stand with regard to government aid when they are hit by a natural disaster?

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the Hon. Member with respect to the need to approach problems of this

nature on a long-term basis. Quite frankly, I think we have been making some significant steps in that direction.

I refer, for example, to a new forage program which was not in place when we came into power four years ago. While not as many farmers and ranchers are making use of it as I would wish, the merits of that program are becoming more readily apparent with the passage of time.

In addition, there have been attempts to approach crop insurance in different ways. Studies have been done with respect to amending crop insurance to make it more responsive. One of the ways in which we might do that—although it is not a view shared by the province it may be a view shared by the New Democratic Party—is to move more in the direction of genuine tripartite.

There is no reason why agriculture should not be supported by tripartite programs, because it is a joint responsibility between the federal Government and the provinces. Quite frankly, the federal Government has been carrying its share very well in the last four years. Unfortunately, not all of the provinces have been doing as well.

FORTHCOMING MEETING OF FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL MINISTERS

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, we need to get rid of the ad hoc approach which it has been necessary for the Government to use. With regard to the meeting of the Agricultural Ministers, will that item be on the agenda of that meeting?

In addition, is the Minister going to make a proposal to his counterparts regarding the promotion of grain ethanol as an industry in Canada?

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member seems to speak in a disparaging way of ad hoc programs. I would think that most farmers in Canada are extremely appreciative of the ad hoc programs. I think of a $1 billion program in 1986-87 and a $1.1 billion program in 1988. I refer, of course, to payments under the Western Grain Stabilization Act. Many of these programs have kept the farmers operating on the land. If it had not been for them, they would not be there today.

In addition, with respect to long-term plans, there have indeed been some. I previously mentioned forage and will also mention the dairy program, a five-year program which the previous Government was not able to initiate.

With respect to crop insurance, if I recall the agenda correctly, the subject is on the agenda and will be addressed.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

SALE OF GOVERNMENT COMPANIES—SECRECY REQUIREMENT

Mr. George Baker (Gander—Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada is presently in the process of selling two telecommunications companies, each worth over $200 million, one being Northwest Telecommunications and the other Terra Nova Communications in Newfoundland. Certain questions have been raised as to the procedures being used by the Government concerning the sale.

I will direct my question to the Minister of Transport. Will he explain to this House why every bidder had to sign an oath of secrecy saying that he will never disclose any of the contents of his bid? Not only that, bidders had to sign an oath that when they visited the sites they would not tell the employees what company they represented.

Why all the secrecy? Whose interests are being protected? It is certainly not the interests of the employees and the communities affected.

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of interests which need to be protected. On such commercial bids it is commonly accepted that they have to be done with the secrecy to which my friend is referring. The first reason for that is to prevent lobbying because all bidders do not have the same ability to lobby. We consider that maintaining secrecy will not allow advantage to be given to any one bidder.

Many of these bidders are publicly traded and could be in violation of regulations. I think my friend will understand that. The arguments are relatively technical but they are for the protection of the commercial bids presented. For that reason we consider it to be for commercial use and it has to be done in the case of CN.

EXTENSION OF CLOSING DATE

Mr. George Baker (Gander—Twillingate): No, Mr. Speaker, that is not normal practice. That is unnecessarily covert. Some people would claim that the interests being protected here are the Progressive Conservative lobbyists who are representing some of the bidders for those very companies. Those are whose interests are being protected, not the employees and not the communities affected.

Can the Minister explain why the decision date of July 15 has been lifted? Who made the request to lift that date? Why is it being lifted? Is it because this House will perhaps not be sitting and the decision which has to be made by Cabinet cannot be examined publicly in this Chamber?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I consider the Member from Gander to be a man of common sense. I believe that he is very impressive at this level. I cannot make any guarantees at other levels, but at this level he could be considered to be a man of common sense. For that

reason I know that he basically agrees with me that this secrecy is the best procedure.

The reason we extended the closing date was to give all bidders—of whom I am not aware, and I am sure my hon. friend is not aware either—the chance to make site visits and talk to the employees in order to have the best chance that their bid will be successful. That is the only reason. I am sure that this Member will agree that that is common sense.

* * *

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

DEFINITION OF ELECTION EXPENSES

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Government House Leader. After the investigation by the House Committee into the allegations with regard to the election expenditures of the Member for Frontenac it became apparent that there is a very glaring loophole in our election law. At that time the Government asked us for any proposals we had with regard to election expenses, and a definition to that end.

Three months ago, on April 12, we sent the Government a letter with legal wording defining what election expenses are and what they are not. We have not received a reply to that letter and have not seen the introduction of any legislation on this very important issue. When is the Government going to act?

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, the House will know that we brought forward Bill C-79 which makes a number of very important changes to the Elections Act. We were negotiating two or three changes within that Act at the time to which my hon. friend refers.

It is my understanding that there was a letter sent to both Parties in reply to the letter about which my friend speaks. I will check into it and ensure that my friend gets a copy of it.

REQUEST FOR ACTION ON LEGISLATION

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I believe I have every letter that has been sent on this issue. Every letter from the Government has deliberately avoided referring to election expenses except to say that it was still studying the matter. It has made no attempt whatsoever to deal with this issue.

Can we get a commitment from the Government that before we leave we will have at least proposed legislation before either the standing committee or the House in order that this matter is not delayed until after the next election? We do not want a Dodge City, wide open election. We want honest rules by which all of us can live.

• (1150)

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Minister, since my hon. friend mentions Dodge City, I should tell him that, at the same time as this suggestion came forward from the NDP, the Hon. Member for York East was quite concerned that taxpayers' money was being used by NDP candidates in municipal elections. That is also a very valid reason to open the Elections Act and correct it on behalf of the taxpayers of Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TEXTILES

REQUEST THAT NEGOCIATIONS WITH BRAZIL BE REOPONED

Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance, and it concerns the textile industry and Canada's disagreement with Brazil concerning the quotas that country wants to obtain for its exports of towels and sheets to Canada.

GATT's textile surveillance body published its decision this week, based on Article 3 of the multifiber Arrangement:

Firstly, Canada's complaint of a disturbance in the sheet fabric market is well-founded;

Secondly however, the organization concluded that Canada's towel market had not been disrupted;

Thirdly, the organization suggested that both countries sit down again to negotiate and try to agree.

Would the Minister care to reassure Canadian textile workers and resume negotiations with Brazil? Alternately, because of the 100 per cent increase in imported towel fabric in Canada since 1982, will the Minister ask the arbitration tribunal to review the case?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): I thank the Hon. Member for Drummond for his question.

[*English*]

This Government took decisive action in January in response to Canadian concerns over the surging imports from Brazil. At that time we invoked Article 3 of the multifibre arrangement, unilaterally limiting imports on pillow cases, sheets, and terry towels.

Since then we were vindicated by the GATT surveillance body because they supported our action on the sheets and pillow cases. However, they indicated that we did not have sufficient grounds with regard to terry towels and have urged us to withdraw these restrictions.

I can tell the Hon. Member that this matter is before the Minister. He is studying the situation and the request from the surveillance body.

Canada retains the right to monitor and take action to protect Canadian jobs in the future if imports threaten to disrupt the market in terry towels.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

BANKING FEES—SMALL BUSINESSES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard—Anjou): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance.

When the policy on bank charges was announced on June 30, the Minister of State (Finance) only mentioned personal accounts, thus excluding the business accounts of small businesses which are as vulnerable as consumers in this respect.

Will the Minister of Finance issue new directives to the banks to warn them and to protect small businesses from any undue increase in charges by the banks? That is what the Canadian Federation of Independent Businesses is asking.

[*English*]

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I missed the first part of the Hon. Member's question. I am sure he was asking about the unemployment rate this morning which was announced at 7.6 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

And also, Mr. Speaker, because of the drop in the unemployment rate in the province of Quebec. Today there is less than 9 per cent unemployment for the first time in the past seven years.

[*English*]

I am sure the Hon. Member put that question to me. If he wants to put another question on unemployment, I can elaborate on it.

I heard the second part of his question about bank charges as they relate to small business. We have also been in touch with some members of the small business community, including the Canadian Federation of Independent Business. My colleague, the Minister of State for Finance, has indicated that we are arranging a meeting between representatives of the small business community and the Canadian Bankers Association in the very near future to discuss this issue. I believe it is within the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Gagliano: Canadian small businesses do not need meetings, they need action. They have had all the meetings they can get.

TREATMENT OF SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard—Anjou): Mr. Speaker, why did the Minister exclude small business accounts when he announced that NSF cheques deposited on personal accounts will not be charged twice? Why does the Minister discriminate against small business? Why do small businesses, that receive most of those cheques from their customers, have to be charged twice? Instead of using small business when you have to make a public relations announcement, put your money where your mouth is.

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I think this Government has demonstrated a very clear ability to act on a number of issues. We do not need the blustering and posturing of the Hon. Member in that way.

The Hon. Member said that the small business community does not want to have meetings. The small business community has asked for meetings.

Mr. Gagliano: They have had meetings for six months. Act.

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): We have responded to their request for a meeting. We are arranging that meeting which, as I indicated in my first answer, will be held within the next couple of weeks.

* * *

[*Translation*]

RAILWAYS

CN-DERAILMENT OF CHLORINE CAR IN ABITIBI—REQUEST THAT INQUIRY BE ESTABLISHED

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Once again we had a derailment in Abitibi. Last Tuesday, a CN tanker car of chlorine went off the track at mile 26.8 north of Senneterre. A disaster was averted.

Safety has deteriorated since the last cutbacks in CN personnel at Senneterre.

Would the Minister guarantee the population that better safety precautions will be taken by CN on the Abitibi—Témiscamingue railway network and that a public inquiry will be held immediately on the last three derailments that occurred in north west Quebec during the past year?

[*English*]

Mr. Allmand: Tell us how many jobs were created in Canada.

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): I am no longer Minister of Employment, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I don't think the issue of the lay-offs at CN has any direct connection with the disasters to which the Hon. Member is referring, at least in the reports we are receiving so far, since the lay-offs were made in the locomotive maintenance sector. So there is no direct link.

However, like the Hon. Member, I realize this was the third incident of its kind within a given period, and I have asked Canadian National to give us all the information so that we can see exactly what is going on, especially since incredible precautions are taken when transporting this kind of material.

I will let the Hon. Member know as soon as additional information is available.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL PARKS

SOUTH MORESBY—DELAY IN SIGNING FINAL AGREEMENT

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. On May 14, 1987, the House unanimously endorsed a resolution to preserve South Moresby and compensate interests affected, and to involve the Haida Nation fully in matters affecting South Moresby.

Since Monday is the anniversary of the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding in Victoria by the Prime Minister and the Premier of British Columbia, will the Acting Prime Minister advise the House as to what is holding up the signing of the final agreement? A state of chaos is being created on the Queen Charlotte Islands as visitors from around the world arrive to find public services inadequate to meet their needs.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for his question. I understand that the Province of British Columbia is looking at a proposal from their officials which is quite consistent with the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding signed between the Prime Minister and the Premier of British Columbia.

• (1200)

I expect there will be an opportunity for us to make progress on this matter at a very early date. I am hopeful that will be the case.

In the meantime officials of Environment Canada and Parks Canada are in discussion with respect to a co-ordinated plan with other government agencies on this important area. We are making specific arrangements to make sure that the tourist traffic will be adequately and properly dealt with and handled during the course of this tourist season.

Finally I want to say that we in the federal Government regard the arrival of an agreement with respect to South Moresby as a very significant matter. We look forward to the Province of British Columbia completing its consideration with respect to it at an early date.

INVOLVEMENT OF HAIDA NATION

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Since this House undertook unanimously to involve the Haida nation fully in all matters affecting South Moresby, and since for more than a year there has been no progress made in reaching a Canada-Haida agreement on South Moresby, will the Minister instruct officials to accelerate the progress and reach an agreement acceptable to the Haida Nation?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I am informed the Haida have been kept informed with respect to the progress of the federal-provincial agreement, and that Environment Canada is continuing its efforts to reach an understanding with the Haida on its role in the planning, management, and operation of the National Park Reserve.

We take the representation very seriously and appreciate the support of the Hon. Member. We want to be involved in a co-operative manner with the Haida Nation and are acting in a very pro-active way, if I can put it like that, with the Haida people to make sure that their interests are being fully considered and taken into account.

* * *

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDENT

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion. It is bad enough that the Government is trying to sabotage the Cape Breton Development Corporation by doing away with the industrial development division, but on October 3 the Government fired the then president of Devco, that is over nine months ago, and the Government has not as yet replaced the president of the Cape Breton Development Corporation.

As the Minister can appreciate, this is having a devastating effect on the operations of Devco. Why is it taking so long for the Government to appoint a president for the Cape Breton Development Corporation?

Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, for somebody who expresses such a

great interest in Atlantic Canada, it is very hard for me to believe that he comes from the same Party that in the Senate is devastating our economic development efforts in Atlantic Canada.

We are trying to create jobs as we have been doing throughout the country. We have 7.6 per cent unemployment throughout the country. Mr. Speaker, remember that number. When I look at the regional distribution, it is still more heartening. You see a very real reduction in unemployment in all regions of the country. That is what we are trying to do through our efforts in economic development.

With respect to the second part of the Hon. Member's question concerning the Devco presidency, we are going through the normal procedure to replace a head of a corporation, otherwise we would be accused of pork barrelling or what have you. The Opposition would be there with great phrases to reduce the kind of activity being undertaken. Through the board of directors we went through a search committee. That committee went through the normal process of having an outside independent firm review the possible candidacies of a number of people. Recommendations were made to Government and we are in a position to act very swiftly in this matter.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister quotes unemployment figures. The unemployment in Cape Breton today is higher than when the Government took office.

Mr. Valcourt: That is false!

Mr. MacLellan: It is not false. It is true.

Some Hon. Members: It is not true.

Mr. MacLellan: The miserable excuses which the Minister gives for not having appointed a president are just plain gall. The Government and this Minister—

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the hour, I would ask the Hon. Member to put his question.

Mr. MacLellan: The Government has had time to interview everybody in Canada for the job. Why hasn't a president been appointed for the Cape Breton Development Corporation? The people in Cape Breton are not going to accept lame excuses any more.

Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, first, the introductory remarks to the Hon. Member's question are totally false.

I would like to state a few facts that might interest my colleague. Here are the jobs that have been created—in Newfoundland 18,000; P.E.I. 7,000; Nova Scotia 32,000; New Brunswick 37,000; Québec 307,000; Ontario 588,000; Manitoba 33,000; Saskatchewan 13,000; Alberta 92,000, and B.C. 129,000.

That is good management. That is what we are doing with the economy. That is what we were doing with Devco. The Party of the Hon. Member is holding up the legislation that will help Atlantic Canada and Cape Breton get out of the situation which they had been in for years and years under the previous Government.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre. This will be the last question in Question Period.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

EQUALITY IN EMPLOYMENT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for the Treasury Board. Is the Government satisfied with the report of the Public Service Commission published last week, according to which women in the Public Service earned about $27,800 compared to $37,000 on average for male civil servants and the gap between male and female increased from $9,000 to $9,300 between 1986 and 1987, when the Conservatives were in power? Why did the Government break its election promises for greater equality for women in the Public Service? And what concrete steps will the Government take to give women equal treatment in future?

[*English*]

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to my friend that prior to our taking office there were employment equity programs. We took at look at things and started to set targets.

While there are some areas in which we are not meeting all the targets that we would like to, I can assure my friend that the targets for employment of women by occupational categories have been set and we are getting very close to meeting them in all areas of the public service.

GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, is the Hon. Minister then saying that we are close to achieving targets but that, as a consequence, the wage gap between men and women will continue at around $9,000 a year and that that is tolerated as far as people working for the Government of Canada are concerned?

Is this Minister aware that federal law requires equal pay for work of equal value, and that that has been so for 10 years? When will that kind of equality be achieved in the Government of Canada under this Government?

Tabling of Documents

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend is mixing programs. We are negotiating at the present time with most of the bargaining units which currently represent a large percentage of women. There will be increases within those negotiations which in time will reflect very favourably in terms of salary and wages paid to women.

I want to reiterate that you cannot do anything without targets and know where you are going. This Government knows where it is going on employment equity.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) has a question of privilege?

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I do have a matter of privilege that I wanted to raise concerning statements made yesterday in the House by the Minister for the Environment (Mr. McMillan). I am informed by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister that the Minister is not available today but will be in the House on Tuesday. I will raise it at that time so the Minister can respond personally.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour of tabling, in both official languages, the Government's response to 10 petitions numbered as follows: 332-4668, 332-4748, 332-4751 to 332-4755 inclusive, 332-4760, 332-4761 and 332-4772.

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

* * *

TRANSPORT

ANNOUNCEMENT OF BILL TO CREATE INDEPENDENT BOARD OF INQUIRY INTO TRANSPORTATION ACCIDENTS

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Transport, I can say that the safety of our transportation system is one of the Department's major concerns. For this reason, I am tabling today a Bill to establish an independent transportation accident investigation board that will cover all transportation modes in Canada.

A good investigation system is essential to transportation safety. The new board will improve the quality of investigations on railway, marine and aviation accidents. Creating an independent board will also guarantee that investigations are fair and objective. The result will be increased safety in our transportation system.

Of course, Canada already has an excellent transportation safety record. This is due to the constant vigilance and efforts of many parties, including the Government, employees and the private sector. However, we cannot afford to be complacent.

Our Government is committed to assisting in every way possible those who are involved in improving transportation safety. My Department is conducting research to make equipment safer, including studies of daytime "lights on" for cars, anti-smoke masks in aircraft and locomotive recorders.

We are upgrading our equipment to facilitate air and marine navigation. We conduct public awareness programs, such as Operation Lifesaver, to reduce accidents at level crossings, and various water safety programs are provided by the Coast Guard for fishermen and the public. We are providing funds for the provinces in connection with setting up a national safety code.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we are constantly updating our safety regulations and improving our enforcement capability.

• (1210)

[*English*]

Beyond all this activity, the Government proposed, and Parliament adopted, in the National Transportation Act a national transportation policy which places safety at the top of our list of objectives. The Government takes this commitment seriously. We have brought forward better safety legislation for all the modes of transportation regulated by the federal Government.

In 1985, Parliament passed amendments to the Aeronautics Act which give us the most effective safety regime in the last 60 years. In 1987, safety amendments to the Canada Shipping Act were adopted. Most recently, the Railway Safety Act was passed by this House and is now before the Senate. Today, we have before us the final piece of transportation safety legislation—the Transportation Accident Investigation Board Bill. It too will improve safety.

Transportation accidents involving ships, trains and commodity pipelines will now be investigated by an independent body reporting to Parliament. This board, like the Canadian Aviation Safety Board, will be completely separate from the agencies responsible for safety and economic regulation of these modes of transport.

Those who make safety regulations and enforce them will be at arm's length from those who investigate possible shortcomings in regulation and enforcement. They will no longer have a potential conflict of interest.

[*Translation*]

The new Board will determine, entirely objectively, the causes of transportation accidents and will issue recommendations aimed at preventing a recurrence of similar accidents.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, the Board will publish its conclusions and recommendations. However, public disclosure of problems is not enough.

The Bill goes a step further. It provides that the Minister of Transport or any other minister concerned shall respond to the Board's recommendations. We must publish our response within 90 days.

Hence, Ministers will have to be accountable for their actions, both to the public and to Parliament. The Bill provides that the Board's headquarters may be located in the National Capital Region or another location. It is a pleasure to inform you that the Board will be located in Hull, Quebec.

Its staff will consist of persons who currently conduct investigations on aviation, railway and marine transportation accidents. Their knowledge and expertise are a guarantee that the Board will be a success.

Mr. Speaker, all Members of this House can take pride in the transport safety legislation that has been passed in recent years. The public's safety has improved.

[*English*]

This final piece of safety legislation is equally important. Indeed, I hope that the subject matter of the Bill will be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport. I hope that it will receive the same all-Party support as the earlier Bills enjoyed.

I invite all Members of the House to consider it seriously and to support it for what it is—another key to improving transportation safety.

Mr. George Baker (Gander—Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, Clause 43 and Clause 52 of the piece of legislation which the Government is introducing today deal with the transition from the Canadian Aviation Safety Board and the repealing of the Canadian Aviation Safety Board Act. This legislation, in other words, will replace the present investigative mechanisms in marine, air and, as the Minister said a moment ago, rail transportation.

There was an individual appointed by the former Minister of Transport about seven months ago to pass judgment on this Bill before the House. That individual is now a member of the Supreme Court of Canada. His name is John Sopinka. He said in his letter to the then Minister of Transport dated February 3: "My review consisted of an examination of the documentation referred to in the terms of reference". The terms of reference involved, as he said, "policy-related advice in respect of the proposed Act relating the Multi-modal Transportation Accident Investigation Board", which is the Bill that we have before us today.

When one reads what Mr. Sopinka said to the Government of Canada in February of this year, and when one looks at what has happened to the Canadian Aviation Safety Board in its non-investigation of the tragic disaster in Gander, Newfoundland, one has to come to the conclusion that this is negligent legislation. It is in total contradiction to what Mr. John Sopinka said to the Government of Canada in his letter in February.

He was hired by the Government of Canada to pass judgment on this legislation. Furthermore, the legislation flies in the face of just plain common sense.

This board is not all powerful. It is subordinate. To whom? It is subordinate to the Department of National Defence. It is subordinate to the RCMP. It has even to co-ordinate its investigations with other government Departments if they are conducting an investigation.

What did the present Mr. Justice Sopinka say was wrong with the investigative procedures? He said in his letter that there was a very serious problem between the board members and the Chairman of the Board and the investigators. He said that the Board as such had felt as if it had no power. That is why the Board presented a minority report on the Gander crash. The board claimed that it was not fully consulted and that it had no power. The chairman and four board members got together and passed a preliminary report which in effect forms the basis of the final report. Mr. Sopinka stated that that has to be closed in this Bill. What did the Minister and the Government of Canada do in this Bill? The Canadian Aviation Safety Board had 10 members. Under this legislation the chairman still calls the meetings and decides on what investigations should take place, but this time it is five board members. The chairman is one of the five. What is a quorum under this Bill? The quorum is two, two out of five.

• (1220)

Under this legislation it is even doubtful whether the investigation into the Gander air disaster can continue. It states in the Bill that on any matter that is being investigated by the Canadian Aviation Safety Board and on which no final report has been made by the Board when section 43 comes into force, that it will continue the investigation will continue under this investigative board. However, if one goes back to the powers of the Board, it states that "the Board shall not investigate a transportation occurrence that involves a military conveyance or military transportation facility". What is a military conveyance? A military conveyance is an aircraft, ship, rolling stock, motor vehicle, or any other machine designed for movement from place to place that is operated by or on behalf of the Department of National Defence, the Canadian Forces, or a visiting force.

As a former law clerk, I would have to conclude from that that one could argue that the safety board being appointed here today by the Government of Canada would not be allowed to investigate the crash that took place in Gander,

Newfoundland. If the Minister can argue that other sections of the Bill give the authority, I can argue, and any lawyer could with equal force that that section of the Bill prevents it from happening. This is not the answer. As I said, it is negligent legislation. It is a contradiction of what Justice Sopinka wrote only six months ago, and it flies in the face of common sense.

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I share some of the concerns of the previous speaker with regard to this impending legislation. Regardless of the type of investigation that has been conducted over a serious industrial or transportation accident, the situation in Canada is that the investigations take too long, and the reporting to the public is a very long process. The inquiry into the Gander tragedy took years to be conducted and for the report to be made public. In the meantime, the Americans published two complete reports in a much shorter period of time.

The inquiry into the *Ocean Ranger* incident and the drilling rig took years before the inquiry was complete and before the public was aware of the results. The publicity surrounding the original incident diminished and that diminished public interest in the issue. In addition, people who are flying or who are involved in marine or rail transport are subject to a long waiting period before there is any action by government. Certainly, some action is taken, and there is not a complete lack of action in the meanwhile. But there has not been a complete inquiry. Information has not been made public, and there has not been a public response by government.

I am concerned with our record of delays, long inquiries, and the length of time to make a report. How can a smaller commission, which not only investigates air safety but has now been given the responsibility for rail and marine, conduct all the inquiries necessary and be any faster than the dismally slow process we have at the present time?

I would like to see this legislation receive thorough study by the transportation committee. I would also like to see the Government express a willingness to expand the size of the Board. I would also like to see some legislative time limits in which these inquiries report. To do otherwise is to encourage the terrible process and delays that we have suffered.

It is not only in this particular area. In Canada we have seen Royal commissions have been set up with a purpose of producing quick reports, and we see that it takes two to three years, or four to five years for those reports to be made public. I do not see it in the legislation, and I do not see it in the statement of the Minister, but I hope that the Government will make a major commitment to fast, thorough inquiries, and ensure that the new Board has the ability to do so. Looking at the information that has been given so far, and the details that I know of the legislation, if anything there will be longer inquiries and a longer waiting period before the public knows what has happened. I question why the Minister has taken this route under those circumstances.

[*Translation*]

CANADA-EUROPE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF SIXTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF CANADIAN PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Mr. Terry Clifford (London—Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of Bill C-72 and pursuant to Standing Order 122, I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the 16th annual Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association meeting of delegations from the Canadian and European Parliaments, held in Naples from May 23 to 27, 1988.

[*English*]

Earlier in today's dealings in the House the issue of fur labelling was raised. I wish to assure all Hon. Members that this was a major issue in our annual meeting with the European parliamentarians. The authors of that action both from the European Parliament and the British Parliament were at the meeting. We dealt with this issue in great depth. Since it is of interest to all Members of the House, I would urge Members to look at what actions were recommended in our report. I hope it is of interest to all and helps in the solution of this problem for all Canadians.

* * *

CANADIAN NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

PRESENTATION OF THIRTY-FOURTH REPORT

Mr. Bob Hicks (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 101, I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the thirty-fourth report of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

PRESENTATION OF SIXTEENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec-Est): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 16th report of the Standing Committee on Private Members' Business, in both official languages.

The 16th report deals with the tabling of the petition for private Bill S-17, an Act to authorize the Montreal Trust Company of Canada to be continued as a corporation under the laws of the Province of Quebec, pursuant to Standing Order 142.

[*English*]

If the House agrees, I intend to move concurrence in the sixteenth report later this day.

* * *

• (1230)

TRANSPORTATION ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION BOARD ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Doug Lewis (for the Minister of Transport) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-142 an Act to establish a Transportation Accident Investigation Board and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Shall the Hon. Minister have leave to introduce the said Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. Patrick Boyer (Etobicoke—Lakeshore) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-306, an Act to amend the House of Commons Act (by-elections).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Shall the Hon. Member have leave to introduce the Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave at this time to introduce a Bill entitled an Act to amend the House of Commons Act, pertaining to by-elections. This has been certified consistent with Standing Order 108, and timely notice has been given. Briefly, the Bill would require an election writ to be issued within seven days of the vacancy occurring in the House of Commons, and the election to be completed within, at most, 80 days thereafter.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the bill is being introduced by the Member for Québec-Est (Mr. Tremblay).

[*English*]

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. Patrick Boyer (Etobicoke—Lakeshore) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-307, an Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (withdrawal of a writ of election).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Shall the Hon. Member have leave to introduce the Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a second Bill, an Act to amend the Canada Elections Act, pertaining to withdrawal of a writ of election. This is consequential to the earlier Bill pertaining to the prompt holding of a by-election for any vacancy in this House. Let me state in conclusion that the principle here is that the constitutional right of citizens to representation here in the House of Commons must take precedence over considerations of Party advantage as to the timing of by-elections.

This Bill has been certified in conformity with Standing Order 108. Timely notice has been given, and this Bill is also seconded by the Hon. Member for Québec-Est (Mr. Tremblay).

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

ADOPTION OF SIXTEENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec-Est): Mr. Speaker, if there is unanimous consent, I move:

> That the 16th report of the Standing Committee on Private Members' Business, tabled earlier today, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have two motions to put which have been discussed with the House Leaders of both opposition Parties. I think you will find it acceptable. Before I do that, I would like to revisit the Business of the House for Monday and

Tuesday of next week. We made considerable progress yesterday afternoon, last evening, and I anticipate we will make considerable progress today.

This should take us to the point on Monday where we do the following. First, we will call Motion No. 25 on the Order Paper for debate, on a procedural argument only, and adjourn the debate immediately after the procedural argument in order to give the Speaker an opportunity to consider the representations. We would then move in the following order: Bill C-77, the reply to the Senate to the emergencies Bill; Bill C-93, the multiculturalism Bill, report stage and third reading; Bill C-82, the lobbying report on third reading; Bill C-103, the reply to the Senate on the Atlantic Opportunities Bill. I would also say that that also is awaiting a decision by the Speaker. Therefore, that is movable somewhat. It will be done at the convenience of the opposition spokespersons.

We then move to Bill C-30, the national parks Bill, report stage and third reading. It is definite that we will vote the concurrence on the motions and a concurrence report to Bill C-121, the Bill to sell Eldorado, and possibly the amendments and concurrence on C-129, the Air Canada Bill, at six o'clock on Monday. Then, at a time convenient to opposition Parties, we will deal with third reading stage.

All of the comments I make with respect to report and third reading stage are conditional upon it being acceptable to the House to move immediately to third reading from report stage.

On Tuesday, we anticipate doing Bill C-84, the reply to the Senate on the Immigration Act; Bill C-110, the Trade Tribunal Act, at report and third reading stage; Bill S-17, which is a Bill from the other place dealing with Montreal Trust. I would point out to the opposition Parties that they have asked that the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Hockin) be in the House to answer questions at that time, and we will make those arrangements.

We then complete the day with Bill C-126, the Bretton Woods Bill, at report and third reading stage. I want to clarify that when I suggested that we would not be sitting Tuesday night it was only intended to convey that we would not sit Tuesday night of next week but we will be sitting for the balance of the week; Wednesday, Thursday, Friday. I did not want to leave any misconception in the minds of other Members of the House or other Parties.

* * *

CANADA GRAIN ACT

CHANGE OF REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, I have two motions. I move:

> That, the order for second reading and reference to a legislative committee of Bill C-112, an Act to amend the Canada Grain Act and other Acts in consequence thereof, standing on the Order Paper, be changed to read second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Does the Hon. Member have the unanimous consent of the House for the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): I think it would be acceptable to us in our corner that the House go to the agriculture committee rather than to the legislative committee.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Likewise, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

WESTERN GRAIN STABILIZATION ACT

CHANGE OF REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, I have a second motion, if I may. I would move:

> That, the order for second reading and reference to a legislative committee of Bill C-132, an Act to amend the Western Grain Stabilization Act, standing on the Order Paper, be changed to read second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Does the Hon. Member have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

• (1240)

PETITIONS

IRRADIATION OF FOOD

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and duty, on behalf of approximately 3,000

petitioners, to present 235 petitions which deal with the irradiation of food. The petitioners say that irradiation in food processing causes certain products which may be toxic or carcinogenic in food and they say that it should not be consumed. There are certain bacteria which are not killed, and therefore people may eat food thinking it is safe. The Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs made a recommendation on the irradiation of food, and these petitioners want the appointment of a commission of inquiry to conduct an in-depth study into the safety of food irradiation.

OPPOSITION TO OPEN-CUSTODY FACILITY IN RESIDENTIAL AREA

Mr. Terry Clifford (London—Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, it is a duty and a pleasure for me to rise today to table a petition on behalf of over 1,800 constituents of the City of London in my riding of London—Middlesex who are protesting the establishment of an open-custody facility for young offenders in a totally residential area. The petitioners take no issue with the availability of open-custody facilities under the Young Offenders Act. They deplore, however, the arbitrary manner in which the Peterson Government in Ontario has imposed the centre on a residential neighbourhood without adequate consultation.

Notwithstanding several attempts by the residents to approach the Ontario Government to discuss this issue, it remains unresponsive to the concerns of London residents. The petitioners are asking the federal Government to give direction to the provincial Government so that the Young Offenders Act may be implemented in a way that is fair and equitable to both young offenders and other citizens.

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a duly certified petition calling on Parliament to pass legislation that will protect the life of the unborn child from conception and at all stages of development with the exception of the situation in which an abortion is performed in order to save the life of a mother.

REQUEST FOR DESIGNATION OF ROUGE RIVER VALLEY

Mrs. Pauline Browes (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to present to the House a petition on behalf of a number of residents of Scarborough, North York, Oshawa, Willowdale and Bowmanville concerning the Rouge River Valley in Scarborough. It is a very unique and precious natural area. Endangered wildlife and wilderness areas should be preserved in the national interest. The petitioners join with the Scarborough City Council, the federal Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan), the Save the Rouge Valley System and the Coalition of Scarborough Community Associations in expressing a great interest in and support for having the valley made a park. We are calling upon Parliament to work with the provincial Government which owns about 90 per cent of this area to establish the Rouge River Valley as a Canadian heritage land or as a provincial park.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and President of Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos 350, 355 and 356.

[*Text*]

BEDFORD INSTITUTE OF OCEANOGRAPHY

Question No. 350—**Mr. Henderson:**

In (*a*) 1984, (*b*) 1985, (*c*) 1986, (*d*) 1987 did the Government (*i*) allocate funds, (*ii*) award research contracts, (*iii*) make any other grants or contributions to the Bedford Institute of Oceanography in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia and, if so, through which departments and, in each case, in what amounts?

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Fisheries and Oceans, Energy, Mines and Resources and Environment as follows:

In so far as the Department of Fisheries and Oceans is concerned:

(*i*) Listed below are the funds allocated to the Bedford Institute of Oceanography in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia by the Department.

(a) 1984-1985 $44.7 million; (b) 1985-1986 $41.0 million; (c) 1986-1987 $38.9 million; (d) 1987-1988. As a result of the Department's reorganization, funds are no longer allocated to the Bedford Institute of Oceanography (BIO), but to the Scotia Fundy Region of which BIO is a part.

(ii) Nil.

(iii) Nil.

Note: The Department of Fisheries and Oceans maintains the complex. The Departments of Environment and Energy, Mines and Resources have offices housed in the complex.

In so far as the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources is concerned:

(a to d) (i) No. (ii) No. (iii) No.

EM&R's Atlantic Geoscience Centre is part of the Bedford Institute of Oceanography. The Centre carries out geological, geophysical and geochemical studies in Atlantic and Arctic offshore areas and obtains data used in the search for hydrocarbon resources, in resource evaluations, in marine environment protection, and in improving the safety of coastal and offshore engineering structures.

EM&R's operating expenditures including salaries for the Atlantic Geoscience Centre are as follows:

1984-1985 $12.3 million; 1985-1986 $16.4 million; 1986-1987 $13.8 million; 1987-1988 $14.6 million.

In so far as the Department of the Environment is concerned:

(a to d) (i) No. (ii) No. (iii) No.

The Conservation and Protection Services of Environment Canada occupies laboratory space in the Bedford Institute of Oceanography at no charge.

Environment Canada's operating expenditures including salaries for the Conservation and Protection Services are as follows:

1984-1985 $636,000; 1985-1986 $598,900; 1986-1987 $664,200; 1987-1988 $719,500.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDIES

Question No. 355—**Ms. Jewett:**

Has the Government commissioned environmental impact studies concerning the proposed purchase of a fleet of nuclear powered submarines and, if so on what dates and, in each case (*a*) from what individuals or groups (*b*) at what cost (*c*) what were the findings?

Mr. Bud Bradley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): (a) and (c) The submarine project will follow Environment Canada's Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process (EARP) with respect to environmental impact assessments. Atomic Energy of Canada Limited will be contracted to commence the initial environmental screening in mid-1988. Consultations will take place with military base experts, members of the civilian environmental, scientific and technical communities, and local elected officials.

(b) The total costs are yet to be determined, but are expected to fall in the range $300,000 to $400,000.

OVER-ALL COST OF NUCLEAR POWERED SUBMARINES

Question No. 356—**Ms. Jewett:**

Is the cost of the following expenditures associated with the purchase of nuclear powered submarines and, if so, has the Government calculated it and, if so, what is the amount in the case of (*a*) the purchase of initial spare parts (*b*) the purchase of initial weapons load of torpedoes and missiles (*c*) the construction of shore support infrastructure on the east and west coasts, including dockyard facilities and supply and quality assurance systems (*d*) the construction of nuclear fuel (*i*) transport (*ii*) storage (*iii*) handling (*iv*) disposal facilities (*e*) the (*i*) purchase of fuel abroad (*ii*) construction of nuclear fuel production facilities in Canada (*f*) the security for nuclear fuel transport and storage (*g*) the cost of upgrading submarines to Arctic operational standards (*i*) in general (*ii*) by the addition of hardpoints to the hull to enable surfacing through ice (*iii*) by the purchase of navigation aids and ice sensors (*h*) the training of two crews for each submarine, including (*i*) training abroad for some skilled personnel (*ii*) hiring of foreign instructors (*iii*) construction of training facilities (*i*) the training of dockyard personnel in servicing the submarines and reactors (*j*) the training of shore personnel in nuclear fuel (*i*) transport (*ii*) handling (*iii*) storage (*iv*) disposal (*k*) the (*i*) construction of infrastructure for manufacturing hull and internal equipment components in Canada (*ii*) training for builders (*iii*) purchase of Canadian-made components (*iv*) possible changes to the submarine design to accommodate Canadian components.

Mr. Bud Bradley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Department of National Defence's submarine project cost estimates include all items, with the exception of (e) (ii). An appropriate allowance for cost risk is also included in the estimates for each item. The estimates will differ somewhat depending on whether they apply to the French or the British submarine design. The estimates will be refined during project definition so as to support a subsequent government decision on whether or not to proceed with project implementation. The actual cost estimates cannot be divulged at this time so as to protect British and French proprietary information and not to prejudice the selection of submarine design country of origin.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 317 could be made an order for return, that return would be tabled immediately.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The questions listed by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Is it the pleasure of the House that question No. 317 be deemed to have been made an order for return?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN KENORA—RAINY RIVER CONSTITUENCY

Question No. 317—**Mr. Parry:**

Since September 4, 1984, have any government departments or agencies spent money in the constituency of Kenora—Rainy River and, if so, by which departments or agencies and, in each case (*a*) in what amounts (*b*) under which categories and programs was the money spent?

Return tabled.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grisé: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

AIR CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-129, an Act to provide for the continuance of Air Canada under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares thereof to the public, as reported (with an amendment) from a legislative committee.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys) moved:

Motion No. 4.

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 6 by adding immediately after line 37 at page 3 the following:

"(f) provisions restricting the Corporation from acquiring control, through ownership of shares or otherwise, in an air carrier providing international services under a license issued pursuant to the *National Transportation Act*;

(g) provisions respecting the enforcement of the constraints and requirements imposed pursuant to this section."

Mr. Mike Cassidy (for Mr. Orlikow) moved:

Motion No. 6.

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 6 by adding immediately after line 37 at page 3 the following:

"(f) provisions requiring the Corporation to maintain and strengthen its role as a Canadian Corporation by ensuring that labour, equipment and services required by the Corporation be Canadian in origin wherever feasible and where not feasible that Canadian content be maximized as a part of such labour, equipment and services requirements;

(g) provisions requiring the Corporation to maintain existing Corporation standards respecting safety, maintenance and customer service;

(h) provisions requiring any subsidiary corporation of the Corporation to be bound by this Act including any subsidiary corporation which may be formed from or by the parent Corporation once this Act comes into force."

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I recognize the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan) on Motion No. 4.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grisé: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary on a point of order.

Mr. Grisé: Mr. Speaker, in the Chair's decision yesterday, Motions Nos. 4 and 6 were to be debated together and voted on separately.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Yes, they are to be debated together but voted on separately. The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys has the floor.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to Motion No. 4 which I think deals with a very severe deficiency in the Bill that is before the House. I believe that it is a deficiency which must be corrected.

Motion No. 4 is in two parts. The first part relates to Clause 6 and refers to Air Canada not being able to purchase the shares of another airline that has international routes in accordance with the National Transportation Act. The primary reason for this is that all Canadians want to be assured that there is competition between the airlines in Canada. The Air Canada Act as stated alleviates any fear that any other airline in Canada will purchase controlling interest in Air Canada because each shareholder can only hold a 10 per cent interest in Air Canada. Unless there is a shareholders' agreement among various shareholders, an airline will not have controlling interest in Air Canada.

However, the other alternative must be looked at as well. We must not lose our competition through Air Canada purchasing the competing airlines which, in this case, would be Canadian Airlines International and Wardair. If that were to happen, then the lack of competition would drastically reduce any efficiency that would be left in the air transportation industry in Canada as a result of the privatization of Air Canada.

Canadian Airlines International, of course, was formed as a result of the merger of Canadian Pacific and Pacific Western Airlines. Because Pacific Western Airlines purchased Canadian Pacific, I think it is safe to assume that this airline is governed by Alberta legislation which, I believe, restricts the amount of ownership that any one shareholder can hold in Canadian Airlines International. That is not something with which I am very well versed, but that is my understanding.

That, of course, would alleviate the concern of Canadian Airlines International being purchased by Air Canada for the moment. However, the Legislature of Alberta is outside the jurisdiction of this House of Commons, and as such, can change its legislation as it wishes. This would mean that Canadian Airlines International, if it is restricted from having any of its shareholders own more than a certain percentage of its shares, could have that provision changed by the Legislature of Alberta. This amendment also reflects the fact that Wardair is not so bound.

Perhaps there is the protection of the National Transportation Act, but there is a certain amount of leniency in the federal Government's regulations which could ultimately lead to Air Canada purchasing its major international competition. For that reason, I think it is paramount that this amendment, Motion No. 4, which adds subclause (f) to Clause 6, be approved by the House.

Hon. Members will also note that there is a second portion to Motion No. 4 which would add a subclause (g) which deals with provisions respecting the enforcement of the constraints requirements imposed pursuant to the clause.

• (1250)

What that does to Clause 6 is add certain restrictions and reinforce certain of its provisions. For example, we have in Clause 6 provisions that non-residents can own only 25 per cent of the shares. As well, only 25 per cent of the non-resident shares can be voted at any annual meeting. That is an important safeguard. The clause also says that Air Canada must maintain its maintenance base in Winnipeg and its head office in Montreal. Those are important provisions and there must be a provision requiring them to be abided by and there must be sanctions should they be breached.

In Bill C-21, the Act to privatize Eldorado Nuclear and merge it with the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation, we find the exact wording of my proposal. Yet it is not included in this Bill dealing with Air Canada. The Government is saying it does not need that clause in this Bill because we are protected by Clause 6(2) which refers to the Business Corporations Act and says that Act will look after these requirements. However, I will read Clause 6(2) which says:

> (2) The regulations made pursuant to subsection 168(5) of the Canada Business Corporations Act apply, with such modification as the circumstances require, in respect of the Corporation as if the constraints imposed pursuant to paragraphs (1)(a) and (b) were a constraint referred to in paragraph 168(1)(a) of that Act.

The first deficiency is that the application of the Canada Business Corporations Act only applies to subclauses (a) and (b). It does not apply to subclauses (c), (d) and (e) as they are presently in the Act, and does not apply to (f) which would be the first part of Motion No. 4 that I am proposing. In effect, the provisions referring to the percentage of non-resident shares being voted at an annual meeting, the requirement that the maintenance base be maintained in Winnipeg and the requirement head office be maintained in Montreal, cannot be enforced. The provisions are there but the Government is saying they do not have to be abided by. That is ludicrous.

Let me just go on and see what safeguards the Canada Business Corporations Act provides for this clause. I want to refer to Section 168. This is the constraint referred to. Section 168(1)(a) says that subject to subsection 170 and 171 a corporation, any of the issued shares of which are or were part of a distribution to the public and remain outstanding and are held by more than one person may, by a special resolution, may amend its articles in accordance with the regulations to constrain the issue or transfer of shares to any class of persons who are not resident Canadians. That may be fine but there is an optional provision there. The Government does not have to abide by this. It is optional. Then we go to Section 168(5) which is referred to in the Act. Once again it is optional. Therefore, the Canada Business Corporations Act does not help us to make sure that these provisions in the Air Canada Bill have to be followed. I think if they do not have to be followed and are not followed it is going to be devastating to this country.

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am very conscious of the fact, and I hope the Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) is, too, that we really need to get this part of the Bill through in order that the agricultural Bills, which are also important, can be debated. Since there will be no vote on this Bill until Monday night at six o'clock, we are in a very difficult position. As a New Democrat opposed to the privatization of Air Canada, I would dearly like to debate this Bill until two thirty today and again from ten o'clock on Monday right through the day. However, in the end the vote will take place at the same time. Therefore, it is the kind of thing one does at this time of year, that is, to speak less fulsomely than one would like on an extremely important principle.

The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan) has already spoken to his amendments and the ones put forward by myself on behalf of my friend from Winnipeg North which are rather similar. We in this Party are trying to ensure that if Air Canada is to be privatized because of a decision of the Government, we do not then wind up losing the standard of service, safety, maintenance, and commitment to Canadian content in its purchases by Air Canada which we have had in the past.

It is regrettable that in its desire to make Canadian air transportation a clone of the U.S. system the Government was not prepared to put these kinds of provisions in the Act to begin with. In addition, it is important that the articles of continuance, when they are drafted, have provisions to ensure that the commitments which are to apply to Air Canada are enforceable. I do not want to see a situation where pious wishes are put into the articles of continuance but the board of directors, which according to the Government will include only passive participation from the majority shareholder, the people of Canada, will be able to say we saw that but it was not very important and forgot about it.

There will be no means by which an employee, a union, a customer or simply a Canadian concerned about Air Canada will be able to ensure that the commitments being made in this Bill are lived up to.

It was stated repeatedly in committee that Air Canada is the leader among Canadian airlines in safety and maintenance. Do we want it to stay that way or do we want to allow the standards to be steadily downgraded as a means of shaving a dollar or two off the fares here and there? I suggest that this motion could be seen as a vote of confidence in the way that Air Canada's management and employees have run the airline over a lengthy period of time. I feel that sense of confidence and I am sorry the Government does not feel the same but is withdrawing its participation and letting Air Canada go into the private sector.

• (1300)

I fear that the quality of service we receive from Air Canada is going to diminish. Thanks to the magic of telecommunications, the new Air Canada management will find the area of

Canada where it can drive wages down to the lowest level and will put its reservation services there rather than have a local service which is approachable and friendly. The guarantees that are suggested here in terms of maintaining standards of safety, customs services, and maintenance are not in the collective agreement. There is no binding force on those.

I, frankly, think I know what is likely to happen. We have two and a half national airlines given the restructuring of the airline industry which has taken place in recent years. I would not be surprised if the Government's effort at deregulation and its decision to privatize now will lead us very soon to having one and a half or possibly even only one national airline rather than having two and a half national airlines and that that one national airline will be in private hands and have an effective monopoly over air travel in much of Canada.

Canadians in Ottawa, Toronto, and Vancouver are well served by air services in Canada right now. One of the reasons for that is the public-private competition which we have also had in broadcasting, the railway industry, and other areas. However, to know what it is like to have only one private sector monopoly you should talk to residents of some of our northern communities who are served by only one airline. It costs them $600 just to get to a southern point where they can take advantage of the cheap fares which are offered from time to time for off-season travel.

That is the situation which will prevail in many parts of Canada if there is no further rationalization. No control of that can be exercised from here, nor can we exercise any control over the threat that the standards of Air Canada could be reduced at the risk of both Air Canada customers and those who presently work for this great airline. We want Air Canada to continue to be a great airline.

In the interests of time I will cease speaking now but I want you, Mr. Speaker, and all Canadians to know that New Democrats feel very strongly about these issues. We are distressed beyond words that the Government is prepared to allow Air Canada to be privatized and is not prepared even to guarantee that Air Canada will maintain the excellent standards it has had in the past.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I want to support Motion No. 4 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan) concerning the takeover of other Canadian airlines with international routings because that would destroy competition for international carriers into Canada except those already owned by the United States.

There is great concern that the general thrust of Air Canada has been toward the international. Most Canadians do not mind that. We are proud to see the flagship of our national carrier carrying Canadians and visitors around the world to Canada.

The problem which I see with the privatization, which will ultimately be 100 per cent if this Government survives long enough, is that the policy direction of Air Canada and service to Canadians will be lost. Air Canada has already pulled out its service to Sault Ste. Marie in my own constituency of Algoma. It now serves only two cities, I believe, in northern Ontario. It is clear that when it moves away from ownership by the Government it will pull out completely and will go in the direction in which it has always wanted to go, that is, toward international carriers. I have no objection to that but I want the national carrier to serve the regions of this country. We oppose this Bill because we think that it is the only way to maintain the regional service and policy service to Canadians.

It is clear that the whole matter of competition is being lessened in a tremendous rationalization of airlines since we have two airlines in the country, Canadian Airlines International and Air Canada, and three if we count Wardair. If this company is allowed to take over Canadian Airlines International when it is privatized all the competition will be lost because Wardair has a very limited service and certainly does not serve the regions. If Canadian Airlines were to decide that there is more money in serving Bangkok, Melbourne, Sydney, London, and other international capitals, we could be left with no service to the regions.

I find it absolutely incredible that in this divestiture the Government is divesting itself, initially at least, of 45 per cent but is going to vote its 55 per cent share with the majority of the private shareholders. If those private shareholders are Texas Air and Pan American Airlines and hold 25 per cent they will have control because the Government of Canada is going to vote with the private shareholders. Therefore, if 25 per cent is held by various American airlines they will have the majority of the shares held by the private sector. The Government has committed to vote with the private sector even though it holds the majority of the shares. That is an incredible disaster.

We do not agree with selling off Air Canada. People in the private sector say that if the Government is going to sell it off it should sell it all in order that it become a fully private sector oriented arrangement. This is a mixture of private and public sector, with the public sector voting with the private sector. I predict that it will be like the BCRIC of the Socred Government in B.C. before the days of Vander Zalm. It will be a disaster.

We had the same problem with the Canadian Development Investment Corporation where the private and public sectors were mixed. It simply does not work because the public sector is offended and angry when the federal Government intervenes in decisions. It simply does not work and this will not work unless the Government divests itself totally, in which case, of course, we will lose complete control of Air Canada as a carrier which will benefit the regions.

We have seen the beginnings of that in the last three and a half years since the Government came to power. It has been pulling out of the regional airports and leaving them with poorer service. People who live in smaller cities like Timmins,

Sault Ste. Marie, and North Bay like to have a national carrier serving them. They like to be able to walk into the Air Canada office and have world-wide service for ticketing arrangements and inquiries. That, of course, has already been lost since the Government took power, but it will become even worse when Air Canada is fully privatized.

I want to support the motion before the House but I certainly want to put forward those caveats about the divestiture and privatization of Air Canada. My Party is not opposed to privatization. In fact, a large number of private sector companies that were held by the Canadian Development Investment Corporation were put into a package and privatized. We have supported privatization in other areas. We are not ideologically opposed to privatization. When the public policy role is not necessary, privatization is acceptable. It could be very beneficial.

• (1310)

However, Air Canada is our national carrier and the flagship of the nation around the world. We do not believe it is possible to mix adequately the private and public sector with regard to this institution which represents our nation throughout the world. It is not good for the private sector or the Government of Canada to be interfering in the policies of a private sector corporation.

If we are elected in an election this fall we will not privatize Air Canada. We believe that it has a policy role to play, not only as an important flagship for our country around the world, but in its responsibility to serve the regions of our country. The most important responsibility of a Crown corporation is to serve the national interest rather than the international transportation aspects of Air Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of my colleague's proposal that Bill C-129 be amended by adding the following to Clause 6, after line 37:

> "(*f*) provisions restricting the Corporation from acquiring control, through ownership of shares or otherwise, in an air carrier providing inernational services under a license issued pursuant to the *National Transportation Act*;
>
> (*g*) provisions respecting the enforcement of the constraints and requirements imposed pursuant to this section."

Mr. Speaker, I want to stress the importance of this amendment because it touches on the subject of deregulation and privatization, a very current topic, and I think we owe it to Canadians to explain exactly what deregulation and privatization means.

Mr. Speaker, in other countries people have said that deregulation and privatization of public corporations has often wiped out smaller, less profitable companies which were unable to compete, once the rules of the game had changed.

If we look at our neighbours to the South, we see that passenger service has deteriorated substantially in peripheral regions. Why? The answer is quite simple. Airline companies prefer to concentrate on busy routes, on large urban centres and on opportunities for quick profits, in order to make more money and thus reduce competition. That is why we must keep Air Canada, to ensure that quality service is maintained throughout the country, between urban centres and between the regions. If we look at what happened in Great Britain, for instance, when they privatized British Airways, we see that they first cut nearly one-third of the jobs, and that in the final instance, privatization resulted in the establishment of a monopoly. We don't want that in Canada, because we are too dependent on air transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak to this motion because the amendment contains a very essential provision in this connection, to prevent Air Canada from acquiring control, through acquisition of shares or otherwise, of international services.

[*English*]

I want to refer to the May issue of *Policy Options*, a magazine that I think we all read attentively. There is a very interesting article dealing with deregulation and the whole problem of takeovers and big business. This article by Andrew J. Roman begins:

> Deregulation will increase competition, right? Wrong. What masquerades as economic "reform" is often naked self- interest.

He explains the effect of deregulation and privatization. He goes on to speak about Air Canada:

> The Canadian Government is trying to create more competition in the airline industry. This is not as easy as it appears. Air Canada now has 60 per cent of the jet traffic in Canada. It has created a computerized reservations system, widely used by travel agents. This system books reservations so as to favour Air Canada.

I recommend this article to all Members. I will be using it during my third reading speech, if we get the chance.

The dilemma facing Canadians in regard to deregulation and privatization may well be whether we want Air Canada to eat up the other international carriers. It essentially controls the heart of the system, which favours Air Canada rather than dealing with all carriers equally.

Deregulation and privatization may be an objective that the Tories embrace, but I do not think they are serious when they tell us that it will improve transportation services, the quality of service, or improve what Canadians expect from their international airline, which is that Air Canada be a good, solid and competitive company.

The Hon. Member's amendments should have the support of all the House in order to prevent competition from being diminished. Not only would this allow Air Canada to maintain its good quality service, it would prevent it from buying off the competition and becoming a monopoly.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Before I recognize the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Ms. Dewar), I wish to inform the House that because of ministerial statements, Government Orders will be extended 16 minutes.

I regret that I did not see the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain rise before the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier).

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, it is with some sadness that I rise to speak to this Bill. I certainly urge Members of the House to support Motions Nos. 4 and 6 because they could make a bad Bill a little better.

We know that historically it has been important for Canada to have a national carrier, and it is tragic to be faced with legislation such as this.

These motions would ensure that the Government will implement in the legislation the kinds of policies it says exist. It is well known that Air Canada has the highest standards of security and maintenance anywhere in the world. We want to maintain that standard. The experience of Eastern Airlines in the United States shows how badly the standards have slipped there as a result of more competition through deregulation. That possibility exists in Canada. If the Government does not accept these motions, it is simply saying that it does not care. But many Canadians are concerned about the quality of our air carriers and their standards of maintenance and safety.

Some three weeks ago I was on an Air Canada flight from Toronto to Ottawa. I spoke to a gentleman who had boarded the plane close to midnight, after travelling from the southern states since the early morning. He explained to me how pleased he was to be on this airline because he had been travelling all day, with nothing to eat, on airlines that had been overbooked. He said that he had missed one important meeting because these damn fools think that deregulation improves services".

• (1320)

As Canadians we have to appreciate that we have the carrier we have. I said, "We have two carriers like this". He agreed and said, "We are so lucky to have that kind of thing but we won't have it for long. We will be back into the same thing".

Mr. Grisé: You are opposed to small business. Are you opposed to small airlines and small business? That is the socialists' philosophy.

Ms. Dewar: It seems to me that we have to look at other people's mistakes and instead of reinventing the wheel and making the same mistakes, we should benefit and protect ourselves from the disasters that have happened in the airline industry south of the border.

We have an airline that is now making money. We are asking in one of these motions for customer services to be retained. I want to see that protection built in for customer services. Very often you are talking about the ticket agent in the smaller community earning about $30,000 a year. That is not an exorbitant salary. It might be the kind of wages this Government would like to save by reducing them to $6 an hour. The present customer service allows the airline to make a profit. Air Canada has not been in a deficit situation; it has been making a profit. It is about time the Government recognized that.

Sometimes when I hear that Conservatives understand business I think, God help us all if we are left with those kinds of business decisions. Their understanding of business is to de-employ the population, make a lot of money for a few and not worry about services anywhere else. Look at what has happened in the United States. You talk about cheaper airfares, but we know that there are cheaper airfares for travel to the main centres; not good service, but cheaper fares. What happens in the more remote areas? We know that those fares, if there is any service at all, become very expensive. That should not be tolerated in this country. We hope that we will have an election soon so we can get rid of all this bad legislation before us.

Motion No. 6 attempts to protect the pension funds of the people who have paid them. We have seen the experience of certain private owners and what they have done with pension funds. We must protect those funds for the people who have been the contributors. Surely that is not too much to be asking of the Government when it is stripping people of their potential futures. Just to protect pension funds is not an over-demand. The Government spoke nicely at the press conference that the Government would secure all these things. If the Government really meant it, why is it not in the legislation? Those are the kinds of things we are asking for.

If the Government is sincere about trying to make the best of a bad situation, it would listen to these motions and support them. The New Democrats don't believe in the privatization of Air Canada. We think Canada deserves to have a national carrier. We have been able to have two very competitive national carriers, which has been a good thing. We think there has to be a mixed economy in Canada and we have been very successful in stabilizing the economy by having that kind of mixed economy. The tragedy is the convoluted formula that we have. Whoever dreamt up the idea in the bowels of the bureaucracy that 45 per cent will be privatized, but the remaining 55 per cent will have the same say as the 45 per cent private, that is, one vote. With 25 per cent nationally owned, that means you can have foreign ownership. I do not know who was playing with the computer that day, but obviously it went down when people were trying to figure it out.

It is a tragedy but also an embarrassment for us as Canadians to think that that is the way the Government is playing with our assets and national carriers. If the Government had any respect at all for the country and the image we have in the transport industry, surely it would adopt these amendments to bad legislation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Motion No. 4?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on Motion No. 4 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 6. Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on Motion No. 6 stands deferred.

Motion No. 8 will be debated and voted on separately.

Mr. Mike Cassidy (for Mr. Orlikow) moved:

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 10 by striking out line 26 at page 7 and substituting therefor:

"the Corporation and the Commissioner of Official Languages shall include in the annual report a review of the performance of Air Canada in respect of attaining the goals and objectives of the Official Languages Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we go immediately to a vote on Motion No. 8. Perhaps then we can debate Motion No. 9. I believe that would have the support of my friends in the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11) the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Motion No. 9 will be debated and voted on separately.

Mr. Mike Cassidy (for Mr. Orlikow) moved:

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 11 by adding immediately after line 4 at page 8 the following:

"the Corporation assumes all assets and all liabilities of the Corporation held immediately prior to the day on which the Corporation becomes a corporation to which the Canada Business Act applied."

He said: Mr. Speaker, while we would like to prolong the debate on this we are aware of the agricultural bills and I will be the only speaker for my Party on this motion.

[*Translation*]

I may add that the motion on which we just voted was about official languages, and its purpose was to ensure that the Commissioner of Official Languages will continue to monitor the performance of Air Canada with respect to the objectives of the Official Languages Act. Unfortunately, the Government rejected this motion which simply ensured that the Commissioner's annual report would contain an assessment of Air Canada's performance in this respect.

[*English*]

This is the final amendment. The amendment is designed to ensure that the Government does not give away Air Canada to the private sector and then take back a number of debt obligations which essentially would take a load off the private sector and put in on the taxpayers of Canada. That can take place according to the legislation right now, unless this amendment is ensured.

I hoped that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) might have been prepared to speak to this amendment because it is designed to ensure that the deficit does not increase by half a billion or one billion dollars because of the taking on of the obligations of the private sector. People might say: "How on earth would they do that?". If you look at the Eldorado Bill or arrangements on the sale of de Havilland, that is exactly what was done. Basically, the people of Canada gave away their interests in those Crown corporations by means of the obligations and debt which they took on when those Crown corporations went into the private sector.

Time is very limited, but let me say that there is a great tradition in this country which goes back to Sir John A. Macdonald whereby the public, through the Government, have participated in the industrial development and the industrial life of this country. That has been the case beginning with the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was only made possible because of land grants and other participation of the Government of Canada. The Crown corporation culture is something that we have developed. We have been responsible for that in a very successful way. I hate to see this go down the drain.

• (1330)

I am not alone when we say that we want to make sure that we do not get ripped off in the privatization under this Bill. Many Canadians do not feel that the sale of Air Canada is fair. As it has been put, is it fair to give assets to the private sector and leave a debt with the public sector? That is what has been done in cases such as Eldorado and de Havilland.

In the case of Air Canada, the liabilities amount to about $2.1 billion, plus another $336 million in perpetual bonds. The assets are in the order of about $3 billion. This is a big company. It is an effective company. However, I do not want to see a situation in which taxpayers wind up taking on some of that debt in order to line the pockets of people in the private sector.

I note the comment made by none other than the present Prime Minister when he pointed out that the only people who benefit from a takeover such as this one are the lawyers, the accountants, and the stockbrokers. I suspect that that will be the case here.

Throughout this debate the Government has hinted that it has polls backing its position on privatization, particularly of Air Canada. The fact is that that is not the case. The results of two recent polls, the Angus Reid poll, first, indicate that 53 per cent of Canadians were opposed when they were asked the question: "Should the Government sell any of the following Crown corporations to the private sector?" With respect to Air Canada, 53 per cent replied no while 35 per cent replied yes. The Environics poll asked a similar question: "Do you think the Government should or should not sell Air Canada?" Some 51 per cent replied in the negative while 31 per cent replied positively.

There is a large number of Canadians—in fact, the majority—with an opinion.

[*Translation*]

Interestingly, in *La Belle Province*, 55 per cent of the population said the Government should not sell Air Canada and only 25 per cent said they were in favour of selling Air Canada to the private sector.

[*English*]

Older polling data also show a consistency in this high regard for Crown corporations. Back in 1983 a Decima report showed that some 60 per cent of Canadians supported and appreciated Crown corporations because of their pricing, their profitability, their public accountability and their role in providing employment. Another Decima poll also showed that Canadians, by about a 69 per cent margin, believed that public ownership should be the same or higher in the major industrial sectors. In other words, there was an acceptance among Canadians of the use of public enterprise in the constructive way in which we have had it in the country over the course of many years.

It is pointed out again and again that the sale of Air Canada is going forward primarily because this is an ideological question for Progressive Conservatives. Even if the private sector has to be subsidized to take these industries over, the ideology says: "Let's sell".

I wish to suggest that if the Conservative Party thinks that the private sector is such an effective provider of jobs and has such an efficient way of doing things, then let it explain the failure of Dome Petroleum, the Northland Bank, Massey-Ferguson, Maislin Trucking and Dominion Stores. There is a long list of private enterprises in the country that have not been efficiently and effectively run. Often the people in charge of them are people such as Conrad Black who are the bosom buddies of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and his colleagues in the Progressive Conservative caucus.

Here is what the Prime Minister himself had to say in his book *Where I Stand*: "I have yet to see a takeover that has created a single job except for lawyers and accountants". The people who will really benefit from this sale will in fact be the stock promoters and those type of people.

I will conclude on this note. In the British Telecom sell-off in the United Kingdom it is estimated that the costs of selling it off were somewhere around 120 million pounds and that the total expenses of the issue were about 220 million pounds. There were underwriting fees and advertising costs. A reduced price on shares was given to employees. There were telephone

vouchers and bonus shares given to customers, et cetera, et cetera. This was all done by the Thatcher Government to move British Telecom into the private sector.

That type of thing will occur with Air Canada as well. In the end, all that will occur is that there will not be any money coming in to the Government of Canada. There will be a share issue which will allow a certain amount of money to Air Canada to buy new planes and nothing more. We will not see any effect on the deficit here in Canada. All we will have is a bunch of Conservative Cabinet Ministers and back-benchers with idiotic smiles on their faces, the Cheshire cats of politics in Canada, as they smile and watch Air Canada disappear into the great beyond, into the private sector.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I regret that very much. That is why at the very least I ask Hon. Members on all sides to support this amendment which will ensure that we do not subsidize by taking over the debt in the privatization of Air Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing 114(11), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Pursuant to Standing Order 13(5), the recorded divisions stand deferred until 6 p.m., Monday, July 11.

Orders of the day.

WESTERN GRAIN STABILIZATION ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (for the Minister of State (Grains and Oilseeds)) moved that Bill C-132, an Act to amend the Western Grain Stabilization Act, be read the second time and, by unanimous consent, referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in the interests of brevity and the importance of getting this Bill to committee, I will keep my remarks this afternoon to a bare minimum.

The Western Grain Stabilization Act has played a very significant role in supporting farm income in western Canada since 1976. It has been amended on two or three occasions since that time, the most important time being when the provisions for an interim payment on a regular basis were implemented. It has worked exceedingly well for those who are in the program.

By way of example, a farmer who has been participating since 1976 at maximum potential has paid some $8,925 by way of levies and has received approximately $65,000 by way of returns. The Government is concerned about two or three matters. First, we are concerned about the fact that there is a significant number of farmers who are not in the program. They may not be in the program for a variety of reasons. Perhaps, in part, they do not believe in the program. They may be opposed philosophically. Perhaps they believe, as some did, that it will never pay. There were no payments for an extended period of time.

We are left today with the fact that this is a very important part of the safety net in western Canada for the western Canadian farm community but some 13 per cent to 15 per cent of the farm population is not participating. Thus we are introducing a series of amendments to the Act which we hope will encourage a significant percentage of that group to join.

We are troubled by the deficit in the program. It exists at a level of about some $2.2 billion. There are provisions in the program as announced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) last December at the time of the Outlook Conference, for a debt write-down of $750 million.

We are recommending that this Bill go to the Standing Committee on Agriculture. We are assuming that there will be a number of farm organizations that would want to appear before the committee, including a group that calls itself the Committee of Non-participants. Anyone who lives in western Canada is aware of the existence of this group. It is a group of individuals who believe for a variety of reasons that the proposed amendments are not satisfactory to them. We assume that the standing committee would want to hear this group of non-participants over the next few weeks.

The proposed amendments are designed to encourage people to join by the abolition of certain penalties which have been in

place with respect to people who are conditional participants and those who might be rejoining the program.

• (1340)

There is an extension in the deadlines provided for in the legislation. The committee may want to look at that and perhaps even extend those deadlines beyond the prescribed dates in order to encourage as many people as possible to participate. The list of eligible crops covered by the program would be extended by the amendments. The fees would be raised, both the levies charged to the participants and also those paid by the Government as another way in which to make the program more fiscally responsible than it has been up to this point in time. There are some changes and proposed amendments with respect to people opting out, because some people may not wish to remain in the program and they would have the opportunity to opt out.

In general terms, as a result of the consultation process in which we have engaged to date and in which we assume the standing committee will participate, we are hoping that a significant number of western grain producers will conclude that it is to their economic advantage to participate in the program. As a result of the amendments we hope that the program will be in a more sound fiscal shape than it is right now. Quite frankly, if it were not for the support and the willingness of the Government to write-down some of the debt, I do not believe that this program could continue. That might be a debatable view, but that is my view, and it is the view of the Government.

With those brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, I recommend the amendments to the House and to the committee. In the interests of ensuring that the program remain viable I hope that the committee will be able to report back to the House in the relatively near future.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to speak to Bill C-132, the Western Grain Stabilization Act. It seems that agriculture legislation gets a very low priority around here. Last week the Minister of State for Agriculture (Mr. Blais) spoke to a rush-up job on the Canadian Agriculture Products Standards Act. This week we heard the Parliamentary Secretary. We would like to see the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) in the House to defend the legislation, or at least the Minister of State for Grains and Oilseeds (Mr. Mayer). So far we do not seem to attract that assistance from the Minister, because we do not have a chance to put these Bills through.

Mr. McDermid: What is the matter with the Parliamentary Secretary?

Mr. Foster: If Members opposite wish to speak, I will be glad to listen. We can talk until 2:15 p.m. or move the legislation along, just as you like.

It is interesting that there is such great support for the Western Grain Stabilization Act. I recall back in the 1970s when Otto Lang was the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board and brought this legislation into the House and attempted to establish the concept that there should be stabilization of the grain industry in western Canada, and mechanisms should be put in place that would be triggered when world prices of grain were down or when the volumes were down.

In the last two or three years we have seen the wisdom of that legislation brought in in the 1970s by Mr. Lang and supported by his Parliamentary Secretary, Mr. Goodale. This legislation has shown its worth, if only last year when $1.4 billion was paid out under this program. In the previous year it was close to $1 billion, and payments will be needed this year.

This legislation is designed to bring greater participation, and to that extent, I support the legislation. It is desirable that we have greater participation. Ultimately, I would like to see that this legislation is the main way in which we stabilize western agriculture, as far as grain production is concerned. I am not sure that this Bill goes that far, but these amendments are designed to provide flexibility and retroactivity, and remove the penalties for not participating. I believe it will encourage a larger number of farmers to participate. It will provide for a larger number of crops to be utilized under the program.

Because the Government has written off the $750 million for those who have not participated, they believe that those funds should have been channelled through the special grains program. From a purely equitable and fair point of view they are correct, but the question arises from the point of view of the Government how that deficit would be paid, because the additional contributions that would have to be raised are inordinately large.

This arrangement provides that the contributions made by farmers will be increased from a maximum of $600 to $2,400, whereas the contributions of the Government will only be increased by 100 per cent. In the committee we will certainly want to look at the fairness and equity of that arrangement.

At the committee stage we will certainly want to be clear how the Government will make this program feasible in the long term. From officials we will want to know whether the increases to 4 per cent and to 6 per cent will be adequate to make the fund actuarially sound, or whether there will have to be large cash injections such as the one provided for under this legislation of some $750 million.

Because this is based on market returns, and market returns drop down, as we have seen in last three or four years, we will also want to know how this mechanism will provide an adequate return. It is not the market returns that farmers are concerned about, but that the costs of production are covered, and clearly those costs have been marching up every year, while at the same time the price of grain has dropped by 50 per cent during the last four or five years.

The Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Grains and Oilseeds will have the distinction of having provided Canadian farmers with the lowest prices in cash dollars since the Government of R. B. Bennett of 1930 to 1935, and because of the drought that we face this year, we will probably be faced with one of the lowest levels of production in modern times. We see the difficulties of the Tory Governments of the 1930s being revisited on the country in the last half of the 1980s.

Those are a few introductory remarks. I believe these amendments will generally be beneficial. We want to see this legislation dealt with in more detail in committee where we will be able to identify whether the program will be actuarially sound; why the Government is increasing its contributions by only 100 per cent whereas farmers are being asked to increase theirs by 400 per cent; and as a result of the mechanisms in place whether the returns will be adequate to cover the losses of farmers this year.

The response will also be important from the group that have been non-participants as to the mechanisms the Government is providing in this legislation to ensure some equity and fairness to them because of the Government's bail-out of the fund when they see it as being more fair if the $750 million had been paid directly to the special grains program.

Those are a few preliminary comments and observations, Mr. Speaker. I wish there was more time, but there are several pieces of legislation before the House today, and I believe that this one can be dealt with in greater detail in the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

• (1350)

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat against my better judgment that I am here, because I made a decision some time ago that I would not go along with the rushing through of agriculture legislation through the House. I find myself here again, at the end of the parliamentary year, reneging on a promise to myself. In the past, several items of legislation have been passed—agriculture legislation—in exactly this way.

I think it is partially the priority of the House, but in many cases it may be that we just do not have enough support for the agricultural industry in the country. When we amended this particular Act some time ago, it was done in exactly the same way as it was being done here. In fact, it never did go to committee. That might partially be the reason for some of the little concerns that we have had. If we had taken it to committee then, we may not have had exactly the problems that we have now. There is no doubt that as we changed the triggering mechanism two or three years ago, we probably should have taken a good look at the levy structure. We may not have found ourselves in the huge deficit that we are in now.

There is general acceptance among all Parties here and across the industry, that there is a need for some amendments to this Act. The Government has the major need here, and it needs authority. To make a $750 million contribution to the fund is what the Government is doing in this particular case. It is an extra contribution to the fund. Without that being done, the whole structure of the stabilization program would collapse, because the levies would not even pay the interest on the deficit in the future. So we do need these changes.

This is also the kind of legislation, the kind of safety net, that is needed. Some day I hope that the three Parties here in the House can get together on a global safety net which would allow the industry to feel some security rather than be dependent upon ad hoc pay-outs by the particular Government in power.

I think that the farming sector of the agricultural industry feels a certain amount of resentment at being dependent upon the Government in power. It would much rather have in place a program which they could be sure will guarantee them some kind of security of income on the way. I think it is to the credit of the Government that it did put in some changes in the last few years which allowed the triggering under other terms than just a straight aggregate.

There is a concern regarding this particular Bill in that there are a number of groups who feel that since the aim of this Bill was to get as many people into the stabilization program as possible, putting into the Bill an opportunity for the people who are presently in the program to get out of it is a concern. As one farmer put it, "What we are doing is, we are giving those who helped to get the benefits of the deficit being created permission to leave the stabilization program". That is a concern. I do not have a solution for it. I do not think that we want to suggest that they should not be able to get out. We are making changes in the program so that they have a right to analyse whether or not they are in the program.

It is a concern and I think it is one of the things which the committee, when it gets together, will have to look at. In other words, what we are doing is inviting some people in through the front door, but we are suggesting to another group that they might leave through the back door. That may cause us some problems and it is something that we need to look at in committee. It is one of the reasons that most people involved with this Act have insisted that the Bill go to committee rather than being dealt with in the House. We do need some assistance and some consultation with those sectors of the industry that have a very good insight into that matter.

There are a couple of other concerns in this particular Act as well. The Bill allows a 1,000-tonne minimum for a designated purchaser. That whole area of farm-fed feeds needs to be looked at, and I think we might get some very profitable advice from the industry if we give them the opportunity to give it.

There is a concern that has been expressed about whether to extend this privilege of stabilization to non-Canadians. I know that that has to be dealt with within the Charter and it is something that we need to look at a little more closely, although I have no great concern about it, myself.

The third and fourth areas that we have to look at are the levy deductions, how they are going to be carried out. Knocking them off the pay-outs is one method which is suggested in here which may need to be looked at as well.

All in all, I have no particular concerns about the Bill. We will support it, but we do need to look at it and, possibly, there need to be some amendments. The people who have been non-participants in the past really need an opportunity to be able to say yes or no to some of the things that are in here, or give us advice as to how they think we should handle it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-92, an Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): There are three motions in the amendment of report stage of Bill C-92, an Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, and all are related to Clause 8 of the Bill. After consultation, I am selecting Motions Nos. 1 and 3. Both will be debated and voted on separately. Motion No. 2 will not be selected. It is in the name of the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) and is in essence identical to the motion which was moved, debated and negatived in committee.

Therefore, the House will now proceed to debate on Motion No. 1.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma) moved:

That Bill C-92 be amended in Clause 8 by striking out line 33 at page 33 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"railway car during the pool period. The said sum shall reflect an equitable allocation of the costs incurred by the Board to maintain the country delivery points."

He said: Mr. Speaker, my motion which amends Clause 8 is a provision to ensure that the amount provided for in Section 8, which provides for the Government to prescribe a payment to those farmers who use producer cars, is paid. The question turns on how large that payment will be, and how much of the cost maintaining the country elevator should be charged to those who use the country elevator system and those who use producer cars. My amendment provides that the said sum shall reflect an equitable allocation of the cost incurred by the Canadian Wheat Board to maintain the country delivery points.

• (1400)

There has been a great controversy surrounding this issue. The Prairie Pools has sent every Member of Parliament a letter which says:

Clause 8 would allow the Canadian Wheat Board to waive interest and storage charges on grain shipped in producer cars.

The farmers' right to use a producer car must be maintained. However, the only savings that should be deducted are elevation and handling costs.

The argument there is that the only cost that should be deducted and paid out as a sum to an individual farmer is the elevation and handling charges. This argument is put in very strong terms.

This letter received from the Prairie Pools today was signed by Mr. William Strath, Mr. Garth Stevenson and Mr. D. Livingstone, the Presidents of the three western pools. They go on to say:

Any further deduction of storage will likely add to the costs of those farmers using the country elevator system. The infrastructure costs of western Canada's grain handling system are not charged to the users of producer cars.

There is clear evidence of extra costs associated with the producer car since these costs are attributed to the railways and are paid for by all producers in the costing process.

You are aware of direct expressions of concern from large numbers of grain producers in the Prairie area. We urge you to take all possible steps to remove Clause 8 from Bill C-92.

The pools feel very strongly that this payment as proposed in Clause 8 would not necessarily ensure that those using producer cars are paying their fair share of maintaining the infrastructure surrounding the operation of the country delivery points. I do not want to elaborate any more fully. In committee, I thought that my motion was relatively mild. It did not propose to delete the clause.

The Canadian Wheat Board does not have the full responsibility for all of this. Some of it comes under the Western Grain Transportation Agency and some of it under the Wheat Board Act. We were not dealing with the Western Grain Transportation Act so we could not deal with that side of it. The Government refused to give us the cost figures. My amendment is simply designed to provide that there be a fair share of the costs of maintaining the country delivery point paid by those people using producer cars.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this motion moved by the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster), particularly since I understand that my motion which is very similar was not allowed. I did not know the decision of the Chair until this moment.

I support this motion because, for some unexplained reason, the Government has been unwilling to deal with this issue logically. During committee hearings, a suggestion similar to this motion was brought up, and the suggestion that there are no other costs for producer cars is absolutely illogical. Consequently, there is a need to deal with the costs of producer cars in a comprehensive way. That is all we are suggesting in this motion. We should look at the cost of producer cars and decide how much of it should be returned or needs to be returned.

There are two or three possible ways of proceeding with this particular Bill. We could eliminate the clause altogether, which is what my motion suggested, or we could put in a clause which would deal with producer cars in a comprehensive way, or we could drop the Bill entirely and start over. However, there are some things in the Bill which the Government feels it needs, so that option is unlikely.

There are some benefits from producer cars and there are some liabilities. It is like a balance sheet. We want to be able to put the total picture in front of the farmers and the people who use producer cars, add the credits, subtract the debits and possibly pay that amount. There should not simply be an *ad hoc* approach, allowing the Wheat Board to try to make a decision, arbitrary or not, as to how much a producer should be paid.

At this time, the producer knows what he will get out of using producer cars. It is possible that he may even lose money if the Wheat Board decides it wants to do this in a different way.

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in the interests of brevity, I will make only two or three points in an attempt to address the concerns raised by both Hon. Members.

First, I want to make it clear that we are talking about a recommendation by the Wheat Board that certain moneys currently being paid by the users of producer cars for services which they do not receive will be remitted to them. It is important to remember that at the moment they are being charged for services which they do not receive.

The Bill itself only goes part way in addressing the concerns of producer cars. This is enabling legislation in which the Wheat Board would make a recommendation to the Minister which would then go to Cabinet and, by Order in Council, a percentage of the fees involved would be remitted to the users of producer cars. It is clear that they would continue to pay a certain amount to the country elevator system for services which they do not receive, but presumably that would be just in the sense that all prairie grain producers would benefit from the presence of the producer car system.

I would also remind Hon. Members that we are not talking about huge amounts. For example, at the moment, the storage and interest charges currently being paid for wheat by the users of producer cars is $2.68 per tonne. For barley, it is $1.62 per tonne. This Bill would permit the remission of a certain percentage of that amount, that percentage to be determined by Order in Council.

I think this is fair. It is perhaps a typical Canadian compromise. It goes down the middle in terms of addressing the concerns of producer car users while at the same time recognizing the need for the continued presence of the country elevator system.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The question is on Motion No. 1, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 13(5), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred until six o'clock p.m. on Monday, July 11, 1988.

• (1410)

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert) moved:

Motion No. 3:

That Bill C-92 be amended by deleting Clause 8.

The Acting Speaker Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 13(5) the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred until six o'clock p.m. Monday, July 11, 1988.

* * *

CANADA GRAIN ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (for Mr. Mayer) moved that Bill C-112, an Act to amend the Canada Grain Act and other Acts in consequence thereof, be now read the second time and, by unanimous consent, referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I was hoping the Parliamentary Secretary would speak, but this Bill tends to be a technical Bill and deals with a number of matters relating to the Canada Grain Act and things such as grading, documentation, definitions, and such things as, for example, changing the designation of chemists to that of scientists. It creates some new grades for wheat and a number of other changes like that. However, as we understand it, the secret reason for bringing this legislation before the House is to provide a seven-year tenure for the three members of the Grain Commission. We are concerned about this because it not only provides tenure at pleasure, but also provides for a five-year tenure for assistant grain commissioners. We are concerned that this might lead to the Government using it for political patronage purposes.

In the February 18 edition of the *Manitoba Co-Operator* it was reported that this was going to happen. The Government was planning to bring this legislation in to provide tenure so that the Hon. Member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta) can be appointed to the Canadian Grain Commission.

Whether or not that is true we are not sure, but that is what is reported in the *Manitoba Co-Operator*. The article says that the Hon. Member refused to be appointed to the Grain Commission because there was no tenure. The deal was then struck between the Minister responsible for grains and oilseeds to get a seven-year tenure for commissioners by changing the Act. That is the part of this Bill which we object to. We think that doing this is not necessarily in the best interests of the country.

The article points out that if the Hon. Member for Lisgar was appointed to the commission, the present commissioner would be moved over to the Canadian Wheat Board. I think we should ask the Government to withdraw these provisions which are of a purely partisan nature and which would change the commission from a non-partisan regulatory body . . .

Mr. Clark (Brandon—Souris): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We were hoping we could go to committee and these questions could be answered in detail there because there are answers. Grain commissioners used to have a term of ten years in the 1970s, if I recall correctly. The legislation was then amended so that the term was at the pleasure of the Minister. It is now suggested that it be seven years.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It is my understanding that the Hon. Member for Algoma was going to suggest that we not see the clock.

Mr. Foster: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to see the Bill go to committee if we can avoid seeing the clock for another 10 or 20 minutes. Otherwise, I would rather see the Bill come back and we will finish it on Monday.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): We have Private Members' Hour coming up. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Axworthy: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am quite prepared, if there is unanimous consent, to give another 15 minutes to the Bill. I want to reserve my right to speak for a few minutes because there are a number of things here that I think are important and I want to speak to them on second reading.

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to agree to the request of the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) that more time be given to this Bill so that it may go to committee. However, I do so on the understanding that the additional time would not be taken from the important motion standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Yukon (Ms. McLaughlin) and that we continue with the normal amount of time for that debate. This is a vital question relating to the North, and the North is much too neglected anyway to shortchange it this afternoon.

Mr. Grisé: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. We are prepared to extend debate on Bill C-112 for 15 minutes if we have unanimous consent that after that time this Bill will be referred to committee. After that, of course, you will allow the full one hour for debate on the motion of the Hon. Member for Yukon.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Do I have unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Foster: Mr. Speaker, our concerns are that this legislation is being changed as the result of a direct political arrangement worked out between the Minister of State (Grains and Oilseeds) (Mr. Mayer) and the Hon. Member for Lisgar. The Bill changes the present arrangement where

members of the Canadian Grain Commission sit at pleasure to an arrangement where they have tenure. I do not know what the Parliamentary Secretary is talking about when he says there was a ten-year arrangement. Clearly the legislation as it exists today is at pleasure, and there is no guarantee of seven years.

It is not as if this matter has been raised only in the *Manitoba Co-Operator*. It was raised a number of times at other stages. The Government is creating a position by legislation for a member of its own caucus. Bearing in mind the tremendous controversy and publicity which has surrounded thousands of partisan appointments by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), I would think that the Government would not want to bring this kind of aura to the question of agricultural appointments in the West.

• (1420)

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that when, a little over a year ago, the Member for Lisgar was to be appointed to the Canadian Wheat Board, there was such a fuss in western agricultural circles that the Government backed off almost immediately. However, on July 5 *The Toronto Star* reported, "Grain agency posting reported for Tory MP". The article reads:

> Progressive Conservative MP Jack Murta, a former cabinet minister, will give up his House of Commons seat and accept a position on the Canadian Grain Commission, a newspaper says. Sources told the Winnipeg Free Press that the Manitoba MP will be appointed a commissioner with the federal grain-regulating agency, at a salary of $70,000 to $80,000 a year, within five weeks.

The House of Commons is moving legislation directly to create a position for a Member of Parliament. I do not know whether that involves a question of privilege, but it is unseemly that this Bill is introduced and is being rammed through the House during the last week or so of sittings when we have difficulty getting important pieces of legislation through. These reports indicate that the Government is deliberately creating a seat on the Canadian Grains Commission for the Member who does not want a seat in the House of Commons.

Those are our concerns. When we get to committee we will certainly be moving to amend that section to retain the "at the pleasure" aspect. When the Government came to power it found that to be the most satisfactory arrangement to deal with commissioners and assistant commissioners of the Canadian Grain Commission. If it was satisfactory when they came to power, they should certainly want the same satisfactory arrangement in place when they leave.

Those are our concerns with this legislation. The technical aspects would probably be useful, but we are concerned about the political nature of the amendments as they relate to tenure for the commissioners.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to take a few minutes to speak on this Bill. I have somewhat the same concern that Clause 3, which changes the commissioner's term from "at the pleasure" to seven years, does guarantee an appointee of the Government a rather long term. It is unfortunate that timing may have caused some of this, but this has become known as the "Murta Bill", which is very unfortunate.

There are a number of things in the Bill which require thorough study by the committee and experts in the industry. Consequently, there is a great need for it to go to committee before being passed.

For example, the Bill contains the suggestion that the licensing of varieties is not at present acceptable in our grain trade. The suggestion is that it is still a little bit up in the air. We should study the licensing of varieties. There is no doubt that it can be improved and it should be thoroughly studied by the industry.

The Government is to be congratulated on the very good job it has done of consulting with the industry to establish what is needed. That was done between the bureaucrats or drafters of the Bill, but Members of Parliament are not cognizant of that.

There is a section in the Bill which takes away the necessity of Parliament to ratify changes in grades and makes it a bureaucratic decision. I do not believe that this is necessarily good. Parliament has not necessarily done that always in the past, but it has always had the authority to intervene if there was a need to do so. Consequently, I think that is one of the areas which we need to study.

I have no particular objection to the suggestion of privatization of certain of the Canadian Grain Commission's functions, but we should look at that very thoroughly. I have been assured by the Minister and the commission itself that there is no intention to dilute the effectiveness of the commission. If that is so, I wonder why this particular clause is included. On that basis I would allow this Bill to go to committee.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I will not take very long to speak on this Bill. I want to preface my remarks by saying that they cast no personal reflection on the Member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta). I regard him as one of the Hon. Members of this House. I recall with strong respect the speech he made on capital punishment, which I considered to be one of the finer speeches I have heard in this House. As a matter of fact, I understand the Member is now a constituent of mine, having bought a house in Winnipeg in preparation for his new standing in life.

The fact is that this thing stinks. There is no other way of putting it. I want to appeal to some Members on the government side who may have some shred of integrity left. The fact is that they fired people on the Grain Commission who were "at pleasure" without severance. They cut off their careers. They did not give a care about their future, their livelihood, or their families. They just fired them. They threw them out on the streets. They are now trying to protect one of their Members by changing the law in order to get a guaranteed seven-year appointment.

The contrast is that they are prepared to act in the most uncivil, intolerant, and insensitive way to other people, but in their own case are padding their own nest and providing for their own protection.

This is the worst kind of patronage we have seen in this House for many a year. The same thing is happening with Bill C-55. They are going to fire all the members of the boards through that Bill without severance and put their own Members in an entrenched, guaranteed, long-term pay period.

The Canadian people must understand this. Every single newspaper in the Province of Manitoba will have a copy of these remarks. There will not be a person in that province who will not know exactly what the Tories are up to. This is a death rattle. They are trying to take care of their own before they all go to their grave.

People should understand how the Government is abusing its power by trampling on the rights of the commissions and independent agencies of the country. That is exactly what it is doing. It is totally perverting and distorting the purpose of these commissions. They do not mind destroying other people's lives as long as they can protect their own friends.

• (1430)

Mr. Redway: Mr. Speaker, I just have one point of order. What a hypocrite!

Mr. Axworthy: You have no conscience and integrity. Try to defend this in your riding.

Mr. McDermid: The sorest loser in Canada.

Mr. Foster: A point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Before I recognize the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster), I would hope the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway) would withdraw his remark.

Mr. Redway: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that that was unparliamentary. Are you ruling that it is unparliamentary?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Yes.

Mr. Redway: Well, I certainly would not want to say anything that is unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in the interests of getting this Bill to committee where it can be addressed seriously and in the presence of the expert witnesses it deserves, I will resist responding in kind to some of the comments that have been made, even though I must confess I am emotionally inclined to do so.

I want to make two or three points. First, in order to attract quality people to important regulatory positions—the Hon. Member laughs—to have some continuity in this regulatory body as we have in most other governmental regulatory bodies, it is exceedingly important that those individuals have an idea of the timeframe in which they must operate.

According to my information, there was a ten-year term until 1971 when it was amended, for whatever reason, by our friends opposite. The rationale for that can be discussed in committee. That is not the point to be made today.

The amendments in the Bill are important to the industry. These are primarily amendments that have been suggested by the industry. As suggested by the Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo), the Grain Commission is exceedingly important in terms of guaranteeing a quality product.

Quite frankly, if Hon. Members present wish at any time to question the competence or appropriateness of any appointment to positions such as this, they have the capacity to do so. If they see someone being appointed now or in the future who they do not think is appropriate or qualified, they can pursue that in the appropriate manner.

I suggest that the people who are part of the grain Commission now are well qualified. The people suggested and criticized by Members present, in my opinion, would also be well qualified for that responsibility. However, that has nothing to do with me or with the matter at hand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

* * *

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I have received written notice from the Hon. Member for York—Scarborough (Mr. McCrossan) that he is unable to move his motion for second reading of Bill C-292 according to the order of precedence of debate during the hour provided for Private Members' Business.

A Bill which has been designated votable by the Standing Committee on Private Members' Business is now subject to an exchange in positions pursuant to Standing Order 39. Therefore, I am simply directing the Table Officers to drop that item of business to the bottom of the order of precedence.

It being 2.35 p.m., the House will now proceed to consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS--MOTIONS

[*English*]

CONSTITUTION ACTS 1867-1982

SUGGESTED INCLUSION OF THE YUKON AND NORTHWEST TERRITORIES GOVERNMENTS IN CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCES

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should introduce a measure to amend the Constitution Acts 1867 to 1982 to include the leaders of the governments of the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories among the First Ministers participating in all constitutional conferences; and

That this House urge the Senate and the Legislative Assemblies of all provinces to pass similar resolutions.

She said: Mr. Speaker, this is a simple motion that should not really be open to much debate. It states that the duly elected government leaders of the Yukon Territory and Northwest Territories should be part of constitutional talks at First Ministers conferences. This would seem quite logical to ordinary Canadians. I suggest that they would even be surprised that we had to go this route of a Private Members' Motion to petition the House to consider this issue.

The Meech Lake Accord which was passed by this House has effectively brought Québec into the Constitution. Alas, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories have effectively been cut out of potential future provincehood.

Both territories have quasi provincial type legislatures where its members and Governments have responsibility for provincial items such as health, social services and justice. In addition, we have government leaders who are analogous to a premier of a province. We have elections just like all other Canadians, and elect these leaders on the assumption that they will represent the people of the territory on federal matters as well as territorial matters.

While simple justice and fairness would dictate that the provisions in my motion would simply be accepted as indisputable facts, the Meech Lake Accord has had some interesting implications.

Let me return to the Constitution, 1982, in which Section 37 sets the principle for what did not take place in the current round of constitutional amendments. Section 37.1(1) states:

In addition to the conference convened in March 1983, at least two constitutional conferences composed of the Prime Minister of Canada and the first ministers of the provinces shall be convened . . .

It goes on to give the dates on which that shall be done. Section 37.1(3) states:

The Prime Minister of Canada shall invite elected representatives of the governments of the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories to participate in the discussions on any item on the agenda of a conference convened under subsection (1) that, in the opinion of the Prime Minister, directly affects the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories.

Is it being suggested that the Constitution of Canada, the creation of potential provinces in the North, the appointment of Supreme Court judges, the appointment of Senators, the question of whether provinces are allowed to extend their boundaries northward, the question of aboriginal rights, are not all matters that directly affect the people who live in those territories? Apparently that has been done.

In a 1983 meeting of the Premiers and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) there was a constitutional accord on aboriginal rights specifically. The territories were invited to participate in those talks dealing with aboriginal rights. At the same time, the Prime Minister and the Premiers signed a letter stating that they would deal at a later meeting with the outstanding issues of the creation of provinces and boundary extension. That has never really been done except in 1987 to reaffirm that new provinces could only be created by the unanimous consent of all other provinces. British Columbia, should it wish, could simply extend its boundary into the Yukon. B.C. does not have to ask the Yukon, B.C. could just extend its boundary as long as all its other friends in the provinces agree.

• (1440)

Needless to say, the disenfranchisement of 75,000 Canadians north of the 60th parallel in the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories did not meet with a lot of pleasure from the citizens. We have already assumed that we do not leave our rights at the 60th parallel.

During the Meech Lake Accord discussions the leaders of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories were not only not consulted and had no voice but when they came to Ottawa and decided to attempt to make some representation to the Government they were simply told to go home and that the Prime Minister would look after their interests. The interests that have been looked after are the issues I listed a few moments ago.

People in the North do not fundamentally have the same rights as other Canadians. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I have spoken to many groups both here in southern Canada and in the North. One principle people immediately grasp is that Canadians are basically fair people and they understand when people are not being treated fairly. They ask, "Why wouldn't you have a voice? How could it happen that the residents of Alberta, British Columbia or whatever province should be able to say, "We are going to move the borders up. Thank you, Yukoners, take it or leave it' ".

The Prime Minister, to give him his due, as well as the Leaders of the other Parties have worked very hard for the reconciliation of this country by bringing Québec formally into the Constitution. It is an extremely important and historic part of this country. The Prime Minister and the other Party Leaders deserve great credit for that. However, "Why", northerners ask, "in reconciling these outstanding historical issues in the country did we have to disenfranchise northerners? Are we really a northern country? Do we take it seriously?"

We have lots of great speeches about Arctic sovereignty. We are all for supporting Arctic sovereignty. We are a northern nation, but do we really believe it or or do we just say, "We in the south will make decisions for those folks up there. They really don't deserve a chance to participate in one of the most fundamental documents in Canada's history, the Constitution"?

A number of years ago, to lend a little more perspective to this, the now Commissioner of the Yukon made some very interesting observations on history and the lack of Governments, particularly federal Governments, devolving powers to the people in various sectors of the country. Commissioner McKinnon, speaking four or five years ago said:

> The Federal Government today remains as distant, hesitant and uncompromising towards the principle of responsible government for the Yukon as did the Macdonald Government of the 1870s and the 1880s for the then Northwest Territories now Alberta and Saskatchewan.

He quoted also in this piece—which is quite interesting and I would recommend it to anyone who wants to know what northerners really have to say—from the Prince Albert *Times* of February 22, 1884. In an editorial we find:

> If history is to be taken as a guide, what could be plainer than without rebellion the people of the northwest need expect nothing, while with rebellion successful or otherwise they may reasonably expect to get their rights.

We are not talking about rebellion yet. We are talking about the principles of fundamental justice. As you will know, Mr. Speaker, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories have taken their case to the highest court in the land. They have not received a favourable response on various technical points, but on principle there has, in fact, been some encouragement. I would like to run over these principles of fundamental justice which we in the North, and I would suggest many other Canadians, feel have been abrogated by the process. In my motion I am attempting to redress that by at least giving elected territorial leaders a voice in constitutional development of this country.

The first principle clearly contravened is that of the duty of fairness, which includes the right to be heard, the right to give reasons for decisions which affect those rights. In this case, it has not happened. On the question of fairness and fundamental rights, the Prime Minister clearly, legally under the Yukon Act and the Northwest Territories Act, has fiduciary responsibility to the residents of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, which is just a high-falutin' term for saying that the Prime Minister is supposed to ensure that he or she looks after the interests of the Territories.

We feel very strongly that this interest was not carried out in this case. In fact it would be impossible for a Prime Minister of Canada to juggle the best interests of the nation along with the best interests of the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories and so on. However, we do anticipate that the Prime Minister who has this responsibility will exercise it in the national interest. This, we say, has not been done and has not been done in the issue of fairness to northerners. We are not asking, and in this motion I am not suggesting, given the legal status of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories that are not provinces at this point, that we should be considering or saying that they must have a vote at the First Ministers Conferences.

From 1982 to 1987 our government leaders did often attend First Ministers' conferences. However, they were not allowed to speak. Can you imagine this ludicrous situation? You have the leaders of our country sitting around a table and you have the leaders of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories sitting in the back rows not able to express the views of the constituents they have been elected to represent. Surely that is a ludicrous situation. Would the leaders from British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba or Ontario put up with that? Of course not. It is ridiculous. I mentioned before that when our leaders did attempt to participate in 1987 they were basically shown the sidewalk and told that the Prime Minister would look after their interests. Clearly that has not been done.

The principle of fairness is the essential element here. But there is another principle. That is simply the expedient and realistic principle of making sure that those people who are affected by decisions are involved in those decisions. We have many, many historic examples of when they are not. What happens? As quoted by the Prince Alberta paper, there could be rebellion. Certainly if not rebellion, there is a form of alienation from Canada and Canadians.

I would remind this House that the people who live in the Northwest Territories and the people who live in the Yukon are those very people who will protect Arctic sovereignty, who have an interest in protecting that sovereignty, and who will continue to reside there. They will not leave. They are there to stay. The aboriginal people have been there 20,000 to 30,000 years. It is estimated that the aboriginal people in Old Crow, Yukon, have been in that area for 30,000 years. That is sovereignty and that is what we are talking about. Are we saying that those people cannot have a voice in Canada in terms of what Canada will become? I hope not. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is exactly what has happened.

• (1450)

There is a very strong feeling in the North—and I have been from the Baffin region to the Western Arctic to the Yukon in the past two to three weeks and I have seen it—there is unanimity on one point. There is not unanimity on very much in the North. There are a lot of individualists there. A great many of us have very specific opinions about things and about what we would like to see happen. There is the feeling that people have been left out, that they have been treated unfairly and that Canadian justice does not apply to those north of 60.

There is something quoted that is quoted so often that it really became a bit of cliché, but in this instance it really does not apply. It is that justice must not only be done but be seen to be done. I am very well aware of the constitutional and the legal position of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. But

if people feel disenfranchised, if they feel that they do not have a voice and a representation, then clearly that is a significant problem for the country.

Having no voice and having no vote is not acceptable. I suggest that they are not acceptable to the people in the North, and they are not acceptable to Canadians. Dictatorships are systems of government in which there is no voice and no vote. That is not the system that we are participating in here.

This motion is important because it would begin to redress that wrong. It is not a radical change. It is not changing the whole character of Canada. It is so simple. It is saying: "Let our elected government leaders sit down with you and express our point of view as resident northerners about some of the most fundamental issues in Canada".

I suggest that if the Government were to allow this matter to go to a vote it, would be an opportunity to say not only *oui* to Quebec but to say *oui* to the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. It is time that we acted sensibly and maturely. Surely the second largest country in the world can function with 13 provinces, if that is what is about to happen. Is that really so complicated? Can we not cope with that? Of course we can.

What are the consequences of enacting some of the fundamental actions in the Constitution which address the concerns of northerners? It would be to the benefit of the country. It would be to the benefit, certainly, of the development of northern Canada.

In summation, I would like to say that this motion which I put forward is simply a first step in that direction. It is not a radical change to the whole country. It is not rebellion. It is not separation. In fact, it is saying: "Please, Canada, include us in the discussions about the future of this country". We are mature enough to do this. Those who read the submissions by the Northwest Territories, the Yukon and the aboriginal groups, clearly see the concerns that were expressed for the development of a just Canada, a Canada in which all citizens have equal rights. A country in which some citizens have more rights than others is not the kind of Canada we want to see.

In conclusion, I would say here is the opportunity for the Members of this House to say: "We say yes to the North. Come and join us. You are part of our country".

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane—Superior): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for the Yukon (Ms. McLaughlin) by her motion this afternoon reminds the House once again just how shabbily the Government of Canada tends to treat our two territorial Governments and their leaders. It is almost necessary to remind the House that the Governments of the territories and their leaders are drawn from their Legislative Assemblies just as our Government and our leaders are drawn from the Legislative Assembly of which we are Members. Those Legislative Assemblies in the North are elected precisely as we are elected—by constituted elections and by secret ballot.

I submit that, with respect to Motion No. 204, to exclude the leaders of the two territorial Governments, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, from constitutional conferences and from those economic conferences that are called for under the Meech Lake amendment is undemocratic. I support wholeheartedly the sentiments that have been so well expressed this afternoon by the Hon. Member for the Yukon on that particular point.

We know something about how the Government of Canada regards the two territorial Governments. Those views have been expressed by legal counsel for the Government of Canada in open court. What government lawyers have said in open court is that the territorial Governments are not governments at all. They have said that what they are are agencies of this Government and that, in fact, they do not exist.

That is tough to swallow. I put that to my hon. friend from the Northwest Territories, the Hon. Mr. Ballantyne who is serving as Minister of Justice. I put it to him in committee. This is what he said in response to my question:

> —my colleagues in the Yukon and the Territories were shocked and surprised that an argument could even be considered in the furthest reaches of anybody's imagination that somebody by a whim can say you no longer exist. When I travel through the 73 communities of the Northwest Territories and when people come to me as they come to you as politicians with their complaints, they sure as hell think I exist. So I am not quite sure how the federal Government in 1987 could even present such a case.

As the Hon. Member has said, the approval by this House of this motion would not fully or wholly correct the constitutional insult under which northerners now live. It would not do that. However, it would at least be a small step in the right direction.

The Constitution Act of 1982 in Sections 42(1)(e) and (f) imposed upon the two territories the requirements of the amending formula, that is, if any boundaries were to be extended north, or if new provinces were to be created, there must be the agreement of seven provinces having 50 per cent of the population. I remember how delegates from the North came down here and, in fact, occupied part of the Hill to protest.

In 1982, when they came down here, I strongly favoured protesting that provision in the 1982 amendment. I came within a breath of voting against the 1982 amendment. If I did not want that Charter of Rights so badly, as I did, I think I would have been one of those who stood in the House to vote against the 1982 constitutional amendment. But that Charter of Rights and Freedoms was needed in the country as a check against the great executive power that presently exists.

Thank goodness that in 1983 at the First Ministers Conference there was an effort to repair the damage. It was suggested, first, in the 1983 Accord that never got off the ground—that agenda has never been completed—that, among other things, the future leaders of the territorial governments be

invited to constitutional conferences. There was a bit of hedge in that, I admit. The hedge was that the Prime Minister had to agree that those matters were of concern to the territorial governments. I would ask my hon. friends in the House if they can give me one subject that would ever be debated or discussed at a First Ministers Conference that would not be of concern or of interest to the North? I cannot think of one. Even though that hedge was built in, I think, on careful analysis, it was not a serious one.

• (1500)

The second thing that the Accord of 1983 planned to do, if it had ever been completed, was to repeal paragraphs 42(1)(e) and (f). That would have returned the situation to what it was before, that is, extending boundaries or creating new provinces could not be done through the amending formula. It could only be done bilaterally between the people of the territories and the Government of Canada. That is the way Saskatchewan was created in 1905. My grandfather was a member of that territory and strongly advocated provincehood in 1950.

In 1905, the province from which you and I have origins, Mr. Speaker—you still, I am a deserter—was carved out of the Northwest Territories through an arrangement between the people there and the Government of Canada. It was bilateral. Why should that be changed? In the United States of America, a new state is created between the people of that state who are seeking statehood and the Government in Washington. The same thing applies in Australia and India. Why do we have this bizarre system in Canada that requires that the amending formula be imposed upon the aspirations of people who live in the North?

In 1949, when Newfoundland sought membership in Confederation it did not have to get the consent of Saskatchewan or Alberta. Instead of repealing paragraphs 42(1)(e) and (f) what we did in the Meech Lake Accord was to make matters worse. Now, instead of seven provinces with 50 per cent of the population, there has to be unanimity. What we did was to impose constitutional injustice upon the people who live in the North. Why did we do it? Did Québec demand that? I never heard any person in Québec say that that was a necessary price for their signature on our Constitution. It can only be described as an injustice. That is why the Hon. Member for the Yukon, the Hon. Member for the Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson), and myself, among others, voted against the Meech Lake Accord.

The road back to justice and fairness for the North will be a long and difficult one. Constitutional changes are always long and difficult. However, if today we can approve Motion No. 204 in the name of the Hon. Member for the Yukon, we would at least be taking a step in the right direction. It would mean that in the future territorial leaders would be able to sit down with Premiers and the Prime Minister and discuss their concerns and give their input.

I wish to tell the Hon. Member for the Yukon that she is in very good company in what she is proposing. The task force on the Meech Lake constitutional Accord, which was written by the Senate, supports that proposition. In 1986, the plenary session of the Liberal Party of Canada passed a resolution that was submitted by the Yukon Liberal Association supporting what the Hon. Member for the Yukon is proposing, and that was a priority resolution which passed in the plenary.

I wish to turn to the document that was prepared by the Special Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the 1987 Constitutional Accord. This document talked about difficult questions that had to be dealt with at First Ministers Conferences, difficult questions concerning the legitimate interests of the existing provinces without unfairly prejudicing the development of the North. On those difficult questions the document states:

> It would appear from the evidence that we have heard that not all of these matters have been addressed in the necessary detail to allow decisions to be made by First Ministers at this time.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask my friends in the House, how can these difficult questions be considered? How can they be resolved? If the territorial leaders are absent from First Ministers Conferences, they cannot. Therefore, I say to you, Sir, and I say to my friends in the House, that Motion No. 204 in the name of the Hon. Member for the Yukon deserves full, unanimous, and unequivocal support of the House, and not to support it without equivocation and reservation is clearly an insult to northerners.

I want to leave the last word on this matter to a man for whom I have respect and admiration and who has done a fine job in his leadership in the North, the Leader of the Territorial Government in the Yukon. He appeared before the joint committee talking about the constitutional unfairness imposed upon the North by the Meech Lake Accord and he stated: "The right to be heard and to have reasons given for the decisions which affect our rights are fundamental. It is fundamentally unfair that our fate should be decided by others. It should not happen at ministerial meetings at which we are not represented". I say to Mr. Tony Penikett, Leader of the Government in the Yukon, I and my Party agree with you fully on that.

Mr. David Daubney (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity this afternoon to contribute to the debate on the motion of the Hon. Member for the Yukon (Ms. McLaughlin) who is a recently arrived Member in this place for whom I have a high regard. The Hon. Member is a fair-minded Member who was good enough to give credit to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) in her remarks for his role in national reconciliation. I had hoped that perhaps she would have taken a minute today while she had the floor to tell Canadians, particularly her constituents, that today the unemployment rate in the Yukon Territory is the lowest it has been since 1975.

Ms. McLaughlin: There is an NDP Government in the Yukon.

Mr. Daubney: The motion before us today concerns the ongoing evolution of territorial participation at First Ministers Conferences. In my remarks I want to emphasize just how far we have come in providing a greater role for the territories in such conferences since our Government came to office in 1984.

I had the honour of being a member of the special joint committee of the House and the other place that looked at the Constitution Act of 1987. The Member will know that our committee heard a number of witnesses from the territories and a number of witnesses from aboriginal groups, and we gave very serious attention to the concerns that they expressed. We also expressed sympathy for many of the points that they raised and suggested amendments that First Ministers might wish to consider on subsequent rounds.

Under the Meech Lake Accord, which has now been ratified once again by Parliament and by eight Legislative Assemblies, there is a guarantee of First Ministers Conferences on the economy and other matters at least once a year. This provision has not attracted much attention during public and parliamentary discussion of the Accord. Perhaps we as Canadians have become a bit blasé and too easily take for granted the co-ordinating work done by First Ministers conferences. I want to remind Hon. Members that not so long ago the very convocation of such conferences was itself a matter for endless federal-provincial discord.

Until 1985 First Ministers Conferences took place if and when the Prime Minister saw fit. Premiers had to spend much time and energy asking to meet with the Prime Minister and putting forward shopping lists of issues that needed to be addressed. Public opinion was a weapon in this game, so national priorities could be set in exchange for headlines. That changed after our Government came to office with a mandate to seek national reconciliation to end the confrontation and mistrust that had marked federal-provincial relations for too long.

When he was Leader of the Opposition, the Prime Minister made his commitment in an historic address at Sept-Îsles on August 6, 1984. It was there that he laid down his program for bringing Québec back into the constitutional family "with honour and enthusiasm". The program triumphantly concluded with the Meech Lake Accord. But he did more; he also said the following in his speech:

> To end parallel or incomplete planning once and for all between the two orders of Government, we will set up a federal-provincial advisory and co-ordinating body. It will operate at the highest level, namely with the 11 leaders themselves working together in an appropriate institutional framework, advising on the options envisaged and the directions to take.

The First Ministers Conference is a forum where the provinces can make their special concerns known so that federal programs are framed in ways that work for all Canadians, wherever they live and whatever their social and economic setting. As Hon. Members know, the Prime Minister quickly reached the goal of co-ordination that he fixed at Sept-Îles.

• (1510)

At their Regina meeting in 1985, First Ministers unanimously agreed to meet at least once a year for a period of five years. The agenda items of these annual conferences was to include the following: A review of the state of federal-provincial relations; consultation on major issues concerning both orders of Government; and in particular the state of the economy; consideration of broad objectives for Governments in Canada; and exchanging information to facilitate planning for the operations of their Governments.

Three conferences have since been held, first in Halifax, then in Vancouver, and last year in Toronto. These conferences illustrate how First Ministers Conferences can set and move forward an agenda in areas where co-operation between the two spheres of government is essential.

In an address to the Institute of Public Administration of Canada in Saint John last September 3, the Minister of Federal-Provincial Relations, Senator Lowell Murray, said:

> Canadians know too well how easy it is to let political rivalries stand in the way of good economic and social policies. Most of our institutions—whether they be industrial relations, parliamentary or judicial—are premised on an adversarial model. We need to place much more emphasis on consensus-building institutions to achieve all we are capable of as a nation.

First Ministers Conferences are an institution. They provide a framework for continuing federal-provincial meetings of Ministers and officials and impose what Senator Murray called "a healthy discipline" on them.

A forthcoming conference represents a deadline to be met, and First Ministers can also, when necessary, break deadlocks. As Senator Murray told the Institution:

> Our approach to federal-provincial relations is firmly based in reality. No matter what the actual jurisdictional division of power, Canada's eleven governments function in an interdependent world. Each government's policy actions inevitably affect the other, and good policies cannot be developed in isolation . . .
>
> The real challenge before our federation is to seek agreement and shared purpose on the best policies for Canadians. This is rarely easy, but policy innovation and government responsiveness is nurtured by strong governments and the interaction between them.

Regularity lends stability to the annual planning cycle of all Governments, running through the preparation and presentation of Budgets in the first half of the following year, Premiers' conferences, the preparation of Speeches from the Throne.

It also ensures that when decisions are made by Governments at both levels, it is with an up-to-date appreciation of what the impact may be on the broader scheme of things.

I would like to turn now to the specific question of territorial attendance at federal-provincial First Ministers Conferences.

The government leaders of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories have been invited, as you know, Mr. Speaker, to sit at the table at the First Ministers Conferences convened under the terms of Part IV of the Constitution Act, 1982. These conferences are of particular and direct interest to the territories and to the aboriginal peoples of Canada.

Prior to the election of this Government, the government leaders of the territories were not invited to attend First Ministers conferences other than those dealing with the Constitution and aboriginal rights. The Prime Minister took the initiative in November, 1984, of writing to the Premiers to seek their views on possible territorial involvement in the First Ministers Conference held in February of 1985.

As a result of that important initiative, it was ultimately agreed that the government leaders of the territories should be invited as "official observers" to the conference. Furthermore, the Prime Minister invited both of them to come to the table to make short statements. Finally, the territorial Governments were both allowed to use the services of the Canadian Intergovernmental Conference Secretariat. These arrangements have been repeated at all the annual First Ministers Conferences since then, and they go far beyond what is provided for "simple observers".

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, of the role that this Government has played in providing for territorial involvement at public First Ministers conferences and, in particular, of the leadership role of the Prime Minister.

The arrangements I have described concerning the involvement of territorial government leaders at the First Ministers Conferences on the economy are a further example of this Government's commitment to undertaking practical steps to allow territorial Governments to pursue the practical needs and concerns of northern Canadians.

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I am very honoured to stand as a second speaker for my Party today. I would like to start by commending the Hon. Member for the Yukon (Ms. McLaughlin) for not only bringing this Bill forward but for her outstanding role in a very short few months as representative of the Yukon Territory. I think that since I have been in this House, which is now nine long years, almost 10, it is the first year when we have had a very strong voice from the territories. She has been up on many different issues, but none more important than the issue that she raises today, of constitutional representation and representation of the Yukon and the Northwest territorial leaders at the table of the leaders of this land.

I must say, first of all, that I think it was just over three years ago that I attended the First Ministers Conference which was held in Vancouver, as an observer. It is rather ironic that the main topic of the sessions that I attended was equality.

I looked at the table and I was astounded to see that the leaders from the territories were not sitting there. I spoke to Mr. Penikett, as my hon. friend from the Liberal Party said, "the outstanding leader from the Yukon Government". He said that is true, we are still colonials, we are still treated as colonials. It is appalling, really, and I do not think that many southern Canadians really stop to think about this, that we are treating one-third of our territory and the people there who have the longest tradition—thousands and thousands of years—as second-class citizens.

I think also that the kind of situation that we have at First Ministers' meetings where offers are made that the Prime Minister would speak to the territorial leaders and then convey their wishes to the other leaders, if he thought it was important, is a sheer parochial form of government and it is quite insulting, I am sure, to northerners.

Now, we know that the northern territorial leaders have asked to be included, with full voice, at the meetings of the First Ministers. When the First Ministers met in 1987 to decide our constitutional amendments, both territorial government leaders came to Ottawa and they asked to participate. Then they asked that if they were not allowed to participate, could they at least be assured that they would be consulted by the Prime Minister before any amendment was finalized. It is appalling that they were denied both these requests. They had no consultation, no representation and they were allowed no vote at this First Ministers' Table, the most important meeting in our land and perhaps in our history.

The Leader of the Yukon Government made a number of very important remarks at that meeting. My friend from the Liberal Party has mentioned some of them, but I would like to mention a couple of others.

He stated, "On June 1, 11 men in a locked room decided to consign the occupants of one-third of the land mass of Canada to a constitutional limbo". As a matter of fact, I think he said this after a special joint committee meeting. He went on to say, "Except in a manner that would credit Franz Kafka, there was no trial. The condemned had no hearing. There was no evidence, no prosecution, no defence that we know of, but the jury became judges and sentenced generations of northerners to perpetual colonial status".

• (1520)

He said later that even if unanimity were possible, how could one justify allowing the representatives of everyone else in the nation except those most affected to decide the North's place in Confederation? Surely this is the very opposite of self-determination. Surely this is a rule fit for an exclusive gentlemen's club, not a democratic society. We would certainly agree that it was a gentlemen's club, and this kind of decision-making was certainly highly undemocratic.

Both opposition Parties and most government Members as well felt that the territories needed some redress and that we should have amended the Meech Lake Accord. Certainly our Party pressed very strongly for an amendment that would have allowed the former amending formula to be used in any future meetings concerned with the inclusion of the territories as future provinces. Unfortunately, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), despite having some sympathy for this, did not

have enough sympathy to accept this amendment. I think that was very unfortunate.

I call on government Members today, however, to think of this motion as the first step they can take in redressing what I think is a really discriminatory action on the part of all of us in the Meech Lake Accord. In Motion No. 204, the Hon. Member for the Yukon has called on the Government to include government leaders of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories in all First Ministers constitutional conferences. It seems to me to be a very simple and democratic step to take.

It is indeed insulting that there has not been representation from the North. I am not talking about token consultation but about full representation with duly elected leaders from the Yukon and the Northwest Territories sitting down in an equal position with leaders of other provinces.

Speaking as a southerner, I think we miss a great deal when we do not hear directly from representatives of the North. We know how much we have learned from the Hon. Member for the Yukon today and from the many other speeches she has made. When I have visited the North, I have been fascinated and I would like to learn much more about the special needs and circumstances of northerners. Their health services are much different from ours, and perhaps we have something to learn from the kind of pattern that has evolved there. There is a higher birth rate in the North than in most other parts of Canada and the need for child care programs are different and perhaps much greater.

As Hon. Members who spoke previously pointed out, the North has now had long experience with effective elected Government, and the Northwest Territories is moving toward a division about which most southerners do not know. We need to hear about these things from the leaders of the North sitting at the table of First Ministers speaking in an equal way on behalf of the territories. I urge government Members not to talk this out today but to allow it to go to a vote so that we can see how all Hon. Members feel about this issue.

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This afternoon, on a motion involving people living in Canada's North, representatives of the three Parties have spoken. The views have been expressed clearly, and I have not heard any dissenting views. Therefore, I would ask you to seek unanimous consent of the House that this question be put now.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Since this is Private Members' Hour, any Hon. Member rising is entitled to speak. I noticed that the Hon. Member for Québec-Est (Mr. Tremblay) is rising, so I recognize the Hon. Member for Québec-Est.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec-Est): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the real problem is the failure to grant provincial status to the Territories. It must be clearly understood that their becoming provinces would entail fundamental changes in Confederation. To deal with this point first, the Territories recognize that provincehood would be a burden at this time. This is one reason, no doubt the most important, why they do not consider provincehood a practical proposition in the short term. Those who followed . . .

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. There is about seven minutes left on this Friday afternoon. I would like to be able to hear the Hon. Member for Québec-Est.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay (Québec-Est): As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, those who followed the hearings of the Special Joint Committee on the Meech Lake Accord may perhaps remember what Gordon Robertson said about this.

He spoke as someone who had been Commissioner of the Northwest Territories for 10 years, as well as Secretary to the Cabinet and Cabinet Secretary for Federal-Provincial Relations. He said:

> They certainly could not finance on the present basis of federal-provincial financing. The grant the northern territories get in lieu of equalization provides a payment to the northern territories that is proportionately far in excess of what any province gets under equalization.

This is nothing new for Northerners, Mr. Speaker, nor for the territorial Governments, as Tony Penikett, Head of the Government of the Yukon, said before the Special Joint Committee:

> The Yukon and the Northwest Territories are not provinces now; nor do we seek provincial status at this time. Few people in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories would argue that we have reached the point where provincial status makes sense. We know keenly our limitations: our small, scattered population; our slim economic resources; our inadequate transportation system.

In a word, Mr. Speaker, northern residents have the right to benefit from all the range of services offered to other Canadians, no matter where they live. At the present time, and in the near future, the Territories could not in any case provide those services, and northern residents would not obtain them without considerable assistance from the federal Government.

That is one of the main reasons which explains why the territorial governments are not seeking the status of province at this time, and they are not considering such a move in the short term. That is why I cannot support the resolution now before the House which would in effect grant them such a status indirectly or partially, not in the future but immediately. This leads me, Mr. Speaker, to broach another point of the Accord that has been criticized, the fact that there must be unanimous agreement for the creation of new provinces.

The Accord allows us to reach an objective, the recognition of the principle of the equality of provinces: the amending formula provision is the reflection of that principle. It is important for Canadian solidarity that all provinces have an equal say in matters that affect the fundamental nature of Confederation. The creation of a province is one of those fundamental questions. It has an effect on the make up of our

Confederation, as well as on the application of the amending formula.

Before 1982, the creation of a province was the exclusive prerogative of Parliament. It was a form of equality, in the negative sense, since no province had any say in the matter.

In 1982, the creation of a province was made subject to the general amending formula, the so-called "7/50" criterion, that is the approval of two-thirds of the provinces with 50 per cent of the population of all the provinces in Confederation. This requirement brought about an imbalance which could have had serious adverse and unpredictable effects on Confederation.

It meant that Quebec and Ontario together obtained a right of veto, but not British Columbia and Alberta, for instance.

There is no doubt in my mind that the creation of one or more provinces would directly affect all members of the confederation. The addition of a province is a basic question which concerns the composition of the federation and, for example, the way the amending formula itself works. Allowing the creation of a province with the agreement of only some of the existing provinces would be contrary to the underlying principle that all provinces are equal. Adding another province would also have a strong impact on the financial structure of the federation, particularly in connection with equalization programs.

In that respect, here is what Robarts Centre for Canadian Studies Professor Tom Courchene wrote:

> Although the principle is now entrenched in the Constitution, the fact remains that creating a northern province might prevent the federal Government from increasing equalization payments, as it is being urged to do. This cannot be construed as an argument against the creation of new provinces. Far from it. However this argument rests on the principle whereby the three traditionally "rich" provinces of the federation—Ontario, B.C., Alberta—should not have the right of veto over the creation of new provinces if the three so-called "poor" Maritime provinces do not have it as well, especially if equalization payment funds are involved.

In his recent study on Meech Lake, Osgoode Hall (York University) Law Professor Peter Hogg wrote that:

> . . . delegated powers end up by confering full provincial status, and this situation deeply—albeit indirectly—affect the other provinces. The creation of new provinces will boost their total number and so will have an impact on the operation of the amending formula. Since any direct change to that formula requires unanimity, it can be argued that any other change having the same effect should also be subject to the same requirements.
>
> One may also claim that the creation of new provinces, especially ones with a sparse population over a vast territory with a harsh climate, would involve a thorough revision of federal-provincial financing arrangements. This is another subject on which unanimity is at least desirable. Therefore, one may rightly suggest that all existing provinces should agree before new provinces are created.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I do not believe unanimity to be the problem: the Accord itself shows and is concrete evidence that the requirement for unanimity is not an obstacle to change.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the real problem is the one that we will solve with the Accord. I say that because, as I see it, the problem is that mutual trust and respect, between Canadians and between Governments, have been lacking for too long. In short, the problem is one of confidence and faith in our institutions. We have seen that Northerners are not seeking provincial status for the time being and I think we can agree that unanimity is a reasonable requirement.

The real problem is that some northerners—not too many, hopefully—and I trust and believe that this will change . . .

• (1530)

[*English*]

Ms. Mitchell: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but I wonder if he would agree to allow time to give unanimous consent to this very important motion so that it can be brought forward and this House will be able to recognize the importance of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories having representation at leaders' meetings?

Mr. Grisé: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grisé: Mr. Speaker, already today the House has agreed to sit beyond normal hours to deal with an important Bill, Bill C-112, to have it deferred after second reading to the Standing Committee. As we have already gone thirty-five minutes beyond the normal time of adjournment and as the Member for Québec-Est (Mr. Tremblay) has not finished his speech, I think that we should listen to . . .

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Before both Hon. Members rose the time had expired.

The time provided for consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 42(1), the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

It being 3 o'clock p.m., this House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned 3.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, July 11, 1988

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REPORT OF CANADIAN OBSERVER AT MUNICIPAL AND LEGISLATIVE ELECTIONS IN EL SALVADOR

Mr. Jean-Guy Hudon (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 67(2), I wish to table, in both official languages, the report by the Canadian Observer at the legislative and municipal elections in El Salvador on March 20, 1988.

* * *

[*English*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table in both official languages government responses to 20 petitions bearing Nos. 332-4675, 332-4676, 332-4773, 332-4776 to 332-4778 inclusive, 332-4793, 332-4795 to 332-4799 inclusive, 332-4802, 332-4804 to 332-4806 inclusive and 332-4808 to 332-4811 inclusive.

* * *

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE TO TRAVEL

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor) moved:

That the legislative committee on Bill C-130 be empowered to adjourn from place to place in Canada and the United States for the purpose of hearing witnesses on the proposed trade agreement with the United States.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt—

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would like to contest, if I may, the procedural acceptability of this motion being on the Order Paper under "Motions". The reason I do that is this.

Traditionally, the heading "Motions" has been reserved for concurrence requests in reports of standing committees which have been prepared by this House through the efforts of the standing committee, an independent body of this House. Members of standing committees, as the Chair will know, have the right to request that a concurrence motion be put on the Order Paper and then any member of the committee can move that concurrence motion in order to have a debate. I suggest that if motions of this nature are allowed to be put on the Order Paper under "Motions", we will have a complete subversion of the private Members' process.

If you look at the Order Paper under "Private Members' Motions", you will see other motions of instruction which a private Member puts in a draw and takes the chance that the motion will be drawn from a hat and thus go through the regular private Members' motions process. The House will know that process was developed by the parliamentary reform committee to ensure that private Members' motions and Bills had a decent opportunity of receiving full consideration by this House.

A private Member drafts a motion exactly as my hon. friend has drafted his, puts it in a hat and hopes that it is drawn out. When it is, it goes to the private Members' committee for deliberation as to whether or not it will get one hour's debate, such as the motion of the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) on the Order Paper today, which says:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider designating as potential parkland all military lands located in urban areas and presently used for military purposes, once their present use is discontinued.

There are other examples on the Order Paper.

I suggest we have a process for private Members' motions. You will note this motion is on the Order Paper in the name of an individual Member. It did not flow from a committee. It is an individual Member's effort to bring something to the attention of the House. It is a subversion, in my opinion, of the private Members' motion process and private Members' Bill process which was instigated and enacted by this House. For that reason I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend is trying to do something by way of Motions which he should quite properly do by way of a private Members' motion.

• (1110)

Second, I suggest that the committees in this House are the masters of their own destiny. We set up committees under a legislative chairperson now, not under a government appointed chairperson. The Chair appoints those committee chairpersons from a panel and those committees operate and decide on the business of the committee independent of the House.

I think it is fair to suggest that the arrangement of the business of that committee, unless it is in the original motion sending the matter to the committee, should be left up to the committee. It is my understanding that, in this particular instance, the committee has decided not to travel.

It is very much the exception that committees travel. If one wishes to argue that this particular committee should travel, I would counter that by saying that standing committees of this House, one a joint committee with the Senate and one an independent committee of this House with no Senate membership, have already travelled this country to consider the issue of free trade. Before this legislative committee is the question as to whether or not Bill C-130 accurately brings into legislation the agreement between Canada and the United States on free trade. That is the narrow question before the legislative committee on Bill C-130. I think that speaks to why the committee should not travel.

In concluding my remarks I want to reiterate that I believe this motion should properly come under Private Members' Business, a motion for an allotted day, or proceedings on delegated legislation. Second, I want to refer to the argument which has always been before us, that is, that committees are masters of their own destiny. For those reasons I do not believe that this motion is in order.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to reply to the Minister's point of order that this motion is out of order and should not be moved under Motions during Routine Proceedings.

I first want to refer to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, citations 756 to 762 which list the rules and practices with regard to instructions to committees. I believe that if you consult these citations you will clearly find that the motion which the Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon) has moved is in order in terms of the object which the motion seeks to achieve. Citation 756(1) states:

> An Instruction is a motion empowering a committee to do something which it would not otherwise do, or to direct it to do something which it might otherwise not do . . .

Clearly, the object of this motion is to empower the committee to travel, a power which a legislative committee does not normally have, as the Hon. Minister has indicated. That is all the motion does. In that sense it is procedurally a "permissive" instruction.

Obviously, this type of motion has not been moved in this House by an opposition Member in a very long time. In fact, I believe the last time such an instruction was moved by someone other than a government Minister was during the great pipeline debate in 1956. At page 604 of *Journals* for Wednesday, May 23, 1956, we find an instruction moved by Mr. Drew, seconded by Mr. Rowe, to enable the committee that was to study the pipeline legislation to divide the Bill into two separate orders.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, there was some discussion as to whether the motion required notice and whether or not the motion was debatable. Ultimately the Speaker of the day decided that the motion was in order and it was put to the House for a vote.

The principle which existed in 1956 has not been extinguished over time. The House now has the ability to instruct a committee to do something or permit it to do something that it might otherwise not be able to do. The right to move such instructions extends not only to government Ministers but to all Members of the House.

The right to move instructions is clearly recognized in Beauchesne. It is recognized in Bourinot at page 512 and in Erskine May Twentieth Edition at page 539. Nowhere in these citations does it indicate that such instructions can only be moved by Ministers of the Crown.

Proper notice has been given of this motion and it is my contention that the Hon. Member should be allowed to proceed with debate on this important issue. We are talking about enabling the committee to travel so that Canadians from coast to coast can come to these important deliberations and participate by presenting evidence on the effects of the trade deal. The Government may want to hide these hearings, to shut them off from the people of Canada, but we in this Party do not agree with this at all.

An instruction, if placed under Private Members' Business, as the Hon. Minister would have us do, would have almost no chance at all of ever coming up for debate. You, Mr. Speaker, know the process for private Members' initiatives. They go into a draw. I have had dozens in there for years which have never been drawn. In order to give instructions to a committee to act, we cannot go through the normal private Members' routine because the chance of that item being drawn for debate, and particularly for debate that would be followed by a vote, is virtually nil. It would be an exception.

If we are serious about giving instruction to a committee to travel this, in the absence of an initiative by a Minister, would seem to me to be the honourable way to do so, as has been tested time and again.

In response to the Minister's comment that there already had been travel, we all remember the farcical nature of the hearings when the committee was not debating the trade deal itself which was eventually signed by our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), but the issue of free trade with the United States. Hearings were held across the country, allowing one single day per province. I remember the day they came to the Province of British Columbia, which I have the honour of representing.

Hearings were held for a few hours and legions, if you like, of individuals and groups which wanted to have input into the process were turned away.

By the Prime Minister's own admission, this trade deal is the biggest trade deal signed, not in Canadian history, but in world history. If, as the Prime Minister has indicated, this is the biggest trade deal ever signed in world history, surely to goodness it would be appropriate to travel throughout the country this summer so that Canadians, wherever they live throughout Canada, would have an opportunity to participate in this discussion on the most important trade deal in world history.

We recognize the fact that in its present structure under the present rules and traditions the committee is unable to take the initiative to travel. That is why the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor felt it was appropriate to move this motion so that the representatives of all the people of Canada in the House of Commons can give a clear instruction to the committee to do the honourable, decent, and correct thing, that is, to travel throughout Canada and hold hearings on what the Prime Minister himself describes as the most important trade deal in world history.

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I think we should start by looking at what a committee is supposed to be. A committee is clearly a subsidiary body to which a matter is sent for consideration by a larger body. The legislative committee which is studying Bill C-130 is clearly a subsidiary body of this House. In spite of the fact that the rules with respect to parliamentary reform may give a standing or legislative committee more authority to do things of their own accord, nothing in those rules has changed the fundamental concept of what a committee is.

• (1120)

A committee, especially the committee set up to study Bill C-130, is not a totally autonomous or independent body. It is nothing more than a subsidiary body of this House, to which this House has literally committed a piece of legislation for the kind of detailed study which was concluded some time ago and cannot be given in this Chamber as a House of Commons or even as Committee of the Whole.

I make this point because the Deputy Government House Leader seems to be arguing that somehow or other, under the rules reflecting parliamentary reform, our committees have such a status that once they are set up they are somehow cut loose from any link with this Chamber and it is somehow wrong for this Chamber to try to direct or instruct such committees.

If you consider what is the concept of a committee in principle and look at what our rules say, I invite you to conclude that the Deputy Government House Leader is wrong in inviting you to decide that under our rules it is no longer possible for this House to give an instruction to a committee as to how it should conduct itself. This House has no less authority under our current rules than it did before the rules were adopted to give an instruction to a committee.

Incidentally, I find it ironic to say the least that the Deputy Government House Leader is basing his argument on the spirit of parliamentary reform when he and his colleagues on the Government side were so quick, so ready to throw parliamentary reform out the window when it served their purpose to do so in order to suspend the calendar concept under which we have been operating for some years so that the Government could get the House to sit through the summer.

Be that as it may, if the Deputy Government House Leader is interested in parliamentary reform and has returned to the view that parliamentary reform is important and should be supported, I maintain that there is nothing in our current rules under parliamentary reform which no longer makes it possible for this House to give an instruction to a group of Members who are nothing more than a subsidiary body of this Chamber.

It has already been brought to your attention that there are precedents that clearly set out what the authority of the House is to give an instruction to a committee. I want to draw your attention to some of the content of these precedents. You have already had drawn to your attention Citation 756(1) which says:

> An Instruction is a motion empowering a committee to do something which it could not otherwise do, or to direct it to do something which it might otherwise not do. It directs the order and course of the committee's proceedings and extends or restricts the order of reference according to the discretion of the House.

We already know that this committee has shown itself through the efforts of the Conservative majority unwilling to seek the permission of the House to travel. I think we have clearly reached the point where it is appropriate for the House to adopt a motion giving an instruction to the committee studying Bill C-130 to travel from place to place, to hear directly the views of Canadians, where they live, where they work, where they make their homes, about the Government's trade deal with the United States.

It is clear from looking at Citation 759(1) that the motion which the Government has challenged could not have been called much earlier and that we are now at the appropriate point in time for such a motion to be made. Citation 759(1) states:

> The time for moving an Instruction is immediately after the committal of the bill, or, subsequently, as an independent motion. The Instruction should not be given while the bill is still in the possession of the House, but rather after it has come into the possession of the committee.

We are just at that point contemplated by Citation 759(1). I suggest that the motion is very much in order from the point of view of the timing of its being called for debate.

I also submit that it is quite appropriate for this motion to be called under Motions rather than to be treated as a matter of Private Members' Business. I certainly can find nothing in the precedent set out in Beauchesne saying that this motion must be dealt with as Private Members' Business. I would say

that the whole concept of instructions to a committee by the House would be meaningless unless such instructions could be proposed as a motion during the point in time in our Routine Proceedings for the consideration of motions.

I repeat, there is no meaning whatsoever that could be attributed to the right of this House to give instruction to a committee unless it could be done in a way which would lead to a decision being taken on the request for instruction. This can happen only if it is done during the time set out in Routine Proceedings for motions.

I also suggest that it is consistent with the spirit of parliamentary reform to which the Deputy Government House Leader has once again become converted, after his unfortunate lapse in connection with cancelling our rules respecting the calendar concept.

If he is serious in regard to what parliamentary reform is supposed to mean, giving greater authority to individual Members to do things in the House, surely individual Members not of the Privy Council must be permitted to move motions to give instructions to committees during that item under Routine Proceedings entitled Motions. I believe the Deputy Government House Leader is very much in error when he argues that this motion can be presented only as a matter of Private Members' Business.

My friend, the New Democratic Party House Leader, says that a motion to instruct the committee with respect to such things as travel is rare and last happened during the pipeline debate. I have to take some issue with him on that because at page 230 of Beauchesne, paragraph 6 of Citation 761 states:

> Power to adjourn from place to place—Instructions have been given to committees to adjourn from place to place both within and outside Canada for the purposes of receiving evidence. Journals, October 21, 1976, p. 49.

There is a much more recent precedent on which to base our request that this motion be accepted and dealt with as quickly as possible. As recently as 1980, approximately, the special joint committee on the Constitution was authorized by this House and by the other place, I presume, to broadcast its proceedings after the committee was under way and without receiving any request from the committee that it be given such authority. That is a further precedent of this House giving instructions to a committee to do something it would not otherwise have the power to do. My hon. friend interjects to say that this motion to which I just referred was done on consent, but all consent means in this House is the equivalent of a unanimous decision of this House, but the consent does not always have to be given.

• (1130)

We are discussing whether this motion is in order, and I would like to say that rather than making the argument that this motion is somehow contrary to the spirit of parliamentary reform, if the Deputy Government House Leader and his colleagues have once again become converted to parliamentary reform, after their lapse with respect to suspending the calendar in order to force the House to sit through the summer, they would welcome the initiative of the Hon. Member for Essex-Windsor (Mr. Langdon) and the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy), our critic on trade, who proposed motions to allow the committee to travel.

I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I believe this motion is in order not only insofar as it intends to give an instruction to a parliamentary committee, but with respect to it being called during Routine Proceedings under the heading of Motions, and also with respect to the substance of the matter.

I think something that is very consistent with the spirit of parliamentary reform is to make it easy for Canadians to have access to their parliamentary institutions. One of the best and most effective ways to do this is through enabling committees to travel when they are considering something as important as this trade deal so they can get the views of Canadians where they work, where they live, where they have their homes, and where they will be affected by measures such as this Government's trade deal with the United States.

It is not satisfactory to say that a committee has already travelled for this purpose. As has already been pointed out, the travel of a previous committee was clearly inadequate with only one day in each provincial capital. In any event, the committee in question did not study the matter that is currently before the legislative committee on Bill C-130. It did not study Bill C-130, nor the trade deal itself.

Mr. Speaker: I wish to hear all the submissions and certainly those of the Hon. Member for Windsor West. However, with respect, I think the Hon. Member is straying from the procedural point with which I am faced. I will certainly hear the Hon. Member for Windsor West in conclusion, but I would like to put a question to him. Assuming this particular motion is acceptable and receives the support of the House, can the Hon. Member for Windsor West assist the Chair as to whether that would mean that the committee would necessarily have to accept the power given to it and to in fact decide to travel? It seems to me, as the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap pointed out and very properly, that this is framed in terms of a permissive motion and even if it was passed here, it would not necessarily result in the committee deciding to travel.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, you quite rightly pointed out that in effect there are two kinds of instructions. There are mandatory instructions and permissive instructions. I would hope we could have an instruction from this House which is mandatory, which requires this committee to travel and hear Canadians where they live and work and where they will be affected by the Government's trade deal. If that is not the case, there is a motion on the Order Paper presented by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry which I would interpret as providing mandatory instructions.

I would point out, looking at the previous decisions in this respect, that mandatory instructions are quite acceptable and have been used in the past. As Citation 758 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition states:

> The object of mandatory instructions is to define the course of action which the committee must follow.

If this House wishes to do so, it can give an instruction to the committee which is mandatory. It may be that there are other examples of mandatory instructions related to exactly how a committee should deal with a particular Bill, but I do not think there is any limitation on the authority or power of this House to give a committee a mandatory instruction with respect to the process or procedure it should follow in study of a particular Bill. If this House agrees, and I think it should because this is what Canadians want this House to do, they want the committee on Bill C-130 to travel and hear evidence across the country, then the motion is quite in order and should be passed, and the committee would be obliged to follow the instruction in its mandatory terms.

Mr. Speaker: I am going to hear the Hon. Member and also the Minister of State. I will hear the Hon. Member for Kamloops Shuswap and the Hon. Member for Windsor West if necessary, in reply. However, I take it the position of both the Hon. Member for Kamloops Shuswap and the Hon. Member for Windsor West is whether or not a mandatory motion of somewhat the same nature is procedurally in place, this is a permissive motion. The argument that is being put by both the representatives of the Official Opposition and the New Democratic Party is that procedurally it ought to be allowed, and if it is put into the procedures for Private Members' Motions, the practical result is it may never come back for consideration. Do I understand the position of both spokespersons for the Opposition correctly? The Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap. I just want to be sure I have the point and I will hear you later in detail.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, the intention of putting forward a permissive motion is that the permissive instruction is the most common and most commonly used, particularly coming from an opposition Member. The reason it was put forward as a permissive motion was that during the committee's deliberations of the last day when it was deciding on how to proceed, when the request came from both the opposition Parties to travel throughout Canada to allow people to have input into the deliberations of the committee, the government Members indicated that the legislative committee, of course, had no authority to travel, that there was no opportunity to travel. Therefore, it was in that spirit that we felt that since the committee itself had determined that under the existing rules it had no authorization to decide to travel throughout Canada, the question was put aside because it was not part of the terms of reference of the legislative committee.

It was at that point that we felt a permissive motion ought to be presented both from an opposition Party and a Member, not a Member of the Cabinet, not a Minister. There was also the fact that if that was the committee's concern, a clear instruction from the House of Commons would then clearly remove that and would allow the committee to continue.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Windsor West. I just want to be sure I have the point.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): I do not intend to extend my general argument, but I do want to say, first, the one basic point we are making is that any motion with respect to the committee travelling should not be placed under Private Members' Business just because it is offered by a Member not of the Privy Council of the Government. Second, I have to admit that the motion could be read as a permissive motion but, as the Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) has said, if the concern of the Conservative majority on the committee was that they did not have the power to travel, and if they had the power they would do it, then, let us hope that such a motion as we are discussing now will clear the air and the Conservative majority will follow through if it is passed and allow the committee to travel.

• (1140)

Mr. Benno Friesen (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I will not take long on this matter. I simply want to point out that as a member of the committee which studied parliamentary reform, I can say quite firmly that as far as I can recollect, it was never the intention of the committee to have motions used in this way.

Mr. Gauthier: We discussed that.

Mr. Friesen: Further to that, whether this motion is either permissive or mandatory, one of the effects remains the same as a result of it. That is to say that if the committee travels it will involve an expenditure of funds and someone will have to pay for it.

Ms. Mitchell: Take it out of your propaganda budget.

Mr. Riis: You're using $50 million for PR now, maybe you can set a little aside for travel.

Mr. Darling: Keep quiet!

Mr. Speaker: I would remind Hon. Members that I have heard from the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap and the Hon. Member for Windsor West twice, as well as the Minister of State. All Hon. Members have given them the courtesy of expressing their comments to the advantage of the Chair. I would ask that that courtesy continue.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about exact budgetary figures but a principle of government, that is, its ability to govern. If motions can be introduced in the House at any time which affect budgetary decisions and which take away from the Government the decision-making process with respect to expenditures, then it fragments the Government's

role and the historical right of Government with respect to the right of expenditure.

Mr. Riis: A parliamentary right.

Mr. Friesen: I would suggest that it fragments the Government's ability to govern since it would take away from the Government the right of expenditure.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Fontaine (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to revert to a remark by the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr Riis). I am a member of the legislative Committee on Bill C-130, I was present during the discussions. When the Hon. Member says that the committee decided not to travel, it wasn't like that at all. He claims the committee asked permission of the House or that it said the permission of the House was necessary. Nobody ever said that. The committee on its own initiative and because of the parliamentary reform, among other reasons, is aware of its powers and it was the committee itself, notwithstanding what the Hon. Member says—he told an untruth, Mr Speaker—it was the committee itself that decided not to travel in order to fulfill more rapidly the mandate that had been entrusted to it by the House of Commons.

[*English*]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have one or two points in reply. I notice other Members rising. I hope that I can reserve my right to reply after I have heard the other Members. In any event, my remarks will not be long.

[*Translation*]

Mr Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr Speaker, I would just like to make a few comments on the remarks by the Hon. Member for Surrey—White Rock—North Delta (Mr Friesen), about how we shouldn't spend the money, or the government wouldn't like to spend the money without authorization. I would like to point out to the Hon. Member that it is up to the House of Commons to decide, and that it's the budget of the House of Commons and not the government's budget that is in question here.

[*English*]

It is the House of Commons which will address this question. I hope that it will address the question seriously and possibly divide on it. If the Government wants to have a question put on it, we will vote on it.

This question is an important question since it deals with process and not with substance. It does not deal with the many, many motions that we find on the Order Paper under the heading Notices of Motions under Private Members' Business. Private Members can and should put substantive motions which state: "That, in the opinion of this House, the House should . . . " That is quite common practice. I have several of mine in there. God knows I have not had a chance to have them drawn, since if I had I would have been able to discuss them. However, because of the draw and because of luck some of us are not as lucky as others.

The point to be made, and the one which has been made by my colleagues from Windsor West and the New Democratic Party, is that it is proper to have such a motion in the order where it finds itself today, that is, in Routine Proceedings under Motions. Where else can private Members who are supposed to be getting more powers as a result of the McGrath Committee and others, as well as be given more power of initiative, put motions which would the Government in the right direction and understand that Parliament it to remain supreme?

We are not talking here about the Government's intentions of pushing this matter through quickly. We think that the committee—and it has been the practice of Parliament thus far—should be given instructions, instructions which it should follow. We have done that before. There is nothing in the Standing Orders or anything as far as I can see in Beauchesne's which would forbid that. It is stated clearly in Beauchesne's that at the committee stage we, that is, the House, may instruct the committee. That is Citation 756. I will not repeat what my House Leader just said. But in this regard one has to refer to Citations Nos. 756, 757, 758, 759 and 760.

I want to say that, first, the motion is appropriately placed on the Order Paper and should be the object of some debate, and a division if the Government so requires. Second, it is a weak argument to say that this would entail or obligate the Government to expend public funds for a purpose for which there is no Royal Recommendation. We are talking here of Parliament's decision. Parliament will pick up on the expenditures involved in that committee in particular if it so desires to travel, or if it is so instructed to travel. That is done every day. It would be astounding to ask how many committees of the House have travelled across the country since September 4, 1984.

Mr. Stewart: How much did you travel on Bill C-72?

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate the intervention. We are now getting into the question of what other committees have done and I do not think that that is helpful.

I want to assure Hon. Members that the Chair has taken very well the point of the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap, the Hon. Member for Windsor West, the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier and, with great respect, unless there is something very particular that either the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap or the Hon. Member for Windsor West may want to add, I do not think I need to hear more. However, out of courtesy I want to hear the Hon. Minister of State.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. One point I would like to make is that my hon. friends have brought forward several quotations from Beauchesne's. I do not dispute the strength of those quotations. When Your Honour comes to

your decision, I am sure you will appreciate that those quotations and citations are only relevant *vis-à-vis* the Standing Orders as they existed at that time.

Second, with respect to the televising of the constitutional committee hearings, I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that that was on consent. I think it should be taken in that light, that is, the consent of all Hon. Members having been given.

Third—something which I should have picked up in my original argument—my friend would be on much safer ground arguing this if the wording of the actual motion put on the Order Paper had been "be instructed" rather than "be empowered" since the committee has already taken a decision. I think my friend is a little late in moving this motion today.

Finally, I suggest to the Chair that in view of the importance of this issue that the Chair may wish to reserve judgment on this matter in order to consider fully the implications of the Private Member's Motion aspect of the argument.

I appreciate the time of the House. I think it is important that we do have a good debate on this issue. We await with anticipation the Chair's ruling on this matter.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I do not have anything new to add in terms of the debate on the admissibility of this particular initiative. However, I do want to clear up one small error that was made by my hon. friend, the House Leader of the Official Opposition. I wish to preface my remarks by saying that his experience and comments I value and respect a great deal. While I had indicated that the last time this initiative was taken was in 1956 during the very famous pipeline debate, he indicated when he quoted from Beauchesne's Fifth Edition that it states:

> Instructions have been given to committees to adjourn from place to place both within and outside Canada for the purposes of receiving evidence. *Journals*, October 21, 1976, p. 49.

That is correct, Mr. Speaker. That was an initiative by a Government member, by a member of the Privy Council. The point I was making was as a member not in the Privy Council, but as a member of the Opposition, the last time that this was done was in 1956.

• (1150)

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to respectfully direct your attention to Standing Order 56 which states, in part:

> 56.(1) The following motions are debatable:
>
> (p) such other motion, made upon Routine Proceedings, as may be required for the observance of the proprieties of the House, the maintenance of its authority, the appointment or conduct of its officers . . .

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, I submitted that a legislative committee is a subsidiary body of this House subject to its authority. I would submit to you, Sir, that this Standing Order clearly contemplates the making of motions of the kind we are discussing now either at the initiative of the Government or a private Member in order to maintain the authority of the House over one of its committees. The wording of the Standing Order is a solid foundation for the points that I have made and those made by the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap.

Second, I know that you will want to look at the Standing Orders and the precedents in light of one or the other, Mr. Speaker, to see which precedent is still relevant. It is a novel argument made by the Deputy Government House Leader that certain precedents should automatically be struck down simply because they anti-date our current rules. I know that you will want to look carefully to see if there is anything in our current rules, Mr. Speaker, that make the precedents that I have cited, or those cited by the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap, in some way irrelevant. I respectfully submit that there is nothing in the rules that make these precedents irrelevant.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: I thank all the Members for their statements. I understand that a few more Members would also like to make statements, but I would ask all Members to co-operate with the Chair, as I believe I fully understand the two arguments. Furthermore, I agree that it is an important issue and for that reason I will probably reserve judgment until tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock. Once again, I thank you for your statements; as always, they are a great help to the Chair.

* * *

[*English*]

PETITIONS

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106 it is indeed an honour to present a petition on behalf of a large number of constituents. The petitioners are very concerned about the recent trade deal initialled by our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) because they believe that the fabric of Canadian sovereignty is threatened by the proposed trade deal. The petitioners also believe that the Government lacks a mandate from the people of Canada because it was not an election issue back in 1984. As a matter of fact, if my memory serves me, the Prime Minister indicated that he was against this type of trade deal with the United States, so he obviously mislead the people of Canada during the election.

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Riis: The petitioners are also concerned that the trade deal would reduce our ability to plan our economic, social and cultural future in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: I understand fully the reason the Hon. Member is pressing all the reasons why somebody may or may not have signed a petition. However, the petition asks something specific, and the rule is clear. The Hon. Member

presenting the petition should make the request specific and not prolong the argument, effective and full as it no doubt was.

Mr. Riis: I thought you were preoccupied in the Chair, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps not paying too much attention.

I will summarize by saying that the petitioners are asking that a national debate take place on the trade deal and that this debate result in a national general election.

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106 I have the duty and honour to present a petition from several of my constituents who are opposed to the trade deal, who are worried about the trade deal, and who feel that it can only be passed as a result of an election. Therefore, the petitioners call upon the Government to pull the plug and go to the polls like yesterday!

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106, I wish to present six petitions from people in the Province of Ontario who state that Canadian sovereignty is threatened by the trade deal, the Government has no mandate, Canada's ability to plan is threatened, and the trade deal would integrate Canada into a North American defence industrial base. Therefore, the petitioners call for a national debate which would end in an election before such an agreement is signed.

REQUEST FOR DESIGNATION OF ROUGE RIVER VALLEY

Mrs. Pauline Browes (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition today from residents of Scarborough, North York, Don Mills, Toronto, Burlington, and Etobicoke concerning the Rouge Valley in Scarborough. The petitioners state that it is a unique, precious, and natural area that needs protecting because of the endangered wildlife wilderness areas, and it is in the national interest to do so.

I join with the Scarborough City Council and the petitioners. The City Council of Scarborough is meeting tonight to amend the official plan to accommodate a park. The petitioners call upon Parliament to work with the Province of Ontario in establishing the Rouge River Valley as Canadian heritage land or provincial park.

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition in which the petitioners indicate that the Conservative Government had no mandate from the Canadian people to conclude a free trade agreement with the United States. The Prime Minister promised that Canadian sovereignty would not be compromised. By removing the power of the Canadian Government to exclusively control foreign ownership, to develop Canadian energy resources in the best interests of Canadians, and to equalize opportunities between the regions, the proposed trade agreement would deny Canada the policy freedom to determine its own economic future. The proposed trade agreement not only denies Canadians secure access to the U.S. market, but threatens the loss of hundreds of thousands of Canadian jobs.

Therefore, the undersigned petitioners call upon Parliament to dissolve and allow the people of Canada the opportunity to accept or reject the proposed free trade agreement during a national general election.

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition duly certified from a number of Canadians. The petitioners are concerned that the Conservative Government had no mandate to conclude a trade agreement with the United States, and point out the negative effects of that trade agreement.

Therefore, the petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to dissolve and allow the people of Canada the opportunity to accept or reject the proposed free trade agreement during a national general election.

• (1200)

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition which has been duly certified under Standing Order 106, and comes from people in my constituency, especially in the areas of La Salle, Windsor, Belle River, Tilbury, and indicates to the Government that they believe that the Conservative Government had no mandate from the Canadian people to conclude a trade deal with the United States, that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) promised in the course of trade negotiations that Canadian sovereignty would not be compromised, and yet the trade agreement would in fact deny Canada the policy freedom to determine its own economic future and would therefore undermine our ability to build a society distinct from that of the United States. They therefore call on this Government to dissolve Parliament and to permit the people of Canada a chance to have their say on this issue.

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I, too, have the pleasure to present a petition signed by a number of electors, this time from Nova Scotia. It is a petition that has been properly certified by the Clerk of Petitions. These petitioners, like many on both sides of the free trade issue—those in favour and those opposed—agree, as indicated in this petition, that the agreement should not come into force until there has been an election held to provide the mandate that did not exist at the time that the accord was signed.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 329, 363 and 366.

[*Text*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND CSIS—EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Question No. 329—**Mr. Boyer:**

Are Canadians of East European background employed (*a*) in the Department of External Affairs (*i*) as a whole (*ii*) on the East European desk (*b*) with the Canadian Security Intelligence Service and, if so, in each case, how many?

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of External Affairs and the Ministry of the Solicitor General as follows:

In so far as the Department of External Affairs is concerned, the Department does not keep statistics of the type requested.

Personal information obtained by the Department can under Section 7 of the Privacy Act only be used for the purpose for which it was initially collected or for the purpose of responding to specific circumstances outlined in Section 8 of the Privacy Act. The compilation of the requested statistics would not be consistent with those conditions which must be met before personal information can be disclosed to a third party. Accordingly, it is not possible to assemble requested statistics.

In so far as the Ministry of the Solicitor General is concerned:

With respect to the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, information about particular employees cannot be disclosed. Under Section 7 of the Privacy Act, personal information obtained by a department can only be used for the purpose for which it was initially collected or for the purpose of responding to specific circumstances outlined in Section 8 of the Act. The compilation of the requested statistics would not be consistent with those conditions which must be met before personal information can be disclosed to a third party.

The personnel practices and rules under which the Service operates do not provide for the gathering of information on the East European background of employees. Any such information that might emerge from the security screening process is protected.

Accordingly, it is not possible to assemble the requested statistics.

DSS—CONTRACT AWARDED SOLE-SOURED

Question No. 363—**Mr. Caccia:**

Was Department of Supply and Services contract 08DB.45045-7-7573 sole-sourced and, if so, (*a*) who authorized the sole-sourcing of this contract (*b*) was the sole-source justification technically and financially evaluated, and, if so, by whom (*c*) did the Department of Public Works make any recommendations on this contract or the tendering process related to this contract and, if so, what were the (*i*) recommendations (*ii*) responses of the Department of Supply and Services (*d*) are there other suppliers of such equipment and, if so, were any contacted prior to the awarding of this contract (*e*) who signed the purchase requisition?

Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of Supply and Services): The DSS contract was sole-sourced.

(a) The request for sole source, directed procurement, was contained in "Sole Source Justification" document attached to Requisition 45045-7-7573, authorized by T. Thompson, Director Headquarters Operation Division, Statistics Canada.

(b) The sole source justification was technically and financially evaluated by Public Works, A and E Services, and recommended by the Director of the main Computer Centre, Statistics Canada.

(c) (i) The Department of Public Works recommended use of Pillar system since it offers maximum protection against line distortion, with EPE System as second option to be considered and a possible combination of MPL/EPE Equipment as a third option.

(ii) DSS accepted the Statistics Canada Sole Source Justification for Pillar System as per letter attached to requisition.

(d) Yes. Since evaluation had been carried out, and sole source justified, no contact with other suppliers was considered necessary.

(e) The Requisition for Goods and Services from Statistics Canada was signed by the following:

Recommended by M. J. Tremblay, Assistant Director, Administrative Support Services Sub-Division, authorized by T. Thompson Director, Headquarters Operations Division, financial authority (Section 25), R. Quesnel, Manager, Accounting Operations.

VETERANS AFFAIRS—EXPENDITURES IN METRO TORONTO AREA

Question No. 366—**Mr. Redway:**

Since September 4, 1984, did the Department of Veterans Affairs make grants and/or loans to persons or corporations, non-governmental organizations and governments within Metropolitan Toronto and, if so, to which ones and, in each case, in what amount and for what purpose?

Hon. George Hees (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Minister of State (Seniors)): Grants paid to recipients in the Metropolitan Toronto area for the period September 4, 1984 to May 31, 1988:

Assistance Fund

Grants paid under the Assistance Fund Regulations, of up to five hundred dollars to eligible veterans to meet unforeseen emergency needs and unexpected contingencies $189,000

Treatment Allowances

Grants paid under the Veterans Treatment Regulations, to pensioners who were receiving treatment for their pensioned disability $613,000

Last Post fund

Grants paid under the Last Post Fund Regulations to reimburse the Fund for expenses incurred for the funeral and burial of indigent veterans $821,000

Children of War Dead/Pensioners Training

Allowances and Tuition Fees paid under the Children of the War Dead Regulations, to eligible students registered in recognized universities or colleges

Also, the payment of allowances and tuition under the Pensioners Training Regulations to eligible pensioners who are registered in approved retraining programs. $252,000

Prosthetic Services

Grants paid to Sunnybrook Medical Centre to reimburse the Hospital for the salary of one prosthetist through a federal-provincial agreement. $104,000

Pension-Burial Grants

Grants paid under the Pension Act to provide for the funeral and burial entlited pensioners $307,000

[*English*]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: The questions as enumerated by the Minister of State have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S. O. 29

POSSIBLE WATER DIVERSION FROM LAKE MICHIGAN

Mr. Speaker: I have an application from the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon), under S. O. 29. I will hear the Hon. Member.

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to seek leave to adjourn the House for the purpose of discussing what I consider to be an extremely vital and pressing issue facing our country. That is the issue of water diversion from Lake Michigan, which could have devastating effects across the Great Lakes system and which would demonstrate to Canadians yet again how important water is within our relationship with the United States and how important it is that there be protection provided for us as a country to safeguard that water in the future.

Because we have such an important issue here, with many indications from the United States of pressure building in order for this diversion to take place, I hope that you will give very careful consideration to this request. Perhaps it might make sense to reserve judgment on it because of the importance of the issue to my constituency, to the many people across Ontario and to all people across Canada, and in view of the widespread implications of a diversion of this kind toward our relationship with respect to water with the United States in the future.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor for bringing this matter to the attention of the Chair. As Hon. Members know, this has been a matter of some interest to this place for some days. However, I want to assure the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor that it is an important matter and the Chair has given it very careful consideration, but at least for today the Chair is not disposed to move to an emergency debate. Of course, as I have stated before on other matters for emergency debates, that does not preclude another application at another time, depending on the circumstances and on what may or may not be said in this place. I thank the Hon. Member.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House that in view of the amount of business that is before the House today and the time that was taken on the procedural argument *vis-à-vis* the motions on the Order Paper, the Government has decided not to proceed with the procedural debate on Motion No. 25. This has been communicated to the other House Leaders. Instead, we will proceed immediately to consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-77. That is the second item on the Order Paper.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, the Government has the right under the rules to determine government business under Government Orders, but I want to say for the record that we received word, not long after nine o'clock this morning, that the Government did not intend to call the abortion motion to enable procedural argument to take place. I do not know how at that point in time the Government was able to determine whether there would be a procedural debate on a motion to instruct the committee on Bill C-130, or to enable the committee on Bill C-130 to travel. I was personally ready to make the points that I had to make about the procedural acceptability of the Government's motion on abortion this morning.

I do not think that the Government should, under the circumstances, use the relatively brief debate that we all had on the motion to enable or to instruct the committee on Bill C-130 to travel as a reason not to proceed with the procedural debate on the Government's abortion motion. I admit that the Government has the full authority to call any motion or any matter it wants with respect to the use of its time under Government Orders, but I do not think it should leave on the record the impression that somehow or other, because the Government itself chose to initiate a procedural debate on the acceptability of the motion to enable the committee on Bill C-130 to travel, it cannot now proceed with the abortion issue. If I am in error as to who first made the procedural arguments, I will withdraw that. I just wanted to say that we were quite ready to debate the procedural acceptability of the Government's motion on abortion.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I, too, have to take a moment or two to register a concern. It is the July 11, and of course once the Government decided to set aside the Standing Orders and to sit in July to conduct government business, we are required to do so. To conduct the business of the House of Commons in a business-like way we need advance notice to enable all sides to plan accordingly. That normally happens, but when it does not happen I think one has to raise a concern. I am a bit puzzled. The Deputy House Leader stood up just a moment ago and said that because we had a prolonged procedural debate this morning, he had decided not to proceed with the procedural debate on the abortion motion.

I was informed this morning, prior to the House of Commons sitting, that we would not be proceeding with the abortion procedural debate. I am curious how the Government House Leader knew at that point that we would be taking up some time in a procedural argument. Other than the fact that there obviously seems to be some confusion with the Deputy House Leader, I want to say to him that to enable us to work as efficiently, as effectively and as positively as we can, it is absolutely necessary that we get some forewarning to allow, not only ourselves as House Leaders to prepare but more important the critics to prepare and to be aware when in the agenda of the day they will likely be participating in a debate. I make an appeal for order to enable us to conduct the business of this House in the most orderly way possible.

• (1210)

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate the comments of both the Hon. Member for Windsor West and the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap. However, both Members while registering a complaint have certainly made it clear that it is completely within the authority and aegis of the Government to set the order for each day. In this respect, the Government is completely within its rights.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

EMERGENCIES ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Defence) moved the second reading of, and concurrence in, amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-77, an Act to authorize the taking of special temporary measures to ensure safety and security during national emergencies and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof.

He said: Madam Speaker, let me just thank the Hon. Member for Brant (Mr. Blackburn). It had been my intention to allow him to speak first and then to respond but it is probably more appropriate for me in moving the motion to speak now.

This will be a very short intervention because Parliament has had the opportunity already both in the Senate and in the House of Commons to debate this legislation. I will say that this is a very momentous day for Canada. With the acceptance of these amendments and the passage of this Bill from the House of Commons, we will see the abolition of the War Measures Act in Canada. Never again will we have a situation, as was the case in World War II, where Canadian citizens were interned on the basis of their racial ancestry. What we will have is a situation where there will be guarantees. Never again, for example, will there be the ability to use the War Measures Act to knock on the door in the dark of night, to sweep up our citizens, to hold them without charge and without the right of habeas corpus. What we will have, Madam Speaker, is a new and modern piece of legislation, one that is adequately safeguarded, one which protects the rights of all Canadians and one which gives to the Government the ability to protect the lives of Canadians, to keep them safe and to ensure that every Canadian has adequate protection in times of crisis.

As the House will know, Canada is virtually alone among modern western jurisdictions in not having this sort of flexible legislation. As a consequence, acceptance of these amendments and passage of this legislation will bring Canada into the 20th century. It will prepare us for the future in terms of the needs of this country.

I might simply mention that the Government is prepared to accept the two amendments which have been proposed by the Senate. One deals with the issue of conscription. While the Bill as it was passed unanimously on third reading in the House of Commons would have allowed conscription to take place by Order in Council, it would have simply maintained the *status quo* which existed under the old War Measures Act.

In the two instances where we have had conscription in the past, even though it would have been possible to do so by Order in Council under the old War Measures Act, the Government of the day felt it was appropriate to introduce special legislation. I would prefer in safeguarding the interests of all Canadians in times of emergency that that power still remain. The very nature of an emergency is such that it is impossible to predict the very dire circumstances which could take place. But I am satisfied that if a balance has to be struck that it is likely it would be possible in times of crisis, if Canada had to go to war, that there would be enough time for us to reconvene Parliament and for us to pass special legislation, if there was consent of the House.

Additionally, there is another minor change made by these amendments, namely, to change the structure of the joint parliamentary committee to ensure representation from both sides of the Senate. We are prepared to accept that as well. It does not go to the heart of the Bill and is something which obviously will reflect better the views of some of the members of the Senate.

I think it is appropriate simply to recall to the House the process that was used with this Bill. It was first indicated to Canadians that the Government intended to act in this area in the White Paper on National Defence which was tabled over a year ago. I tabled the Bill in June of last year prior to Parliament rising for the summer recess with the assurance that the Bill would sit on the Order Paper without being called over the course of the summer and that we would solicit from Canadians, from groups and individuals and from Members of Parliament their views, their responses about the Bill, their concerns and their suggestions about what improvements could be made to ensure that the Bill struck that appropriate balance between the rights of Canadians, the need of the state to protect its very survival and to protect the lives and safety of individual Canadians. I think it is a process which has worked well.

I want to thank members of the legislative committee and Members on all sides of the House for the co-operation which they have shown. We have the Bill which has been substantially amended over the course of the time in which it has been in Parliament. The vast majority of these amendments, in my view, make it a better Bill and better strike the balance between the rights of Canadians, the needs of the Government to provide for the safety of Canadians and for the integrity and survival of the state itself. It has been a process which has demonstrated that Parliament can work if goodwill is shown on both sides of the House.

[*Translation*]

I would simply like to thank all Members for their spirit of co-operation. That positive, constructive spirit has produced excellent results for all Canadians. Because of those efforts, we will have a more effective law that will better protect the rights of all our fellow citizens.

[*English*]

It is an example of Parliament working as Parliament was intended to work and, again, I thank all Members of Parliament for their efforts and co-operation.

I would conclude simply by saying that it is a very proud day for me to see this legislation passed into law. I think it should be a proud day for every Member of Parliament that Parliament is acting now to keep faith with Canadians with the commitment that was made some 18 years ago in the October, 1970 crisis that we would scrap the old War Measures Act and bring in properly balanced and safeguarding legislation to ensure that Canadians in the future would have a piece of flexible legislation with a range of capacities enabling us to deal with emergencies starting on the one hand with natural disasters and going all the way through to war emergencies. We will now have that legislation. I think it is a credit to this Parliament. It is probably a matter which is of great satisfaction and great pleasure for all Canadians that Parliament has acted in such a timely way and that before we rise for our summer recess we will have this sort of legislation.

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Official Opposition I am pleased to note the achievement of today in getting an important piece of legislation as far as it has and to commend the Minister and other Members for the way in which the debate has been handled.

I have to contrast this with the regrettable way in which in earlier Parliaments the issue of emergencies was treated when members of the then Opposition and now Government were certain that the Government had a plot in mind to introduce regulations under the War Measures Act from day to day and that there was a secret plan to subvert somehow or other the democratic process. To me as one who observed that process it was more than anything the impediment that existed in the past to try to update the War Measures Act and bring in more effective legislation. This is a Parliament which is less suspicious of the Government and less suspicious that there is a plan to declare an emergency jurisdiction in force in the country. We have turned our attention in a positive way to the real need for an updating of the War Measures Act and we have a satisfactory substitute before us.

I think the Minister should be commended for the attitude he took toward amendments. Many were introduced by people across the country who saw the Bill in its first version by Members of the House of Commons and finally, and significantly if I can touch on it for a moment, by the Senate.

The Senate is often criticized for its participation in the parliamentary process. It exists in our Constitution. It exists, in fact, down the hall from us, as the so-called other place, but when it tries to act and tries to make an input into legislation it is very often criticized and condemned for what it tries to do.

We have before us an example of a very effective contribution by the Senate dealing with the issue of conscription under the emergency measures legislation, a concern expressed by the Senators. The Minister recognized that, although the War Measures Act contained the power to bring in conscription by regulation, in the past, Governments, however troubled by the emergency at hand in World War I and World War II, chose not to bring in conscription by regulation but to proceed by a more democratic political process. The Senators have proposed an amendment, which I am glad to see the Government has adopted, which will assure that an emergency in the future will be dealt with in the same manner.

• (1220)

[*Translation*]

For me, it is an important moment as we pass a replacement for the War Measures Act, a legislation that can be used more moderately.

I would like to conclude with the idea that while it can be invoked more moderately, it does not have to be done that way. The legislation we are passing today still gives the government very broad powers, and there will always be a role for the lawmakers to play, that of watching to ensure that the four different categories of emergencies provided for under this

legislation are not used by the Government as an excuse to seize the power to rule by regulation.

[*English*]

We always have to be vigilant in this place, in the media and across the country, with whatever emergency legislation the Government has, to be certain that it is not being abused. If there is anything that has been learned in the course of this debate and in the course of the committee hearings, it is that Government, given any power, needs to be watched. While the War Measures Act was a very extreme piece of legislation, that very extreme feature was in a way a safeguard that it would not be used lightly. This legislation can be used lightly, and I think to be certain that it is not used lightly will be the continuing responsibility of vigilant Canadians, of the media and of Members of Parliament in this place.

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Madam Speaker, a couple of things have always troubled me in my parliamentary career with respect to the Liberal Party of Canada. That is its ability to turn no logic into logic and to support the insupportable and make it look as if there were logic in both.

The Hon. Member from whom we have just heard is a former Solicitor General of Canada. He was a member of several Liberal Governments. Between 1971 and 1984, the Liberals had some 12 or 13 years in which to do something about the infamous War Measures Act. They chose to do absolutely nothing. They chose to leave it on the statute books.

This morning, we heard the Liberal spokesperson say that somehow the Opposition bothered them through those years by suspecting all kinds of unquestionable thoughts that might be entering the then Liberal Government's mind with respect to concentration camps and other nefarious business. I find it very, very strange, and from a logical point of view totally unacceptable and insupportable, that the Liberal spokesman would now stand up and somehow switch the blame around by saying that thank heavens today we do not have a suspicious Opposition and therefore this has made it easier for the Government to cope with the infamous War Measures Act. I fail to see any logic in those statements, and I fail to see how an intelligent, responsible Member of Parliament could support that kind of argument.

We all know that previous Liberal Governments had years in which to throw out the War Measures Act and bring in a new Bill, and they consistently refused to do so. That is the sum total of their disastrous record.

I might also add that during the very serious and productive discussions at the committee hearings, we went clause by clause and prior to that listened to representations from a broad spectrum of Canadian organizations and individuals. The Liberals hardly ever showed up at the committee hearings and, moreover, to make it even more disgraceful, they never offered one amendment to the Bill.

At the end, as the Minister said a few moments ago, the Bill was drastically changed as a result of the input from various groups of Canadians, from the New Democratic Party, from members of the Minister's own Party who were represented on the committee and from the Minister himself, showing an openness and a willingness on his part to accept reasonable, intelligent amendments. I think we made some history in this Parliament, as it draws to a close, I believe, in that there was input from the Opposition, from the New Democratic Party, that was listened to and accepted by the Government, and we listened to and accepted government changes brought in at committee, but there were no changes from the Liberals. As far as I am concerned, they acted in nothing but a disgraceful manner throughout the entire proceedings of Bill C-77.

Having said that, I want to mention a couple of points in these, our final remarks on this very important piece of legislation. The first has to do with representations made by the Association of Japanese Canadians, but I think it would also apply to representations made by Ukrainians who came before the committee with respect specifically to the concentration camp episode in our history, a very black part of our history indeed.

The Association of Japanese Canadians, in a letter to me, and I believe also to the Minister, asked that the Government submit this Bill to the Supreme Court of Canada for a final and ultimate decision with respect to the override of the Charter of Rights. We were assured by the law officers of the Crown during committee that no Government could override the Charter provisions in this Bill without a separate amendment to the Bill. In other words, it would have to go through the regular parliamentary process even during an emergency. This apparently does not satisfy some of the critics, namely the Japanese Canadians, and I would think possible the Ukrainian group as well, although it did not send any representation to me and I do not think that the group sent one to the Minister.

I would once again ask the Minister, as I have already in a letter, I believe, and also in my third reading debate, to put in motion as quickly as possible that request by the Japanese Canadians. I think it is a reasonable one. It would certainly allay all fears if the Supreme Court of Canada, as I think it will, decides in favour of the legislation, that no Government in the future could override the Charter of Rights in the application of Bill C-77 which is about to become law.

Another point concerns one of the amendments from the Senate which reads:

> *Page 32, clause 62:* Strike out lines 3 to 7 and substitute the following:
>
> "(2) The Parliamentary Review Committee shall include at least one member of the House of Commons from each party that has a recognized membership of twelve or more persons in that House—

I am not suggesting that the Government should hold up the passage of the Bill at this point, but I am not certain whether it is wise to put in the figure of 12. I think that should be deleted and I think it should be deleted at an early stage.

As the membership of this House increases, it is only reasonable to assume that that figure of 12 which would designate officially an opposition Party or a Party in the House

will also increase. The next move could be to 15 or to 17, depending on the total membership of the House. It is a minor point, but I think it is one that should be cleared up at the earliest possible opportunity.

Finally, obviously I am very proud to have been part of this process that has brought forward what I think it is a good piece of legislation on balance. We will never get perfect legislation out of this Chamber or any other Chamber of this kind, a democratic legislature, but certainly we can always strive to do our best. I truly believe that members of the committee, the chairperson of the committee, the Parliamentary Secretary, the Minister, and those of us who had the privilege to sit on it, did our best and worked hard to bring forward what I consider to be a good Bill of we can all be proud.

• (1230)

A great deal of the thanks has to go to a gentleman who obviously cannot be here today to speak on this Bill, Mr. Bill Snarr, the senior public servant involved in helping pilot this Bill through committee. He was of great help, I can assure you, to an opposition Member like myself. He worked in an extremely objective and helpful and certainly knowledgeable way. I think I can speak on behalf of Minister this morning in public and extend our heartfelt congratulations to Mr. Snarr. I believe he is reaching pretty well the end of his public service career and this is probably the last piece of legislation he will take an active part in. Therefore, on behalf of all Members of the House, I want to extend to Bill Snarr a very long and happy retirement.

I hope this Act will never have to be used, certainly not Clauses 3 and 4. We have no control, of course, over natural disasters. I hope future governments will use it with caution and responsibility, and I am sure they will.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Questions or comments?

Mr. Beatty: Madam Speaker, I would like to use the vehicle of questions and comments to fully associate myself with the remarks of my friend from Brant with respect to Mr. Bill Snarr. Mr. Snarr has served Canadians for over three decades with a tremendously distinguished record. This Bill is certainly fitting testimony to the tremendous contribution he made. I know Members on all sides of the House have been tremendously impressed by his dedication, knowledge, flexibility and determination to ensure that legislation passed by this House is good and well prepared. I think he developed many friendships, particularly in committee, over the time the Bill was under study and certainly I felt privileged to know Mr. Snarr, both as a member of the Opposition prior to the last election, and as a member of the Government. He has retired from Emergency Preparedness Canada and is currently serving as senior adviser to me.

This represents, as the Hon. Member indicated, probably the last piece of legislation that he would be associated with, although there is still an important contribution for him to make to Canadians. However, the mere fact that this Bill has passed unanimously with the support of Members on all sides of this House certainly attests to the tremendous contribution which Bill Snarr made to Canadians. We will certainly miss his contribution to the public service.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to, amendments read the second time and concurred in.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN MULTICULTURALISM ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded with consideration of Bill C-93, an Act for the preservation and enhancement of multiculturalism in Canada, reported with amendments by a Legislative Commitee.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): There are thirty-two (32) motions in amendment on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-93, an Act for the preservation and enhancement of multiculturalism in Canada.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 1, 2 and 3, standing in the names of the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp), the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) and the Hon. Member for La Prairie (Mr. Jourdenais), respectively attempt to include Parliament and the courts within the scope of the Bill. This proposal is taking the Bill beyond what was envisaged when the House approved its principle at second reading when it defined federal institutions.

Second, this motion is proposing a substantive change to the interpretation clause of the Bill which, as Hon. Members are aware, is not an acceptable practice in accordance with Beauchesne's Citation 773(10). Therefore, I must declare the motions procedurally unacceptable in that they go beyond the scope of the Bill as defined in Beauchesne's Citation 773(1).

[*Translation*]

Motions numbered 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 30, 31 and 32 are acceptable and will be debated together but voted upon as follows:

[*English*]

An affirmative vote on Motion No. 4 obviates the need for a vote to be taken on Motions Nos. 5 and 6. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 4 necessitates the requirement that a vote be taken on Motion No. 5. Consequently, an affirmative vote on Motion No. 5 obviates the need for a vote to be taken on Motion No. 6. Nevertheless, a negative vote on Motion No. 5 necessitates the requirement that a vote be taken on Motion No. 6.

Motions Nos. 7 and 8 will be voted on separately.

An affirmative vote on Motion No. 30 obviates the need to vote upon Motions Nos. 31 and 32. A negative vote on Motion No. 30 necessitates the requirement for a vote to be taken on Motion No. 31. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 31 obviates the need to vote upon Motion No. 32. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 31 necessitates the requirement for a vote to be taken on Motion No. 32.

[*Translation*]

Motions numbered 9 and 29 standing in the name of the honourable Members for York West (Mr. Marchi) and Thunder Bay-Nipigon (Mr. Epp) propose to establish a separate Department of Government and a commisssioner of Multiculturalism. In so doing the first Motion undoubtedly would cause a significant charge upon the Federal Treasury in order for the new Department to function on a daily basis. The amendment is at odds with the Royal Recommendation which accompanies this Bill as there is no provision in the Royal Recommendation or in the Bill for a separate government department.

In addition, the proposal for a commissioner with investigative and reporting powers appears to take the intent of the Bill beyond what was included originally.

Consequently, in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (7) of Citation 773 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, I must declare these amendments inadmissible.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 10, 12, 14, 15, 17 and 18 are in order and will be debated together but voted upon separately.

[*Translation*]

Motion numbered 11 standing in the name of the honourable Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp) is identical to motion numbered 10 and will therefore not be selected and put to the House.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 13 and 16 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) are identical to Motion No. 14 and thus will not be selected and put to the House.

[*Translation*]

Motion numbered 19 standing in the name of the honourable Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp) causes the Chair some concern. Paragraphs (h) and (i) of the motion, in my view, take the clause beyond what was agreed to in principle at Second Reading. The Bill makes no mention of designated agencies monitoring, investigating or auditing federal institutions.

In this regard, I must rule the amendment inadmissible, in accordance with paragraph 1 of Beauchesne's Citation 773 in that it goes beyond the scope of the bill.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 are acceptable and will be debated together but voted upon as follows:

Motion No. 20 will be voted on separately.

An affirmative vote on Motion No. 21 obviates the need for a vote on Motion No. 22. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 21 necessitates a vote on Motion No. 22.

An affirmative vote on Motion No. 23 obviates the need for a vote on Motion No. 24. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 23 necessitates a vote on Motion No. 24.

Motions Nos. 25 and 26 will be voted upon separately.

• (1240)

[*Translation*]

Motions numbered 27 and 28 are admissible and will be debated together but voted upon as follows:

[*English*]

An affirmative vote on Motion No. 27 obviates the need for a vote on Motion No. 28. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 27 necessitates a vote on Motion No. 28.

[*Translation*]

I shall now put motions numbered 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 30, 31 and 32 to the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon) moved:

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 35 to 40 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"(b) promote the recognition of cultural and racial diversity as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society and as providing invaluable resources for the shaping of Canada's future;"

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West) moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 37 and 38 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"mental characteristic of Canadian society and that it provides an invalu".

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member for Willowdale (Mr. Oostrom) to move Motion No. 6 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Parkdale—High Park (Mr. Witer)?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Marchi: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): There is not unanimous consent, therefore that motion will not be proceeded with. The Hon. Member for York West did not give his consent.

[*Translation*]

We shall now vote on Motion No. 7.

Canadian Multiculturalism Act

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West) moved:

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 41 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"(c) ensure the full and equitable partici-".

[*English*]

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon) moved:

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 3 by adding immediately after line 29 at page 4 the following:

"(k) encourage the youth of Canada to nurture the multicultural heritage of Canadians while seeking a full participation in the economic, social, cultural and political life of Canada."

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Lastly, Motion No. 30.

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon) moved:

Motion No. 30

That Bill C-93 be amended in the Preamble by striking out lines 31 to 36 at page 2 and substituting therefor:

"Canada recognizes the diversity of Canadians as regards race, national or ethnic origin, colour and religion as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society and is committed to a policy of multiculturalism designed to preserve and enhance the multicultural heritage of Canadians while working to achieve the equality of all Canadians in the economic, social, cultural and political life of Canada;".

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Motion No. 31.

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): moved:

Motion No. 31

That Bill C-93 be amended in the Preamble by striking out lines 34 to 36 at page 2 and substituting therefor:

"that this multicultural nature is a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society, the Government of Canada desires to preserve and enhance this inherent quality in the continuing evolution of the country;".

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne)): Motion No. 32 is in the name of the Member for Parkdale—High Park. Is there unanimous consent that the motion be moved by the Member for Willowdale?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Marchi: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Member for York West has denied unanimous consent. The motion will not be proceeded with.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motions? The Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp) on debate.

Mr. Oostrom: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Last week, in the co-operative spirit which existed in this House on the languages Bill, both sides of the House allowed Members other than the Member in whose name a motion stood to present the motion. We are starting off on the wrong foot again. I would like to ask the Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) to reconsider his denial of unanimous consent for the moving of these amendments.

Mr. Marchi: Madam Speaker, one of the reasons that I did not give unanimous consent is that the amendment proposed by the Member for Parkdale—High Park is found both in an amendment that I will be presenting and in an amendment presented by the New Democratic Committee for multiculturalism. Therefore, no amendments of a substantive nature will be omitted.

Also at heart is the way in which the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism and the legislative committee was treated by the Government which rapidly pushed the Bill through committee, did not listen to witnesses, and did not give critics the opportunity to move the appropriate amendments.

Therefore, as there was no co-operation and respect by the Government and the Minister in committee, we believe that there should be no co-operation offered at this stage.

Mr. Lewis: Madam Speaker, I heard only part of my hon. friend's comments. However, I would like to put on the record what has been understood among House leaders, that is, that my instructions, as we entered this last two weeks, have been that at all times Members of the Opposition would be granted permission to move motions on behalf of other Members in their absence. That in fact happened at report stage on the Air Canada Bill and may have happened on other Bills which I cannot recollect at this moment. However, those are our instructions in order that no Member of the Opposition, nor indeed the opposition Parties, will be foreclosed from placing amendments because of the way in which the Government calls its business.

At this stage it is in the interest of everyone to co-operate, no matter what happened in any committee. I hope that my hon. friend will reconsider because in this business one often finds that the shoe is on the other foot. Even if permission is not given, I stand by my comment that the Government will allow Members, other than the Member in whose name a report stage motion stands on the Order Paper, to move the amendment. In the interests of co-operation and better legislation I hope my hon. friend would reconsider.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Resuming debate. The Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp).

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Madam Speaker, although we are only at report stage on Bill C-93 one is struck by the importance of this moment in that we have Canada's first multiculturalism Bill returned from the legislative committee for consideration in the House. Without making any comment on certain things which have happened, I want to express my pleasure in the ruling which you rendered a few minutes ago. In surveying the motions on the Order Paper for

amendment of the Bill, some motions were ruled to be procedurally inadmissible and some the Speaker, with the guidance of the Clerks, found to be in order and are before us today for consideration by the House prior to voting on them.

• (1250)

The significance of this Bill which will provide for the legislating of the multiculturalism policy is that we have achieved a point in the evolution of multiculturalism policy that previous Liberal Governments had never achieved.

While I do not want to reflect on the ruling itself, it is regrettable that the shortcomings in the legislation made those rulings inevitable. These rulings include the application of the Bill to the Parliament of Canada, motions for the creation of a department and the establishment of a commissioner of multiculturalism. These motions were inevitably found out of order by the Speaker because the legislation was so constrained.

It is regrettable that the legislation brought forward by the previous Secretary of State contained no such provisions. That regret has been expressed by myself and other Members, as well as by many people across the country. They regret that this historic Bill has those constraints. While the Bill does much to establish the principles of multiculturalism policy, it does not fully assure Canadians that this policy will be the basis for action by government in the future.

The motions that you have ruled we are to debate today primarily provide for a recognition of multiculturalism or ethnocultural diversity in this country as a fundamental characteristic. When the Bill came out of the legislative committee, the Government spoke of that in terms of a fundamental element. To speak of diversity or even a policy as an element is poor English. The fact that it is poor English is hardly half the reason to consider means by which we could recognize the diversity of this country.

One of the consequences of the work on the constitutional accord 15 months ago, which has been approved by the Parliament of Canada and eight of ten provincial legislatures, is that there is a recognition for linguistic duality in this country. It recognizes it as a fundamental characteristic.

It is most important that this historic Bill recognize the ethnocultural diversity of the country. The Government should recognize that as well through similar language in the legislation.

The Meech Lake Accord spoke of duality as a fundamental characteristic. That left many of us convinced that there were other fundamental characteristics. This matter has become more difficult for the Government to consider in the last minutes because the two motions by a Government Member which have not been found to be in order provided for this recognition in both Clause 3 and the preamble to the Bill. I suggest that the Government should consider carefully other motions by Opposition Members who were on the standing committee and active in the legislative committee. The Government should carefully consider that one or other of those motions for both Clause 3 and for the preamble be found acceptable by the Government when it comes time to vote on them so they may carry through the amendment to the Bill.

There is a good deal of support for this by various organizations across Canada. The Canadian Ethnocultural Council, the national organization speaking in this area, has suggested that "fundamental characteristic" rather than "element", would be a better way of wording the matter. It is more of an observation than a demand.

However, other organizations have made the case much more forcefully. These include such diverse organizations as the Manitoba Inter-Cultural Council, which has the distinction of being most representative in the sense that it is chosen by members of the community. Most of the members of the Manitoba Inter-Cultural Council are practically elected by ethnocultural communities in Manitoba.

The Council stated firmly that the language should be "fundamental characteristic". The National Congress of Italian Canadians has a most honourable place among the national ethnocultural organizations. In its brief there was a clear recognition of the fact that the Meech Lake Accord had made "fundamental characteristic" a phrase in the context of duality and should also apply to the ethnocultural diversity of the country.

The Affiliation of Multicultural and Service Agencies in British Columbia, one of the most broad organizations involved with both ethnocultural groups and immigrant services, has made the same argument that we should have "fundamental characteristic" as the provision in both Clause 3 and the preamble.

There is a diversity of arguments, from recent Canadian experience, as well as from language and from community organizations across the country that the phrasing should be "fundamental characteristic". I will watch with interest as the Minister of State for for Multiculturalism (Mr. Weiner) thinks about these matters and decides what advice he should give his caucus colleagues, knowing that the motions proposed by a colleague in his own caucus are not before us for decision this afternoon.

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Madam Speaker, I wish to register our support for Motion No. 4 in the name of the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp). It recognizes the change in the word "fundamental element" to read "fundamental characteristic".

I too have a number of motions which address the very same aspect. It is an important matter and I wish to record our support for Motion No. 4.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I would recognize the Hon. Minister right now, but may I suggest that we call it

one o'clock, and I will recognize the Hon. Minister after Question Period?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this day.

At 12.59 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

AIRPORTS

PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—PRICES CHARGED BY SNACK-BARS

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the Pearson International Airport at Toronto, the smallest glass of pop, coca cola, for example, costs $1.29. I was at the airport yesterday and had to spend a fair amount of time waiting for some travellers. I was appalled at the prices they charged at the concession snack-bars in the airport. I call upon the Government to look into this problem.

These are basically monopoly operations which are under the control of the Government. The Government wants to brag about running airports as profit centres and, to a certain point, it is entitled to do so, but it also has a responsibility not only to the public as taxpayers but to the public as travellers. It is appalling to discover how much is being charged for these basic simple services. It should be part of the Government's responsibility to ensure that prices being charged are reasonable in relation to the service and products provided.

I call upon the Minister of Transport (Mr. Bouchard) to look into the situation and to report on what is being done by the Government to keep prices in line for the travelling public at our airports.

* * *

FISHERIES

ATLANTIC INSHORE FISHERMEN—LOBSTER LICENCE STATUS

Mr. Lawrence I. O'Neil (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso): Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge that the desire of inshore fishermen to have their concerns about upgrading their lobster licences to A from B be addressed. Many of these fishermen received a commitment years ago that they would be allowed to regain their licensed status if their personal circumstances changed. Still others had their licences cancelled based on incorrect information or procedures employed at the time. Fishermen who are seeking reinstatement of their lobster licences should be given a full hearing.

To date, fishermen are being told by the Atlantic Licence Appeal Board that the board cannot upgrade or reinstate, it can only decide whether the policy in effect at the time of down grading or cancellation was applied correctly. That is not enough. This issue must be addressed in a complete way with a view to restoring equity by having the circumstances of each appellant fully considered and responded to.

* * *

CANADA POST CORPORATION

CLOSURE OF WESTERN SHORE, N.S., POST OFFICE

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on Sunday in Western Shore, Nova Scotia, the local post office will be closed. It will be closed for the last time. All 720 residents of this small town signed a petition asking that their post office be maintained but no one has listened. These people say that the Member of Parliament for the area simply passed on the message to Canada Post without any recommendations. He is obviously following the lead of the Minister responsible for the Post Office who washes his hands of responsibility when it comes time to stand up for rural post offices.

This problem came about when the local postmistress decided to retire. Are Canadians living in rural areas to be frightened every time one of their postmistresses or postmasters decides to retire that this will be the time their post office will close down?

We must hear these people. Their voices must be heard loud and clear. They describe their post office as a meeting place and they believe the old people will really be the ones to suffer. The people used the post office for money orders and things like that, and every kid who came into the post office received a sucker. That is all gone now. These people deserve to be heard. Rural Canada needs a voice in this Parliament.

* * *

CANADA POST CORPORATION

CENTENNIAL OF AGASSIZ, B.C., POST OFFICE

Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise in the House today to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the post office in Agassiz, British Columbia. Actual postal service to the community was started in 1884, but it was not until four years later that the name of Agassiz was adopted, named after the first postmaster, Mr. L. A. Agassiz. Since that time 14 postmasters have efficiently run the post office, and today Debbie Cliff proudly holds the title

of postmistress. Miss Cliff recently accepted a Canada Post plaque honouring the centennial of the community post office.

• (1405)

There is a rich history of community involvement in the post office. Henry Wilson was the postmaster for 16 years, and Dorothy Aspelund was the first female appointed to the postmistress position in Agassiz. She served for 19 years.

The community of Agassiz has been growing in the last decade, and a second rural route was established in 1980 to meet the needs of this fine community.

Hats off to the people of Agassiz and to your post office! You have set a fine example for many other community post offices in B.C. and Canada. Congratulations!

* * *

MISSING CHILDREN

RETURN OF ABDUCTED HAMILTON BOY

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, in the dog days of summer we do not often get good news. However, I had some last week.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, a couple of months ago I raised in this House the case of a young boy who had been abducted by one of his parents and who had gone missing for several months. Last week that boy was returned to the care of his mother in the city of Hamilton.

I think one of the reasons for the happy ending to what could have been a very sad story was the fine work done by the Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Police and, in particular, Sgt. Wilde, who worked diligently day and night on the case. The boy's mother and other family members never gave up hope that he would be reunited with his mother.

I know that there are hundreds of other missing children, many of whom have been abducted by a parent. I want to ask those parents to remember this. An abducted child, a child who is away from his home, is not a happy or contented child. Think about the child. In this case we had a happy ending. If those parents who really love their children think about them, they will reunite them with their family environment.

I am extremely happy that this story had a happy ending.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

RESEARCH IN QUÉBEC—GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, once again, the Conservative Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Masse) has given the Province of Quebec a helping hand. He announced that an earth sciences research centre would be set up in Quebec, in cooperation with the Quebec Institute of Scientific Research, in addition to an energy research laboratory in northwestern Quebec. The creation of this laboratory in Abitibi-Témiscamingue will be welcomed by the mining industry.

Decisions such as this by the Conservative Minister will enable all Canadians, from Quebec and elsewhere, to contribute to the national policies of his Department. The Department must be present in Quebec, just as Quebecers must be present in the Department.

Mr. Speaker, that is the result of the excellent work done by the Conservative Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Masse) and Hon. Member for Frontenac.

* * *

[*English*]

SHIPBUILDING

PROPOSAL TO BUILD MINESWEEPER PATROL VESSELS

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, it has long since become clear that the Mulroney Government has no shipbuilding policy beyond the assignment of government work to one shipyard or another.

Similarly, the last Liberal Government used special capital recovery projects to provide vessels for the Coast Guard. The present Conservative Government uses naval construction and refits to keep shipyards working.

The award of work on the HMCS *Nipigon* to Port Weller Dry Docks last week marked the application of this practice to an Ontario yard. Ontario shipyards have suffered severely from the shipbuilding depression. Collingwood was closed two years ago, and Port Arthur Shipbuilding is forced to rely on repair work alone.

A consortium led by Canadian Shipbuilding and Engineering Ltd. has proposed construction of minesweeper patrol vessels for the Canadian Navy. The consortium has proposed distribution of this work to yards in Ontario and Quebec, as well as in the Atlantic and Pacific regions.

I urge the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Beatty) to recognize the Navy's need for these vessels and the shipyards' needs for the work. I urge the Minister to award this contract to the consortium led by CSEL.

S. O. 21

AIRPORTS

OTTAWA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Bill Tupper (Nepean—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring Members' attention to a major study of the Ottawa International Airport which has just been completed.

The study, commissioned by the Ottawa-Carleton Economic Development Corporation, points to two surmountable obstacles to growth. First, although the airport has the fifth largest passenger volume in Canada, it ranks last in terms of direct access to major U.S. air transportation hubs. Second, Winnipeg, Calgary, and Edmonton all have U.S. preclearance facilities, but the Ottawa airport lacks such a service.

The airport study indicates that we could remedy the first defect without bilateral negotiations by designating Ottawa as an underserviced destination. The second defect could be remedied by granting immunity to U.S. Customs and Immigration agents, assuming the U.S. would reciprocate.

These are constructive recommendations to improve the airport of our nation's capital. I would like to encourage further consideration of them by our transportation Ministry.

* * *

• (1410)

NATURAL RESOURCES

WATER—POSITION OF LIBERAL AND PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE LEADERS

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks, while western farmers have been experiencing the worst drought in 50 years and people in central Canada have been baking in temperatures in excess of 35 degrees, a lot of politicians have been hopping on the bandwagon and protecting our water from the Americans. Well, in a speech to the United States Chamber of Commerce, 1967, the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Turner) said:

> If some day we can agree to the sharing of this continent's water by offering some of our water for export, we might want to insist that if water is to be considered a continental resource, markets should also be considered on the same basis . . . That, as I see it, must be our position.

Mr. Speaker, when Liberals get up in this House to defend our water, they should remember that their Leader was prepared to export our precious water only a few years ago.

What about Liberal Premier Robert Bourassa? In 1985 he said:

> There is little doubt that Québec and Canada could be a source of water for North America in years to come.

Brian Mulroney in an interview in 1985 with *Fortune* magazine said:

> If somebody wanted to buy a little of our water, hell, we are in business, that is what it is all about. We have it coming out of our ears in Sept-Îles.

Can Canadians really feel that our precious water is safe in the hands of this Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) or the Leader of the Liberal Party?

As prairie farmers watch their crops shrivel and die from a lack of rain, and as the millions of Canadians living near the Great Lakes are faced with the diversion of much of this water to the United States, they should consider just who they can really trust to stand up and fight to keep control over our water resources. It is not this Government and it is not the Liberal Party. Only one Party has been consistent in the defence of our water—the New Democratic Party of Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—THE ADVANTAGES

Mr. Gabriel Fontaine (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, because of free trade in the automotive sector, General Motors of Canada has over the past three years invested 3.7 billion dollars in the Oshawa riding. That is money that is of immediate benefit to 20 350 workers, and the investment is due to free trade in the automotive sector. Fifty par cent of Ontario's exports to the U.S. in recent years are attributable to free trade in that sector.

The Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), the leader of the socialist Party, is very well aware that American investment under free trade is profitable to the Oshawa riding.

Bob White, president of United Auto Workers, also knows how profitable free trade is for automobile workers in the Oshawa region.

It is strange, Mr. Speaker, that Bob White is against free trade when it pays him so well and pays the socialist leader so well. We should remember that Bob White is the national vice-president of the socialist party. These two men, White and Broadbent, have vowed that Canadians who do not live in Oshawa will not be prosperous.

* * *

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—WATER RESOURCES

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, it is very disturbing to learn that Americans are already saying that water is included in the trade agreement, despite denials here in Ottawa. In addition, pressure is mounting to increase the flow of water from Lake Michigan into the midwest river

system, so as to keep water transportation afloat. The Canadian Government has not made its opposition to such increase known in Washington, except for extracting a weak commitment that Canada will be consulted before a decision is made.

The weakness of the Canadian position is scary. Canadian water is threatened. The least the Government must do is to exclude water from the trade agreement. Without such amendment, the credibility of the Government is seriously damaged. We must not allow our water to be up for grabs.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

GLOOMSAYERS' INCORRECT PROPHECIES

Mr. Elliott Hardey (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to congratulate the gloomsayers in this House. They should be recognized for their amazing consistency on every major issue since 1984. They have been proven wrong every time.

They said that the Government could not reduce the deficit without killing many of our social programs. The deficit has come down every year since 1984. Social programs have been increased.

They said that the Government could not lower and stabilize interest rates for any length of time without triggering inflation. They were wrong again. For four straight years inflation has remained under control while exports and housing starts flourished.

The gloomsayers said that you couldn't reduce government make work projects without increasing unemployment. How wrong can you get? Last Friday unemployment in Canada had reached a seven-year low. Canadian youth are showing confidence that jobs are waiting for them as they leave their schools. What a difference from the Trudeau days!

Is it any wonder that Canadians are doubting the gloomsayers now, as they preach their negative nonsense about free trade, tax reform, and defence issues?

* * *

• (1415)

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

PUBLIC SERVICE—HIRING PRACTICES

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, last week Canadians saw the dinosaurs of the Tory caucus in action once again. This time they were displaying their intolerance by trying to destroy the essence of the Official Languages Act, a Bill supporting bilingualism, a Bill widely accepted by most clear-thinking Canadians.

It is true that those Tories have every right to table amendments, but that misses the fundamental point, that is, the necessity that bilingual federal Public Service hiring practices must be fairly and equitably applied for Francophones outside Quebec and Anglophones within Quebec. Their amendment gave Canadians a rare glimpse of the archaic out-of-touch thinking inside the Tory caucus.

Let us not forget that it took active intervention by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) to get this Bill passed. Now, will the Secretary of State fulfil his responsibility by ensuring speedy implementation of Bill C-72 for both Anglophones within Quebec and Francophones outside Quebec? Let me remind him that implementing this Act is a federal responsibility which does not require an *entente cordiale* anywhere across this land.

I am sure all Canadians will remember this episode as a repeat one, a reminder of Tory thinking that began when more than 26 Tories voted against the first Official Languages Act back in 1969.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

GREENHOUSE EFFECT—NEED FOR CO-OPERATIVE MEASURES

Mr. Bill Gottselig (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, as a result of what is being termed the "greenhouse effect" future generations may be forced to live through devastating years of hardship and drought, far worse than we experience today. Not only could disease such as skin cancer be more prevalent and deadly, but crop production could be diminished to an extent that ultimately will affect our basic food supply. Jobs could also be lost.

It is a known fact that human activities influence the destruction of the ozone layer. If Canadians were to adjust their way of life we might be able to slow down this damage significantly. For example, farmers could implement changes in their methods of grain production and livestock maintenance; we could all learn better waste management in order to prevent pollution in a variety of areas; and water should also become a cherished commodity and used with greater respect.

I urge government, business, labour, and individual citizens to pull our resources together. We must enhance research and become more aware of the environmental consequences of our actions, which have become habit.

Environmental protection is everybody's business.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—WATER RESOURCES

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue. The Minister knows that I have been arguing for some time that Tariff Schedule Item 22.01 of the trade deal with the United States covers ordinary natural water of all kinds, and thus will allow for the eventual export of Canadian water to the United States. The Minister also knows that his colleague, the Minister for International Trade, has argued that Item 22.01 applies only to bottled mineral water—he talked about Perrier with great gusto in the House of Commons.

The Minister of National Revenue has issued the official explanatory notes on the harmonized customs tariffs for the Canada-U.S. trade deal. I quote from his document where he states that the official explanation for Item 22.01 is "ordinary natural water of all kinds other than sea water". It seems pretty clear.

Will the Minister explain why his explanation of the customs Item 22.01 contradicts flatly the rejection of our argument of the past number of weeks here in the House of Commons that the trade deal does not contemplate the inclusion of water within its ambit?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the position is exactly as has been stated repeatedly, and is very clear from the free trade agreement. The free trade agreement does not apply to water in its natural running state. It does not apply to any diversion of water from any natural basins of this country. It applies principally to bottled water.

Let me tell the Hon. Leader of the Opposition the following. If he checks the same agreement, he will see in one of the schedules that compressed air is included. That does not mean to say that Canada is in danger of losing its air, certainly as long as the Leader of the Opposition is around.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

• (1420)

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I think the air pressure in this House will stay well above normal as long as the Minister sticks around, and that won't be for too long.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

[*Translation*]

POSITION OF MINISTER OF NATIONAL REVENUE

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, that may be the Minister's point of view, but I want to repeat the official interpretation given by his colleague. Under the law, the Minister of National Revenue is responsible for providing an official interpretation of all questions related to Customs. This official explanation by the Minister says that tariff item 22.01 covers water of all kinds except sea water.

Now the Great Lakes are not sea water, any more than Lake Winnipeg, Lake Athabasca, Lake Nipigon or Great Slave Lake or the St. Lawrence River. The waters of these lakes are covered by this tariff item in the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement, despite the claims and statements by the Minister for International Trade. Does the Minister of National Revenue deny having sent this official explanation to his Customs officers and how can he reconcile his official interpretation with the statements made by his colleague, the Minister for International Trade?

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, might I refer again, in our attempt to keep the Leader of the Opposition on a factually correct road—I know he would not intentionally distort the facts—to an interview shown on television on Sunday, May 1. Mr. Craig Oliver along with Pamela Wallin interviewed Ambassador Clayton Yeutter on CTV.

Mr. Yeutter was asked—he, of course, is the United States trade representative who negotiated this deal—a question:

> Did you see this deal as leading to a system by which the United States can also have easier access to Canadian supplies of water?

And he said:

> I don't see the free trade arrangement being used as a vehicle to accomplish that, but I can certainly see there might be U.S.-Canada discussions on access to water supplies over the next 10, 20 or 50 years.

That is exactly the same point which the Leader of the Opposition in his famous book made a number of years ago when he said he could see water being used as an item of trade as a natural resource.

Mr. Yeutter went on to say:

> I happen to know the issue of water well because I did my PhD. dissertation on water law and water administration, but I don't see it being an FTA issue. I see it being a separate issue that will inevitably draw attention in time.

And so on. Here is the chief trade representative of the United States who said that the free trade arrangement has nothing to do with the question of water, that it is a separate issue that will inevitably draw attention in time.

When it does, this Government has a policy that we will not permit—which was enunciated in November, 1987, for the first time by any Government in Canada—inter-basin transfer of water from Canada to the United States or anywhere else. We have got the policy. We are only in danger if the hon. gentleman opposite gets into power.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Dick: Poor John. Give him some water.

REQUEST THAT AGREEMENT BE AMENDED

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in that celebrated declaration which the Minister cites that I made 20 years ago to the United States Chamber of Commerce I said quite clearly to the suggestion that the water of North America should be considered a continental water supply, Canadians say hold on a minute. We say there is Canadian water, there is American water, and there is Mexican water, but we do not like the new vocabulary which calls our water continental water. That has always been my position and it is my position here before the House.

I don't care what Clayton Yeutter's PhD. thesis says or how he interprets the agreement. The Minister of National Revenue in his official interpretation of Article 22.01 includes ordinary natural water within the purview of the agreement. No matter what the Minister of Trade says, no matter what Clayton Yeutter says or what anybody else, that is the official interpretation of this Government.

The Minister of Justice—I ought to put this to the Acting Prime Minister, and I would like to be advised who is Acting Prime Minister today—

Mr. Crosbie: We will let you know.

Mr. Beatty: Who is the Acting Leader of the Opposition today?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I will put the question to the Acting Prime Minister whoever he or she may be.

On Friday the Minister of Justice said:

> The question of our ability to control water policy in Canada transcends any agreement.

That is to say our water policy would out rank anything in the agreement. However, Clause 8 of the legislation passed by this House says quite clearly that the trade agreement supersedes and transcends any Canadian legislation or policy.

• (1425)

With great respect, I say to the Minister of Justice that he does not know what he is talking about. I ask the Acting Prime Minister, if the Minister for International Trade is so categorical that despite the trade agreement, despite the trade legislation and despite the customs tariff we have recited, why does he not agree to an amendment specifically to exclude water from the purview of the agreement?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the hon. gentleman first about what he said in his famous book. He said:

> We might wish to export water, not for money as we sold power under the Columbia River Treaty, but in return for access to your markets. That, as I see it, must be our position. I don't want to sound tough.

He didn't.

There is nothing in the free trade agreement which requires the diversion of water to the United States. We are not going to permit the diversion of water to the United States. That is our policy.

The prohibition of water exports by means of inter-basin transfers falls squarely within exceptions permitted by GATT and is totally consistent with the free trade agreement. The hon. gentleman, *The Toronto Star*, and their supporters who are anti-free trade are trying to stir up these fictitious fears. Let the mud settle. It just is not true. Please just let it settle and stick to the facts. Don't stick to your book of a few years ago; that is too dangerous.

REQUEST FOR SPECIFIC EXEMPTION OF WATER

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister for International Trade, and sticks to reported facts, at least that are as recent as one week ago.

Last week the same chief negotiator for the United States, Mr. Yeutter, was quoted as having said in an interview with Republican Representative Grandy that water is in the agreement. This is as recently as one week ago.

In light of continuous pressures on Canadian water, what has the Government of Canada got to lose by adding water to the list of items including beer, unprocessed fish, and lumber, items that are exempted from the trade agreement?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who asked the question himself issued a release just a few days ago, July 5, not that long ago, which should not have passed out of his mind so quickly, in which he said, "While the Government has repeatedly stated that nothing in the trade deal forces Canada to sell water to the U.S."—the hon. gentleman admits that the free trade agreement does not force Canada to sell water and then he goes on to say—"the same Government cannot give assurance that the deal prevents the export of water." We do not enter into agreements to prevent something. If we are a Government with resolution, a Government that has a policy, we do not need an agreement to tell us what we can prevent. We prevent it by saying it is against our policy to permit it, something which you never did when you were in power and now you are clucking like a rooster every time water is mentioned.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly where we want the Minister for International Trade to do, to take a measure that will prevent it. That is all we are

asking for. What have you got to lose by including water in the trade deal? Tell us now.

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the free trade agreement cannot now be amended. It is before the U.S. Congress and it is before this House, but not only that, there is no need to amend it. There is no danger unless the Hon. Leader of the Opposition gets into power and wants to treat water like a commodity and make some money on it.

The Hon. Member quoted Iowa Republican Representative Grandy who made certain comments which he said were based on comments made by a U.S. trade official at a discussion on trade issues organized by Grandy for his constituents. He never had any conversation with Mr. Yeutter. He has no information from Mr. Yeutter on this matter.

The U.S. trade office will confirm that water in its natural state is not a subject of the free trade agreement. Only bottled water is, the same as compressed air. I know the hon. gentleman is going to go racing around the country now saying, "Watch out for the air, watch out for the air, because it is being sold to the United States under the free trade agreement," just like the little red hen.

• (1430)

PROPOSED CHICAGO CANAL WATER DIVERSION

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister.

Mr. Rodriguez: Which one?

Mr. Langdon: I am not sure which is the best actor over there.

A water diversion increase of three times the amount presently going through the Chicago diversion, which is what is being proposed by various U.S. Senators and Governors—

Mr. McDermid: Wrong! Name the second Governor.

Mr. Langdon: —would decrease the water level in Lake Huron by up to nine inches, by five inches in Lake Erie, and would have a tremendous effect on water quality, hydroelectric production, shipping and recreation. It is not a laughing matter.

Given this significant danger will the Acting Prime Minister show leadership and see to it that this House unanimously passes a resolution to be conveyed to the U.S. which indicates our complete opposition to any increase in the Chicago diversion?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the House will be happy to know, and I believe the House already knows, that we have conveyed the strong views of this Government to the U.S., and I am sure those are the views of all Members of the House. We have had our Ambassador visit and set out our position very clearly. Our position was also stated clearly by the Attorney General, I believe it was, on Friday.

We take the position that Canadian consent is needed for any such diversion of water as proposed by one or two Governors, not by all. Our view is not based on any interpretation of U.S. domestic law. We say the obligation to get Canada's consent is governed by international law and is based on a number of bilateral treaties, agreements and exchanges of notes between Canada and the U.S., including the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty, the 1959 Niagara River Treaty, and the exchange of notes on the Long Lac-Ogoki diversion, as well as the practice of the two countries going back to the early 1940s.

In all that time no unilateral diversions have been undertaken by either country, and we fully expect that this proposal will be rejected also. There will be no diversion with our consent and the U.S. knows forcefully and well that we object strongly to this proposal.

REQUEST THAT AGREEMENT BE AMENDED

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, the same detailed report of the International Joint Commission reviewed this whole question in 1985 and indicated that unfortunately there is an ambiguity in our legal right to prevent the U.S. from diverting water from Lake Michigan. Given that unfortunate fact, will the Government move to do something about the ambiguity by amending the trade deal so as to block water diversions from the Great Lakes to the U.S., whether through the Chicago diversion or some other diversion south of Lake Superior, or any place else in the Great Lakes Basin? Otherwise, the impact on our country would be disastrous.

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of warnings from the hon. gentleman about disasters to befall Canada. I am sure if there was a serious diversion of water, that would be of serious concern to Canada. However, we do not believe there to be any ambiguity in the practices which have been followed since the early 1940s, or in international law. We always know, of course, that there can be arguments about what the law is.

Our position is there is no ambiguity, but if there is we know that our relationship with the U.S. is a good, solid, honest, cooperative one and we feel sure that the U.S. administration will listen to our representations, apart altogether from laws and ambiguities that might surround any issue.

GOVERNMENT'S POSITION

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, the former Minister for International Trade, who negotiated this infamous trade deal, said she is against even considering the possibility of an amendment. What is it that prevents the Government from putting such a simple safeguard in a trade deal? What is it that prevents the Government from standing up on behalf of Canadians for once and doing what it should

do? What is it that prevents the Government from standing up for Canada for once?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, these theatrics are not very impressive. The position is this. I am answering these questions as Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs. This has nothing to do with trade matters.

If the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement had never come into existence, if it had never crossed anyone's mind, if it did not exist, if it was up on the Moon or Saturn somewhere, we would still have this problem of the proposal by the Governor of Illinois to divert these waters and we would be handling it in the same way. It has no connection at all to the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement, which is an agreement governing commercial relations to increase our access to the U.S. market, to make our people more prosperous, to give Canadians a chance to show what they can do in competition with the Americans, to help Canada and Canadians.

It has no connection whatsoever with the free trade agreement and we do not need to approach the Americans about the free trade agreement. This is a different issue to be treated differently by a different Minister.

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I will direct my question to the same Minister. If he had read the agreement he would know that Article 409 provides for a full sharing of goods and services. The interpretation given by the Minister of National Revenue to his customs officers includes natural water as part of that definition of goods and services. It is therefore part of the agreement.

The Minister can solve the problem very simply by proposing an amendment that would exclude water from being subject to Section 409. The Minister says he cannot do that because the deal is final. The fact is that the U.S. has not completed its legislation. It has not tabled its Bill yet. The Minister is not describing the state of affairs accurately to the House. Considering Article 409 and the official interpretation given by his colleague, why does the Minister refuse to propose the kind of exclusion required to ensure that water will not be included as part of the trade agreement?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the only way in which water is touched upon in the free trade agreement, and I will say this again for the record, or any trade in water as a commercial good, is under the heading "beverages, spirits and vinegar". Vinegar is certainly apt when we hear these repetitious questions, these same feeble attempts to alarm the Canadian people, day after day, week after week.

• (1440)

Water itself as a natural resource is not dealt with in the free trade agreement. There is nothing in the free trade agreement which requires or obliges or directs or orders or permits the diversion of water to the United States. The policy of this Government, contrary to the last Government, enunciated in November, 1987, is that there shall be no transfer from Canada of water as a natural resource.

We have ignored the advice of the Leader of the Opposition in his book from which I quoted a few minutes ago. We do not buy that policy. We are not going to permit water to be given away like that.

The exact analogy is to compressed air which is also dealt with as a commercial good. Compressed air—does that mean that Canadians are now in danger of being cut off from the air because some Government is going to sell all the Canadian air? For heaven's sake, stop the childish nonsense.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I would like the Hon. Minister to add a document to his reading list as part of his remedial reading program. That document is one provided by his colleague, the Minister of National Revenue, which in the explanatory notes to the customs tariffs which apply to Section 401, says the following very clearly on Article 22.01:

> Waters, including natural or artificial mineral waters . . . This heading covers: (A) Ordinary natural water of all kinds . . .

It is not mineral water, not the Minister's hot air, and none of the other spurious comments he is making.

The fact of the matter is that under the present proposed agreement Section 409 includes goods and services. This custom tariff classification clearly includes natural water as part of that definition. In order to ensure that there is no future demand under the trade agreement for access to our water there is only one serious, responsible way of proceeding, that is, to propose an amendment, which the Minister has every right to do because the deal is not yet finalized. The Americans are still considering their amendments.

Why does the Minister stand time after time and refuse the logical, honest, responsible way of dealing with a matter which is very important to Canada? Is it simply that he knows the real reason and he is prepared to sell out Canada and its water?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. gentleman's remedial reading is confined to *The Toronto Star*.

The situation in Canada with respect to beer is unchanged by the free trade agreement. Wine changes and liquor changes, but beer is not included. Even though it trickles along or flows out if you turn the bottle upside-down, up, just like water, it is not included. That does not mean to say that Canadians have

to send all their beer down to the United States. It just means that there is a provision which deals with beer.

I will refer again to Mr. Yeutter who headed the United States negotiating team. In the same interview he said the following about water: "But I don't see it being an FTA issue. I see it being a separate issue that will inevitably draw attention in time. Now, clearly all of that would have to be worked out on the basis of an international compact between the two countries".

Water in its natural state is not included. There is nothing to fear. As long as the Government is kept in power there is nothing to fear about the transfer of water in large amounts to the United States.

PROVISIONS OF AGREEMENT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Minister for International Trade. He will be well aware that the provisions of the trade deal transcend government policy now or in the future. He indicated in his response to the Leader of the Official Opposition that the policy on water can change. It could change with this Government and can change with a future Government.

If the Minister felt it was appropriate to exempt logs from this trade deal, and also that it was appropriate to exempt beer, with the concern that this has created across the country why not work to exempt water? Is the Minister saying that beer is more important than water?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I can tell Hon. Members that beer has never crossed my lips. I don't like the stuff. Whether it is different from water, I don't know, having never tasted beer.

To return to the question, it is not appropriate, nor is it necessary, to deal with water in the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement. Water has been dealt with in a statement of policy by the Minister of the Environment. If and when the Government decides that legislation is also necessary, the way in which to deal with the matter would be with legislation brought into this House by the Minister of the Environment.

The Liberals were in power for 40 years and they did nothing, they didn't adopt any policy. The man who was Minister of the Environment then did not care about water. We do not know what he cared about because he never spoke up at all during the time he was Minister.

If the Government decides that legislation is necessary, the hon. gentleman will hear about it in the usual way. Perhaps we should open up longer during the summer to deal with it in that way, but we are not proposing to open up the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement which was signed last January 2 and which does not deal with water. Nothing forces us to divert water to the United States.

REQUEST THAT AMENDMENT BE INTRODUCED

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I remember the words of the Minister for International Trade when he said to the people of Canada not many months ago, "If we told them what we were going to actually do they'ld never vote for us". In recalling that now I wonder whether there is not some hidden agenda here. I wonder whether the Minister is not trying to cover up what the Government is actually up to.

If the Government were listening to the people of Canada it would know that people across Canada are very concerned about the whole discussion of water diversion into the United States, whether from the Great Lakes, the Nawapa plan, the Garrison Project, or whatever the project. There are very serious concerns.

This morning on the West Coast the former Minister for International Trade said that the Government is not at all interested in an amendment at this time. At this very critical moment the Minister could set aside the concerns of Canadians and make a lot of Canadians feel a lot easier about the Government's intention, forgetting about its stated policy, by simply bringing in an amendment. Why will he not do that simple thing at this time to ease the fears which are growing by the day across Canada?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, if there are fears growing by the day across Canada on this issue it is because the people are being misled by hon. gentlemen opposite who do not want them to understand the position.

With respect to the diversion of water as suggested by the Governor of Illinois, that is not a matter which can be dealt with in the free trade agreement. That is a matter to be dealt with under bilateral treaties with the United States under international law. According to the precedents since the early forties the Americans have never attempted to divert water in that way without consultation with and the consent of the Government of this country.

The hon. gentleman referred to something which he alleges I said at some time. I remember reading what the hon. gentleman said about his colleagues. He said, "They have misspoken the truth, they have misrepresented what happened, they have lied, they have not told the facts. I don't know how much blunter I can be about that". It was with reference to Mr. Waddell and Mr. Manly that the hon. gentleman said those words. How does he explain them?

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

OVERSEAS SERVICE—FINANCIAL NEEDS OF FAMILIES

Mr. Lawrence I. O'Neil (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Associate Minister of National Defence. I am concerned about the special circumstances of Armed Forces families who must move frequently and face new expenses, including expenses related to spouses seeking new employment, their eligibility for unemployment insurance, and the existence of exchange rates in West Germany, for example.

Can the Minister tell us what the Department is doing or is contemplating doing to meet the special financial needs of the families serving in Canada's Armed Forces?

Hon. Paul Dick (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, Canadian Armed Forces personnel who move overseas are already given a foreign service premium. There is a cost of living allowance which is indexed to the local economy in which they are living, there is a shelter share in which the Department subsidizes the housing utility costs, and there is a living-out allowance for single persons who wish to live off a base.

As a result of the differentiation between the mark and the Canadian dollar, last year we increased the amount they were allowed for living off the base in rental accommodation to try to make it more equitable for them.

• (1450)

We continue to analyze any fluctuations in the exchange rate to see if this fairness can be maintained.

* * *

RAILWAYS

CARRIAGE OF DANGEROUS GOODS STUDY—RELEASE OF MINORITY REPORT

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Minister of Transport who, regrettably, might be the Acting Prime Minister. Residents of Toronto are still waiting for the result of a study into the rail carriage of dangerous goods, a study that was undertaken because of the near disaster in Mississauga. The minority report which is dated today and was just released by Harold Morrison, gives a behind the scenes insight into the pro railway bias of the majority of the task force, and reveals that the majority report does not recommend reduced speeds.

Today I want to call on the Acting Minister to release the majority report and, at the same time, indicate that in spite of that report reduced speeds will be imposed on the carriage of dangerous goods by rail through Metro Toronto.

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am sure all Members would regret that a member of the committee would release a minority report before the main report has even been tabled with the Minister. We have not yet received that report, but I can assure the Member that when it is tabled, which I understand will be in the next few weeks, it will be dealt with properly by the Minister and in a way that I think will be satisfactory to the vast bulk of Members here.

MAJORITY REPORT

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Parliamentary Secretary. Does the Government intend to hold on to that report until it makes its own conclusions or, as I have urged, will that report be released as soon as the Government receives it?

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it will be dealt with like all reports. The Minister will have to study it and make his own personal consultations with people with whom he thinks he should touch base. He will make a recommendation to the Cabinet and it will then come to the House in that way.

* * *

ENERGY

DEVELOPMENT OF HYDROGEN TECHNOLOGY

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, today the Agriculture Ministers are meeting to consider the tragic consequences of an historic drought. As questions today indicate, we are immersed in a controversy over the diversion of Great Lake waters. This is an indication of the tremendous perils that the greenhouse effect presents to mankind if we do not wean ourselves from carbon based fuels. Yet since 1984 the Government has cut expenditures on alternative fuels and energy conservation. It has yet to respond to the proposal by its advisory committee that Canada establish world leadership in the development of hydrogen technology.

My question is directed to the Minister of State for Science and Technology. When will the Government respond to the proposal that Canada make a significant contribution to the attack on the greenhouse effect by developing technology for substitution of hydrogen for carbon? When will it correct its error on cutting back in energy alternative expenditures?

Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of State (Science and Technology)): Mr. Speaker, as usual, the Hon. Member is merely responding to action the Government has already taken in a number of these areas. In fact the Prime Minister raised the issue during the summit conference in Toronto, offering Canada to take a leadership role in co-ordinating the activities

throughout the world in terms of the management of the global commons.

Initiatives are under way following a report on hydrogen to examine the prospect of using hydrogen as one of the replacement fuels going into the next century. A consortium of business people from the major companies in Canada recently met with me and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources to get together in a major national mission on hydrogen.

The Hon. Member is merely following behind the lead dog and has lost his vision.

Mr. McCurdy: I did not know we were talking about dogs. I am sure dogs would be more specific in answering the question than the Minister of State just was.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, when will the Government announce that it has restored the cuts in expenditures for alternative energy and for conservation? How much, when, over what period of time? Will the Government establish the hydrogen authority as asked for in the advisory committee report? When will the Minister establish that committee and how much funding will it be provided? Do not give these general assertions of being in favour of this or that.

Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of State (Science and Technology)): Mr. Speaker, as usual, it is a very simplistic approach simply to anticipate that one can buy all of these solutions. The fact is that these committees are meeting, discussions are under way.

We have just announced $1.3 billion of new spending for science and technology. Five hundred and forty million dollars will go into universities for fundamental research. There will be a centres of excellence program. There is no doubt in my mind that energy will be one of the areas which Canadian scientists will want to study and develop linkages to leaders in various disciplines throughout the world. I could go on forever. The fact is that we are acting and measurable progress is being made. The Hon. Member just refuses to acknowledge it.

* * *

FISHERIES

ARREST OF SPANISH FISHING VESSELS OFF NEWFOUNDLAND

Mr. Morrissey Johnson (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception): Mr. Speaker, two Spanish fishing vessels were arrested off the coast of Newfoundland over the weekend for alleged illegal fishing inside Canada's 200-mile zone in 1985. Will the Acting Minister of Fisheries fill in the details of the arrest and what has transpired since the vessels were apprehended?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have a chance to praise the officials of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans for this magnificent piece of work. On Saturday two Spanish trawlers were sighted by a specially equipped Beach Craft King air surveillance aircraft operating out of St. John's, owned by Mr. Tom Collingwood's firm, and leased to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. It was determined that arrest warrants were outstanding for the two vessels and the captains.

The *Leonard J. Cowley* patrol vessel was alerted to intercept these two vessels and board them to determine whether the two captains were the same as those named in the warrants. It successfully intercepted the two Spanish trawlers on Sunday and first arrested the *Lenengoa* and its captain and then the *Bigarena* and arrested her captain. They were brought into St. John's at four o'clock Sunday afternoon.

It turned out that both captains had been wanted since 1985 for alleged offences that have occurred in our waters. This was a magnificent piece of work, as was the apprehension of the American vessel that attempted to steam away with four of our officers onboard but was intercepted by a second vessel with an armed patrol party. All of these measures were instituted by the present Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

* * *

SPORTS

CANADIAN POLICY—SOUTH AFRICAN ATHLETES

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport. He will know that his Government has adopted a sports policy which is clearly racist in nature and violates the spirit of the Gleneagle's Agreement. It is setting the stage for a situation where we are now permitting South African athletes who belong to racist organizations to compete on the international level by parading as "independent business people". Is he prepared to reverse the policy that was adopted by his predecessor in relation to Canadian sports policy?

Hon. Jean J. Charest (Minister of State (Youth) and Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of what exactly the Hon. Member is referring to. If she is referring to any specific case as far as our policy applies to South African athletes, the policy that we have laid out is not always easy to apply but we have done our best.

Perhaps she is referring to the case of two tennis players that was brought up in *The Toronto Star*. If that is the case, I can only inform the Hon. Member that the two athletes to whom she is referring have never asked for visas to enter Canada.

REQUEST THAT VISAS BE DENIED

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, will the Minister give a commitment in the House today that they will be denied visas and this will be the first step in the revision of a policy adopted by the Conservative Government in 1985 which

permitted individual athletes to come to Canada under the guise of independent business?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, our policy on sporting contacts with South Africa is fully in accord with the spirit and the text of the 1977 Gleneagle's Agreement on sporting contacts with South Africa, and the 1982 Code of Conduct.

With respect to the tennis players, participation in the Canadian Open tennis tournament is determined according to the international ranking of eligible players. These several persons, if they do apply for visas, will not fall within the Gleneagle's policy, because it is sports people who represent the South African Government—

• (1500)

Ms. Copps: Not true, and I've got a copy of it right here.

Mr. Crosbie: —sport associations, or organized South African sport, who fall within the policy.

Ms. Copps: That's false!

Mr. Crosbie: That is how the policy is applied. We will have to wait and see if and when they do apply for visas.

* * *

BANKS AND BANKING

NSF CHEQUE CHARGES—SITUATION OF SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. About two weeks ago the Minister of State for Finance responded to the report of the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs with respect to bank service charges and how they affected consumers. The Minister at that time referred to the charges, particularly the NSF charge-back, as reprehensible and objectionable.

In light of the fact the banks reluctantly withdrew the charge-back on NSF cheques for consumers, would the Minister not agree that what was reprehensible and objectionable for consumers is equally reprehensible and objectionable for small businesses?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, this raises a broader question of which I am sure the Hon. Member is aware. The Canadian Federation of Independent Business has had consultations with the Department. In fact Mr. Bullock had a meeting this morning with my colleague, the Minister of State for Finance, to discuss this whole question of bank charges as it relates to small business. We want to have further meetings with Mr. Bullock and his people, and following that we may have some further discussions with the banking community.

ROYAL BANK SUGGESTION

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. We are very concerned about specifics with respect to the charge-back on NSF cheques. Rob Parker at the Royal Bank feels that the NSF charge-back to small business is justified. He says it is a cost of doing business, and further suggests that small businesses ought to use their credit card system to protect themselves. In light of that suggestion from Mr. Parker, would the Minister not agree that this is a form of tied selling which is specifically prohibited by the competition laws of our country? Would the Minister investigate this suggestion by the banks with respect to tied selling?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I think the conclusion the Hon. Member has drawn is a somewhat far-fetched one—

Mr. Rodriguez: That's what Rob Parker said.

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): —but I am pleased to discuss that further with my colleague. Tied selling is a responsibility of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, but both that Minister and my colleague, the Minister of State for Finance, will be in discussions with the banks. It is quite a bit more complex when the matter of bank charges involves the business community. It is much more difficult and complex as to how to deal with it, but we are looking at various proposals the Canadian Federation of Independent Business has put forward to us and we may want to take these up with the banking community as well.

Mr. Speaker: I want to advise the House that there will be a single question from the Hon. Member for Saint-Jacques followed by a single question from the Hon. Member for Vancouver—Kingsway. We will then close off Question Period.

* * *

[*Translation*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

BELL CANADA STRIKE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, I have a question about the strike at Bell Canada.

Canadian consumers continue to experience problems with communications, especially those who require the installation of new equipment and those who need operator assistance to make their calls, and I am thinking especially of the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has done very little so far to try and settle this dispute. All we have had was a kind of

homemade conciliation effort by an official from the Department. No conciliation commissioner, much less a mediator, has been appointed.

I would like to ask my question . . .

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): . . . for the benefit of my "interrupters" opposite. I want to ask the Government to inform the House whether consumers should expect to face these problems for some time yet, or does the Government intend to take some kind of action to help reach a settlement? What does the Government intend to do to put an end to this strike? When is the Government going to wake up and help Quebec consumers, despite those turkeys who are trying to interrupt me?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I understand that Bell Canada has indicated that continuation of the TDD service for the hearing impaired will have top priority during the strike.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that management personnel are replacing striking operators in order to provide a much needed service, for the handicapped.

* * *

[*English*]

DISASTERS

NORTH SEA OIL RIG EXPLOSION—LOSS OF CANADIAN LIVES

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. I spoke a few moments ago by telephone to a father in Vancouver who lost his son on the Piper ALPHA Platform which blew up in the North Sea a little while ago. He indicated to me he has some serious concerns about the safety measures which were not taken.

Given the difficulty of an ordinary Canadian affording representation at any inquiry, for example, in Aberdeen, would the Government consider giving legal representation to the two Canadian families involved? And would the Government admit there is also a national interest for Canada because if we start Hibernia, we will have oil rigs out there in very dangerous situations? Would the Government be prepared to consider giving representation to two ordinary Canadians and their families at that inquiry so the families could feel justice could be done as much as that is possible now for their loved ones who were lost?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Hon. Member that the concern of the Government for safety measures is ongoing. We have on our East Coast, particularly with respect to Hibernia and to developments there, some of the strictest safety measures in place in the world. That is not to say that at any time they cannot be improved. Suggestions coming from individuals and organizations would certainly be studied.

I cannot give the Hon. Member an assurance that certain individuals could go to specific hearings, but I can assure him that if he would see that their concerns are channelled to the Government, we will see they are given consideration.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

SPEAKER'S RULING ON BILL C-103

Mr. Speaker: I want to bring to the attention of Hon. Members that on Friday last there was some discussion in this Chamber as to a certain action taken by the other place, and for those uninitiated that means the Honourable the Senate, with respect to a Bill which after having passed in this place was sent to the Senate.

In the interests of Hon. Members, but especially in the interests of the public who are watching and listening, I want to just in very simple language explain what happens because I have a technical ruling and it just may be that the public of this country, which ought to understand what we are doing here, will find it easier to follow if I give a brief explanation in layman's language, if I can put it that way.

What happened was simply that a Bill numbered Bill C-103, which is a Bill respecting economic development in Atlantic Canada, was passed by this House in all stages and was sent to the Senate, as is the normal procedure. When it was being considered by the Senate, the Senate decided, for whatever reason, to split the Bill, in other words to break it into two parts, and the Senate sent back to this House one part of the Bill. There was much argument in the House Friday as to whether or not this was justified. It is not for the Speaker to say whether or not on any substantive reason there was any logical justification for it.

• (1510)

Essentially, that is the point that the Speaker has been asked to comment upon, that is, whether it is under our system appropriate for the Honorable The Senate to take a Bill that has passed this place and to break it into two parts and send back one-half of the Bill, especially when it is a money Bill which requires at its very beginning the Royal Recommendation for the expenditure of funds.

As I have said, that is a layman's explanation. It is important that all Canadians understand just exactly what it is the Chair has been asked to do in this particular case. I am now going to get into the formal part of the ruling. I will try not to keep the House too long. I hope that given this explanation it will be clear to everybody just exactly what has happened here and what the response of the Chair is in this ruling and the

invitation that the Chair gives to this House as to whatever further response the House may wish to take.

On Friday, July 8 last, the Chair informed the House that a message had been received from the other place that it had divided Bill C-103, an Act to increase the opportunity for economic development in Atlantic Canada, to establish the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts. The message from the Senate simply informed this House of its decision and reported back without amendment only Part 1 of Bill C-103.

The Hon. Minister of State for the Treasury Board (Mr. Lewis) rose on a point of order objecting to the unprecedented action by the Senate in dividing Bill C-103 and requesting guidance from the Chair as to the acceptability of such a message. The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan) counter-argued that what the Senate had done was quite logical since Bill C-103 was composed of quite distinct parts and could easily be divided into two parts, each standing as separate and independent legislative proposals.

I point out that the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys also argued strenuously for the substantive issue that is involved. As I said, that is for others to argue and is not for the Chair to comment upon.

The Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy), supported vigorously by the Hon. Member for Annapolis Valley—Hants (Mr. Nowlan) and the Hon. Member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby), objected to the innovative procedure of the Senate on the grounds that the privileges of this House had been violated. The Hon. Member for Churchill claimed that the Senate had no authority to split a Bill originating in the Commons. The Hon. Member for Annapolis Valley—Hants further added that if this precedent were to be allowed, the House of Commons would be at risk in seeing much of its legislation originating in an elected Chamber compromised in principle by the Senate's actions.

[*Translation*]

Before dealing with the essence of the problem, it might be useful to summarize what happened with Bill C-103, the Government Organization Act, Atlantic Canada, 1987.

The House passed Bill C-103 on third reading on May 10, 1988, and sent it to the Senate the same day with a message signed by the Clerk of the House.

[*English*]

Let me say parenthetically that it is unusual to refer to specific proceedings of the other place—again, for those listening, "the other place" is a term used here to mean the Honourable The Senate—in this House. The Chair finds itself obliged to lay that convention aside for clarity's sake in this particular issue.

On June 1, 1988, a motion was moved in the Senate to instruct the Senate Finance Committee to divide Bill C-103. A procedural debate ensued. Having first reserved his decision, the Speaker of the Senate on June 7, 1988, ruled the motion out of order. In other words, the Speaker of the Senate ruled the motion to split a Bill from the House of Commons as out of order. His reasoning, which is a matter of record, was based on the fact that Bill C-103 is a money Bill and that the Senate, while free to split Bills originating in the Senate, as a general principle should not divide Bills originating in the Commons.

Thereupon the ruling of the Speaker of the Senate was appealed to the whole House, that is, to the whole Senate, and was overturned by a majority vote. The motion to split Bill C-103 was moved, proposed, debated and passed. May I also add parenthetically that this House, the House of Commons of Canada, has seen the wisdom of leaving final procedural decisions to its presiding officer and accordingly has long abolished the appeal procedure relating to Speakers' rulings.

[*Translation*]

Bill C-103 was then studied by the Senate Finance Committee, which split the Bill in two, in accordance with the Senate's instructions. The Committee reported Part I of the Bill to the Senate and the Senate sent this part back to the House last Friday. That is where we are today. The House has only one part of Bill C-103.

[*English*]

I must also underline for the House that this procedural event is totally without precedent. I have been unable to find any instance in our practice in which the Senate divided a Commons Bill, or in which the Commons has divided a Senate Bill. There are several cases in which the Speaker of the House of Commons has ruled certain Bills originating in the Senate out of order because they infringe the financial privileges of the House which are enshrined in the Constitution of Canada. I refer Hon. Members in this case to *Journals* of November 12, 1969, and June 12, 1973, for two such examples.

[*Translation*]

I refer Hon. Members to page 502 of the 20th edition of Erskine May. It concerns a procedural incident in the British Parliament, where there had been an attempt in the House of Lords to split a bill from the House of Commons, but this attempt failed after a motion to split the bill was rejected. This incident is reported but the author carefully refrains from indicating how the Lower House could have reacted if the motion had passed. This incident occurred in 1852 and I could find no similar incidents anywhere since then.

[*English*]

A Canadian precedent does exist for a consolidation of two Commons Bills into a single legislative measure by the Senate. That took place on June 11, 1941, with a message from their Honours, from the Senate, asking for the concurrence of this House. The Commons agreed with the Senate proposal, that is, a proposal to take two Bills from this place and put them into one Bill. The Commons agreed with the Senate proposal

waiving its traditional privilege, and a single Bill was eventually given Royal Assent. I underline that that was the act of this House in waiving its tradition of privilege and accepting the invitation of the Senate to put two Bills together.

If it is admitted that the Senate can consolidate two Bills, why then can it not divide one Bill into two or more legislative measures? The answer is at least in part in the message. In the 1941 case just alluded to the Senate specifically sought the concurrence of the House for its action. Apparently it was the disposition of this place to accept it. In the message received last Friday relating to Bill C-103, the Senate does not seek the Commons' concurrence in the division of the Bill, it simply informs this House that it has done so, and returns half of a Bill.

• (1520)

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: I ask Hon. Members to restrain their comments until some other time. Whatever Hon. Members may feel, I do not think that this is a partisan matter. I am trying to make it very clear that it is a procedural matter, and a matter of some importance to the workings of this place and its very important relationship with the honourable the Senate, which is very much part of the Parliament of Canada.

The Speaker of the House of Commons by tradition does not rule on constitutional matters. It is not for me to decide whether the Senate has the constitutional power to do what it has done with Bill C-103. There is not any doubt that the Senate can amend a Bill, or it can reject it in whole or in part. There is some considerable doubt, at least in my mind, that the Senate can rewrite or redraft Bills originating in the Commons, potentially so as to change their principle as adopted by the House without again first seeking the agreement of the House. That I view as a matter of privilege and not a matter related to the Constitution.

In the case of Bill C-103, it is my opinion, and with great respect of course, that the Senate should have respected the propriety of asking the House of Commons to concur in its action of dividing Bill C-103 and in reporting only part of the Bill back as a *fait accompli* has infringed the privileges of this place.

Furthermore, Bill C-103 has attached to it, pursuant to our Standing Orders and Section 54 of the Constitution, a financial recommendation of Her Excellency the Governor General. Again, for those who are watching and who are uninitiated in all the terminology that we use, there is a requisite that in a Bill that is going to call upon the expenditure of funds, a financial recommendation of Her Excellency the Governor General is necessary. So this Bill is in a very real sense a financial Bill. The Senate is somewhat limited in its review of money Bills. Standing Order 87, which is still on the books after many decades, is quite clear and it states:

> All aids and supplies granted to the Sovereign by the Parliament of Canada are the sole gift of the House of Commons, and all bills for granting such aids and supplies ought to begin with the House, as it is the undoubted right of the House to direct, limit, and appoint in all such bills, the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of such grants, which are not alterable by the Senate.

Certain questions remain to be answered: by splitting the Bill does the Royal Recommendation still apply? Have the financial privileges of the Commons been breached? Will the Crown assent to two Bills when it agreed to the introduction of a single one? As Speaker of the House of Commons, I will not attempt to answer such constitutional questions, but clearly this House has always considered Standing Order 87, which I just read, as setting out the special relationship between the Commons, that is, this House of Commons, and the Sovereign.

I have ruled that the privileges of the House have been infringed. However, and it is important to understand this, I am without the power to enforce them directly. I cannot rule the Message from the Senate out of order for that would leave Bill C-103 in limbo. In other words, it would be nowhere. The cure in this case is for the House to claim its privileges or to forgo them, if it so wishes, by way of message to Their Honours, that is, to the Senate, informing them accordingly.

In conclusion, I wish to state to the House that while Bill C-103 is a Government Bill, the same situation could arise under our reformed rules for a Private Members' Bill. It is in the better interests of this place to request Their Honours in the Senate to first consult with this House before they report to us such unilateral action. As Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada I must uphold the privileges of this place at all times, and I must also advocate them privately, publicly, and with vigour. Having said that, if on an issue of substance, the House wishes to waive those rights, as usual the Speaker will not enter into substantive debate but will follow the House's directives.

I thank all Hon. Members for their valuable contributions in this most unique and interesting case.

The Hon. Minister of State on a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: I wish to thank you on behalf of all Members of the House for the very clear ruling which you have made in reinforcing the privileges of this House *vis-à-vis* the other place. We had intended to immediately call for debate on the message which is presently on the Order Paper to send this matter back to the Senate immediately. I think that we would all benefit from an opportunity to review your ruling in detail and incorporate it into our remarks as we address this as Members of Parliament, no matter what Party we represent, in order that we can make it very clear where the Members of this House stand *vis-à-vis* the other place, the actions which should be taken by the other place, and the actions which we think are constitutional for the House of Commons and the other place to take.

For those reasons, I wish to compliment you on your ruling, and signal to the House that instead of debating the Message to the Senate immediately after your ruling we will ask the

Table Officers to call resuming debate on Bill C-93, the Multiculturalism Act.

Mr. MacLellan: I would like to thank the Deputy House Leader for his recommendation with respect to Your Honour's ruling. Certainly, our Party would find it preferable to have some time to study your ruling and then to comment. We welcome the Deputy House Leader's suggestion.

Mr. Speaker: I know Hon. Members would not object to me saying directly to the Hon Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan) that, having listened to his very vigorous argument on Friday, the decision is on a procedural basis and does not affect his strong views on other matters relating to the Bill.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join with my colleagues in indicating that it is a more than appropriate way to proceed, and to lend my voice to that of the Deputy House Leader for the Government in terms of the content and the initiative of your decision. While we always accept your decisions as being appropriate, there are some that send a very clear signal. The primacy of this place encourages us all, and I wish to thank you for that decision.

• (1530)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADIAN MULTICULTURALISM ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-93, an Act for the preservation and enhancement of multiculturalism in Canada, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee; and Motions Nos. 4, 8 and 30 (Mr. Epp, Thunder Bay—Nipigon), and Motions Nos. 5, 7 and 31 (Mr. Marchi).

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Resuming debate. The Hon. Minister of State for Multiculturalism (Mr. Weiner).

Hon. Gerry Weiner (Minister of State (Multiculturalism)): Madam Speaker, I wish to give the support of the Government for this motion, Motion No. 4 by the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp).

When I appeared before the legislative committee examining Bill C-93, I pledged to work to improve this Bill, to take the necessary measures to ensure we would have the best possible Multiculturalism Act for Canada. Well, I kept my promise and I think we all can see that the Bill as amended by the committee is considerably stronger. Today we are finishing that process. The amendment presented by the Hon. Member states clearly that the cultural and racial diversity of Canada is a fundamental characteristic of this nation.

Why have we chosen to support this motion? Why do we feel that the words "fundamental element" are not clear enough? Is it true that the Bill even from its first reading was clear in stating that multiculturalism was part and parcel of our identity, our realities and our heritage? I feel that it is important to underline this. It is not only part and parcel; it is one of the foundations of our identity and heritage. It is one of the foundations of Canada.

This Bill deals with relationships among Canadians, about a fundamental characteristic of Canada. It seeks to bring people together to build a stronger nation. We have worked closely with all those who came before the committee and in particular with the Canadian Ethnocultural Council, who, from the very outset of this exercise have had as their goal that multiculturalism finally would be recognized as a fundamental characteristic of Canada.

We are doing that today, and I call on all Members of the House to unanimously support this motion and the whole Bill. But while we support this motion today and a similar one which brings to the preamble of this historic Bill similar language, I wish to draw to the attention of the House a small limitation in this motion.

This motion translates the expression "fundamental characteristic" as *trait fondamental*. This in my mind is weaker language than the use of the phrase *caracteristique fondamentale*. We had presented a strong amendment which embodied this language. But, the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) chose to block it on narrow procedural grounds. Although this is an important difference, I feel that it is one that we must set aside in order to proceed with this Bill today. We must set aside these petty tactics to bring forward a world first—a first-class Multiculturalism Act.

Therefore, it is with pleasure that we on this side of the aisle support this motion and will support a corresponding one made by the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon to the preamble.

Mr. Marchi: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the words of the Minister, although I have differences with the Bill. I would like to withdraw my opposition to both Motions Nos. 6 and 32, in the name of the Hon. Member for Parkdale—High Park (Mr. Witer), and would consent with my other colleagues to have the Hon. Member for Willowdale (Mr. Oostrom) present them at this time, as we are discussing the groupings of these amendments. It was not a procedural move. I have recognized as well that there is a difference in the French translation and a fundamental characteristic in both languages, I think, is supreme. Therefore, I would be prepared and pleased to allow the Hon. Member for Willowdale at the appropriate time to introduce and debate those amendments on the floor of the House of Commons.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Chair does thank the Hon. Member for York West. As we are debating

both Motions Nos. 6 and 32 as a group at this time, I think I should put them both to the House.

Mr. John Oostrom (for Mr. Witer) moved:

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 37 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"mental characteristic of the Canadian heritage".

Motion No. 32

That Bill C-93 be amended in the Preamble by striking out line 35 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"mental characteristic in the continuing evolution of".

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Resuming debate. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow).

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Madam Speaker, I rise to support the amendment proposed by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp), and to welcome the support for at least one of the amendments that he has proposed by the Government.

No Member of Parliament who represents any city in Canada can help but be aware of the tremendous changes which have taken place in terms of the people living in the cities of Canada in recent years. The constituency which I represent has always been recognized as an ethnic constituency, a constituency populated almost completely by immigrants; first, of course, by the immigrants who came from Great Britain and, later, by immigrants from Germany, Russia, Poland and many of the eastern European countries.

In the last 10 or 12 years we have seen a tremendous change in my constituency, as in many others, because beside the groups which I referred to earlier we now see people from Portugal, Italy, the Philippines, all the Caribbean countries, Central America, Africa, and Asia. From Asia we see people from India, Sikhs, Vietnamese, Chinese people from Hong Kong and from mainland China, Laotians and I am sure there are others who I have missed.

We also see a tremendous movement into the City of Winnipeg by native Canadians, who are moving to Winnipeg as they are to a number of other cities, from the reserves which they find completely inadequate to provide them with a decent standard of living.

A situation has developed in the City of Toronto where a majority of the students attending the public schools are neither from Anglo-Saxon nor French origin. This type of movement has created tremendous problems for the cities and for the people who come to this country. The issue of multiculturalism was first raised by one of the members of the Bilingualism and Bicultural Commission appointed by the then Liberal Government, headed by Mr. Pearson. A resident of Winnipeg, Professor Rudnyckyj, who, while accepting the main recommendations and findings made by the commission, which dealt with the relationships between the French and the English-speaking people of this country, pointed out that an increasing number—now a third of the population of this country—come from countries which are neither English-speaking nor French-speaking.

Many of these people come from countries which do not have, or ever had our democratic institution, our democratic way of life, our trade unions or co-operatives or civil liberties organizations. Many of them come here without the ability to speak either English or French. While canvassing in the older parts of my constituency I still come across women in their sixties or seventies who still cannot speak more than a few words of English.

In this country until a few years ago we did very little to deal with this problem. We are happy and proud to see the people who have come to this country. We are happy and proud to see the progress that they have made, but they need a great deal of assistance in making that transition from the country from in which they came in making that transition to this country which is so different.

• (1540)

It is not enough simply to give them the opportunity to work. Many of them work in some of the hardest, poorest paid jobs available in this country. We have to give them the opportunity to learn the language. We have to give them the opportunity to fit into our society. For many of them, Madam Speaker, the way in which they do that is based around and with the people from the same countries from which they came. Many belong to the hundreds of thousands of voluntary organizations which these groups have formed.

The Government of Canada and the Parliament of Canada in the early 1970s recognized the importance of helping these new ethnic groups to adjust and integrate into this country. We adopted in principle the idea of fostering the multicultural fact in this country. We have established a part-time Minister and part-time Department. It sounds good. It looks good when one reads about it, but the reality is we really have done very little.

If we compare, for example, the resources allocated for multicultural activities in my province—I will use my province as an example in which as I have indicated a very substantial percentage of the population comes neither from the Anglo-Saxon nor the French background of Canada—we find that what is allocated to help foster the various ethnic communities in the Province in multicultural activities is a very small amount compared to the money, the services and the assistance given to the Franco-Manitobans who make up a very small percentage of the population of Manitoba.

I am not for a moment questioning the assistance given to the French-speaking people of Manitoba. I, like most Members of Parliament regardless of Party, recognize the necessity and the justness of helping the French-speaking people of Manitoba and of every other part of Canada to foster, maintain and strengthen their language and culture. But when I compare the assistance given to them to the assistance given

for multicultural activities, I have to face up to the fact that what we are getting most is mere words.

I know that my colleague, the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon has put a great deal of effort into his work in this area. I want to say on behalf of myself and all members of the New Democratic Party that we support those efforts and we call on the Government, as we called on the former Liberal Government, to do more than say the right things, to do more than make pretty speeches, to do more than appearing at functions organized by various ethnic communities in this country. We call on this Government to take seriously the principles supported almost unanimously in this Parliament by all Members from all Parties to support the efforts of the new ethnic communities and of the native communities to help them maintain the cultures which they brought, all of which in the years to come will help to make this country a much better place in which to live.

Mr. John Oostrom (Willowdale): Madam Speaker, I take great pleasure rising in today's consideration of Bill C-93, the Canadian multiculturalism Bill and to urge Members on both sides of this House to support this basic and fundamental amendment No. 6 to the Bill.

Some weeks ago the Minister of State responsible for Multiculturalism (Mr. Weiner) appeared before the legislative committee examining Bill C-93 and told the committee that he was willing to work with it to improve Bill C-93, as he stated in the House today. That is exactly what happened. The Bill which we are considering today is considerably stronger. It is considerably more vital than that with which we started in late March.

There have been amendments made to this Bill which strengthened it from the preamble to the very last clause. But one or two things have been left to be done here today.

The amendment which I proposed today makes this recognition even more clearly. Many witnesses appeared before the committee expressing their concerns that the multicultural nature of this society could be lost in other considerations and that the Bill was not sufficiently precise in underlining this fundamental characteristic of Canadian society. Many witnesses urged the committee to make a clearer expression of this matter.

The motion that I propose does so. This motion states simply and cleanly that multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic of our Canadian heritage and identity. In a few moments I will also propose an amendment which brings these clear, simple and precise words to the important preamble of the Canadian multiculturalism Bill.

Why have I chosen to make this motion? Why do I feel the words "fundamental element" are not clear enough? It is true that the Bill, even from its first reading, was clear in stating that multiculturalism was part and parcel of our identity and our heritage. But I feel that it is important to underline this. It is not only part and parcel, it is one of the foundations of our identity and heritage. It is one of the foundations of Canada. That is why we adopted simple and precise language, language which has clearly entered our constitutional lexicon to express what multiculturalism means to this society.

I know my hon. friends, the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) and the Hon. Member from Thunder Bay have proposed relatively similar amendments and I congratulate them for doing that. I do not think these particular amendments are well founded for a number of simple reasons.

The Hon. Members from York West and Thunder Bay have translated in their motions "fundamental characteristic" to be *trait fondamental*. If we are to use the same strength of language that is used in other places, we must use the expression *caracteristique fondamentale*. This is not just a matter of terminology. It is important that the language of this Bill in both official languages be crystal clear. I hope the House appreciates the motion that I am presenting today and I urge hon. colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support this simple motion, a motion which in both official languages underlines that multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic of our society.

I would like to take a few moments of the time of the House today to explain Motion No. 32 which clarifies and strengthens the preamble of the Canadian multiculturalism Bill.

Earlier in this debate I rose and urged the House to support a simple, clear and precise amendment to the multiculturalism policy of Canada which stressed that multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic of our identity and heritage. I would urge this House to accept a similar, simple and clear amendment to the preamble of the Canadian multiculturalism Bill which states in only a few words that multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic in the continuing evolution of our nation.

This is an important amendment. The amendment shows that the Government has listened to those who appeared before the legislative committee examining Bill C-93. This simple amendment shows that the Government has been willing to work with the committee and with Members of this House to strengthen the Canadian multiculturalism Bill.

At this time there are two other amendments relative to the preamble, one presented by the Hon. Member for York West and one presented by the Hon. Member from Thunder Bay. These amendments are excellent in spirit, but they are flawed, I believe, in their creation. First, both amendments in the French language utilize the words "*trait fondamental*" as opposed to "*caracteristique fondamentale*". This is an important difference. It is an important shortcoming in both motions about which I spoke earlier today. If we are to signal what this amendment is about and to say that multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic, and if we wish to give the language sufficient force, we must use the language which is already in the lexicon; namely, *caractéristique fondamentale*.

• (1550)

Second, both amendments presented by the Hon. Member for York West and the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp) muddy the waters. In the instance of the amendment of the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon, it mixes policy statements with preambular language. Policy commitments properly belong in Clause 3 of the Bill. A preamble sets the stage. It presents values. It is for that reason that I find the Hon. Member's amendment appealing but unsatisfactory.

In the instance of the amendment presented by my colleague, the Hon. Member for York West, I found repetition of words and ideas in places, and of course, the problem with its French translation and the weakness of that French translation. I think is important that we maintain simple amendments and that we put forward amendments in clear and precise language. It is important that we utilize the lexicon involved in this nation. For this reason, I would urge Members on both sides of the House to support the motion I have brought forward today and thus to recognize that multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic of our Canadian society.

Mr. Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order which has to do with the language of Motion No. 30. There has been some discussions about which motions might be acceptable to the House, discussions which I will not get into, but on Motion No. 30, I would like to change the word "*trait*" to the word "*caractéristique*". If there is unanimous consent in the House, I would like to move:

That Motion No. 30 be amended in the French text by striking out line 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"de la couleur et de la religion constitue une caractéristique".

The only change in the text as published is that last word *"caractéristique"*, to which point the Hon. Member for Willowdale (Mr. Oostrom) was just speaking.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): If the House does give consent, it would then be easier to simply amend the Hon. Member's motion than to call it an amendment to the amendment which would require another vote. If there is unanimous consent, "*trait fondamentale*" would be changed for "*caractéristique fondamentale*". Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Marchi: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to deal with essentially the same principle. The Hon. Member for Willowdale (Mr. Oostrom) was quite correct in saying that there is a difference between the English and the French words in the motion of the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp). The same applies to my motion. Suffice it to say that I had moved the initial motion in English and left it up to the House officials to translate it into French. I would seek the same co-operation to change the word from "*trait*" to "*caractéristique*" as well because it was a translation of the House and not a translation put forward by this Member.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Do I understand that the Hon. Member is referring to Motion No. 31?

Mr. Marchi: Motions Nos. 5 and 31.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Perhaps the Chair could be helpful by pointing out to the Hon. Member for York West that as far as Motion No. 5 is concerned, an affirmative vote on Motion No. 4 would obviate the need for a vote to be taken on Motions Nos. 5 or 6. The Hon. Member might consider the motions together. Then we could get to a vote which would include whatever should be right in this motion.

Resuming debate with the Hon. Member for Vancouver East.

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Madam Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in saying a few words in this debate, particularly to acknowledge the very great importance of changing the language of the Bill through these amendments in order to strengthen it. Many groups across Canada have criticized this Bill because it appeared to be too soft and was in effect tokenism. These groups will certainly be pleased with this amendment, although at this stage we are only dealing with words. We certainly must toughen up other clauses of the Bill as well.

As I understand it, the change of wording in this clause will establish an equal partnership between all cultural groups within Canada. It will mean that people of both French and English origin will be recognized as being part of the fundamental characteristic of Canada and so too will be those from so many other countries. These in fact are the people who are now becoming the majority, certainly in western Canada. These people have origins other than French or English.

It is very important that this Bill not simply be a recognition of songs and dances, arts and culture, which is what some people think is meant by multiculturalism. It is absolutely essential that it have the strength to fulfil the spirit of the Charter. This means that there has to be equal opportunities and there has to be a removal of discrimination and racism that affects people from origins other than French or English.

In western Canada and particularly in the ridings of Vancouver East and Vancouver—Kingsway, by far the majority of new Canadians as well as second and third-generation Canadians are those who have come from Asian countries and those who are not Caucasian but are people of colour or visible minorities. It is absolutely essential that our multicultural policy begin to recognize that not all people of different cultures came from Europe. There is a very different stream of people who are coming from Asia, and in some cases the cultures are very different indeed. For those who come from China or some of the oriental countries, English must be learned in a much different way.

It is also very important to recognize that there is not a representation of visible minorities in the House, and that is very typical of the decision-making process across Canada. It is important that we take this matter seriously and that we strengthen this Bill so that it helps to facilitate and implement multicultural policies.

In the past few weeks, I have attended high school graduations throughout my riding of Vancouver East. I would say that only 5 per cent to 10 per cent of the students graduating from secondary schools are from Anglo origins and probably none are from Franco origins. The majority are young people who are members of visible minorities and have wonderful motivations to complete their educations. They will probably face barriers that are much greater than some of their colleagues at university.

It is important that the Bill not be seen as tokenism and that we recognize the real issues of racism and discrimination in Canada. The Government must do this by acknowledging the injustices of the past. I am referring particularly to the injustices to Canadians of Japanese origin who faced such terrible discrimination under the War Measures Act. People of Chinese origin were also discriminated against and had to pay a head tax and face the Exclusion Act, which was a purely racist Act.

• (1600)

It is time we acknowledged these injustices and provided fair redress so that our young people can grow up and be proud to say that regardless of their origin, regardless of the colour of their skin, they have equal rights in Canada.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway): Madam Speaker, I wanted to say a few words following the Hon. Member's speech.

I can speak pretty openly here, I am losing my riding of Vancouver—Kingsway, and there are a couple of things I would like to say that I think Members might be interested in.

My riding has more Chinese Canadians than any other riding in Canada.

Mr. Belsher: The Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell) said her's does.

Mr. Waddell: There is some disagreement about that, but I think mine really does. As I said, the riding will be gone under redistribution in a couple of days, although I still remain the Member until the next election, but it has become a unique spot with respect to Asian immigrants. This is the new reality in Canada. It is a great plus for Canada. The way Canadians should look at the flow of Asian immigrants is to see it first as part of the continuous flow which builds the population of Canada. My parents came from Scotland when I was a young boy. The same thing is true for people from Italy and other parts of Europe. Now we have a wave of Asian immigration. We should think of it as an advantage. This is where the advantage is.

Second, we are trying to reach out to the Pacific Rim. It is the fastest growing trading area in the world. Canada is on the edge of the Pacific, it is one of our oceans. We have this great resource of Pacific cultures in Canada. We have people who are bicultural. These sons and daughters of immigrants would become Canadians through our schools. We are different from the U.S. because of our multicultural heritage. It is inscribed in our Constitution. We have committed ourselves to saying to people that they can keep some of their heritage. We have great strength in that. The strength lies in these Asian Canadians. That will be in many ways a great help in getting Canada into the Pacific Rim, the Asian Pacific. We should be thinking about things in this way. It took me a while to think that way even in my own riding.

The Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell), an eloquent spokesperson for immigrants and multicultural groups and so on, raised the issue of past injustices. She talked about the Exclusion Act and the Chinese head tax and how she fought for compensation for those who were discriminated against.

Other people, including my predecessors from Vancouver—Kingsway, Grace McInnis and Angus McInnis, fought for redress for Japanese Canadians for the racist treatment they got in Canada during the war. I do not want to go into this in a lot of detail but I want to answer a question which I think a lot of Canadians do not understand. That question is: why deal with past injustices? I remember asking Pierre Trudeau in the House about compensation. He shrugged and said: "Why fight battles of the past?" The reason you have to deal with past injustices is to make sure they do not happen in future. We had the incident of a boatload of Jewish people who were turned away just before the war. Think about that. Think about what we did.

This is a great country, a just country. In spite of our shenanigans in Question Period and our debates and arguments in this House, look at the question I put today to the Minister of Communications (Mrs. McDougall). I asked her if she would take up the case of a fellow who had lost his son in this oil rig disaster and perhaps provide some legal representation. It is going a long way, but she took it up and said they would consider it. That is the best of Canada. We are an open and fair country. We have to make sure that that happens with our immigrants and the multicultural base of our country.

We passed a multicultural constitution in 1982. You know I have had troubles with the new one in 1986, but the one in 1982 was a magnificent constitution. Canada is like a cake, if I might say so. We have the native people at the foundation. Then the French and English. In the constitution we had the recognition of education rights, which I think is really important. Then on top was the recognition of the multicultural reality of Canada. That is a good vision of Canada.

We cannot just sit back and say we have done this kind of thing in law and symbolically. We have to do real things to help multiculturalism. I will give you an example. I do not know what other cities are like, but in Vancouver, English as a second language is the language of the majority of kids in the public schools. That is a difficult situation. It is difficult for the educational system. It may mean that the federal Government, dare I say it, may have some role in additional funding for English as a second language.

Ms. Mitchell: It is done now.

Mr. Waddell: I know it is done now. I do not think the Government has much of a role right now because education is of course a provincial responsibility. However, we may have to look at it and say the federal Government has to help. If you are bringing in waves of new immigrants you have to help educate them in the English language. Parents want their kids educated in English or French in Québec so that they get into the mainstream of Canadian society. We have to take the measures necessary to help multicultural groups retain their own language as well. We have the Ukrainian dancing groups, theatre groups, culture groups, that we support. We take a different view from the Americans. We do not take the melting pot view, we take a broader view where you can maintain some of your multicultural heritage.

I will sit down now. The Hon. Member for Vancouver East provoked me to speak because she gave such a good speech. I just want to come back to that one point which I would like Canadians to think about. I know it is sometimes very difficult, and I hear it in my community offices, "Why are you bringing all these immigrants in? They are different than we are." You have to look at the advantages of immigration. I think one of the big advantages is, especially with Asian Canadians, that instead of sending the traditional businessman to China to try to get a contract, we can send a Chinese Canadian whose family is there. He might be able to speak the language, has taken courses and brushed up on Cantonese or Mandarin at the Chinese Cultural Centre in Vancouver. That is a forward-looking Canada and that is the way we should look at multiculturalism and immigration.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Madam Speaker, I would like to add my support to this Bill and congratulate the Minister on bringing it in. In my view a multicultural Bill has been long overdue in Canada.

I was raised in a cosmopolitan area, probably as cosmopolitan as any in Canada, namely the Drumheller Valley. During my lifetime that area has seen 21 or 25 coal mines, all of which have now disappeared. However, people came from practically every country of the world to work in those coal mines. The wonderful thing about the Drumheller Valley was that these people did not continue to call themselves Ukrainians or Hungarians or Britons, they called themselves Canadians. At the same time they retained their own language, their own customs. I want to pay tribute to those people today.

I want to deal with some specific people, the Ukrainians, for instance. Hundreds of them came to our coal mines. Hundreds of them came in their sheepskin coats and braved the blizzards, the chinook winds, and the droughts. They worked toward a better country. They tried to build a heritage.

• (1610)

Many people do not realize that the Ukrainian people were the first to work on the building of our railways across western Canada. They were later replaced by a large number of Chinese people. The Chinese people were certainly taken advantage of but they remained here. Many of them brought their relatives here and they have become excellent citizens.

Another large group in my area is the Italian community. As a matter of fact, the Italian community is probably the second largest in the Province of Alberta. The Italian group was notorious for bringing their language and customs with them. They still speak Italian in their homes today, but they speak English outside. They endeavour to keep the customs of their homeland.

Another large section is the German community. One of the first things I remember as a young boy during and just after World War I was the antagonism toward those of German descent. I remember my mother saying many times that none of us had any choice as to our nationality, colour, or creed; that it was the way we lived that really mattered. German people suffered a lot of persecution in Canada at that time, but they remained and are wonderful citizens. In my riding in Beiseker and Carbon there are some of the finest farmers in the world. They are doing their utmost to build a great Canada.

In addition to Ukrainian halls in the Drumheller Valley we had a Hungarian Hall. Many people came from Hungary and worked in our coal mines. Some of their descendants now hold high positions throughout Canada. A notable one is the head of the regional office of Parks Canada in Calgary. He came from a wonderful Hungarian family in the Drumheller Valley.

We have the Poles, the Americans, and the Dutch. The Dutch people have made a tremendous contribution too. They are not mentioned often. I attended the golden wedding celebration of a Dutch couple only a few weeks ago. They are symbolic of hundreds of others who have contributed to Canada.

The Spanish, Norwegian, Swedish and Danish groups have also made a wonderful contribution. A chap who originated from Sweden came up from the Dakotas into the Drumheller Valley. He was the first to drive oxen into Canada. There are histories of him throughout the Valley today.

I remember a young Japanese lad who lived in the old Midland Mine. His father was one of the finest citizens I have ever known. He loved Canada and loved our way of life. One of his boys served in the Armed Forces during the war.

We have the Jewish people and the Arabs. They may be fighting each other today, but not in the Drumheller Valley. They are Canadians. They brought their customs and their language, but they are now Canadians. We have the Koreans, the Vietnamese, and many people from that part of the world who are part of our population.

We talk about the English and the French, and they are the founding nations, but these others have played a tremendous part in building this country too. The Scottish, the Irish, and the Welsh object to being referred to as English people. They have their own customs and their own language.

We have people from Yugoslavia, India, Egypt, South and Central America, and Africa. People from all the continents have come to Canada, and I like to think of Canada as a multicultural country, not only as a two-nation country but as a great multicultural nation called Canada. I like to think of Canada as being a tremendous mosaic.

An honour I will never forget is when I was asked to represent Canada at the opening of the Pan-American Highway about 1965. The people in Mexico put on a tremendous outdoor show for the delegation made up of one American, two Canadians and people from Central America and South America under the auspices of the U.S. organization. At the show I saw dances of Scotland, Ireland, and the Ukraine. I saw aspects of almost every country which is now represented in Mexico. What a tremendous job an artistic director would have in Canada today to put on an outdoor show to exhibit the customs of all the nations which have become part of Canada. Someday I hope there will be a tremendous mosaic which will show what all these people have contributed toward building this great nation.

After all is said and done I like to think of the people of Canada, not as the English, the French, Egyptians, Hungarians, Germans, Italians, or Dutch, but as Canadians, because Canada is their country of adoption. They have made Canada their country and this has made Canada a greater and a better country.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is the House ready for the question on the first grouping?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I would remind the House that an affirmative vote on Motion No. 4 obviates a need for a vote to be taken on Motion Nos. 5 and 6. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 4 necessitates the taking of a vote on Motion No. 5. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 5 obviates the need for a vote on Motion No. 6. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 5 necessitates a vote to be taken on Motion No. 6. That is just so we all know where we are.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Motion No. 4?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

Motion No. 4 negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Motion No. 5?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

Motion No. 5 negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Motion No. 6?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 6 agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Motion No. 7?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on Motion No. 7 stands deferred.

• (1620)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The question is on Motion No. 8 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

We will proceed to Motions Nos. 30, 31 and 32. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 30 obviates the necessity for a vote on Motions Nos. 31 and 32. A negative vote on Motion No. 30 necessitates a vote on Motion No. 31. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 31 obviates the need to vote on Motion No. 32. A negative vote on Motion No. 31 will necessitate a vote on No. 32.

The question is on Motion No. 30 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 30 agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): We will proceed to the next grouping.

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West) moved:

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 32 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"institutions shall, with a view to implementing the policy stated in subsection (1)".

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon) moved:

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 3 by adding immediately after line 32 at page 4 the following:

"(a) develop policies and programs to assist ethnocultural communities to enlarge their contributions to the preservation and enhancement of Canada's multicultural heritage;"

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 3

(a) by striking out line 37 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

(b) implement policies, programs and prac-"

(b) by striking out line 41 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

(c) implement policies, programs and prac-".

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West) moved:

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out 40 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"to the continuing evolution of Canada, and that remove discriminatory barriers to their full and equal participation in Canadian Society;"

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 17

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 3 by adding immediately after line 44 at page 4 the following:

"(d) implement policies, programs and practices with particular emphasis on the youth of Canada, to foster an understanding of the multicultural reality of Canada;".

Motion No. 18

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 3 by adding immediately after line 8 at page 5 the following:

"(g) develop annual plans for the implementation of the multiculturalism policy and report on such plans in their annual reports."

[*English*]

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Madam Speaker, in our continuing consideration of amendments to Bill C-93, this particular group includes some small changes in total bulk but represent very significant attempts to strengthen the Bill.

If it is in order, I would like to recognize the presence in the gallery of the President of the Canadian Ethnocultural Council and the past President. Of course, it is not in order, so I note that, in considering the motions before us here seriatim, Motions Nos. 10 and 11 are provided for in part by changes that were made in the legislative committee. My Motion No. 11 is designed to ensure that Clause 3(2) would read: "It is further declared to be the policy of the Government of Canada that all institutions shall—"

The Bill as reported from the legislative committee was amended to read "shall" rather than "should".

Having mentioned the Canadian Ethnocultural Council a moment ago, may I say that this is one of those very important points that this national organization of ethnocultural communities emphasized was necessary. The Bill initially was encouraging, but an absolute commitment was required by the Government of Canada to take strong action. That was

accomplished with the use of the word "shall" as it was changed in the legislative committee.

Unfortunately, it might still not be quite sufficient. Therefore, Motion No. 10 is designed to go beyond that. Motion No. 10 in the name of my colleague, the Member for York West (Mr. Marchi), was accepted by the Speaker rather than my own. It is a motion which states that: "institutions shall, with a view to implementing the policy stated in Clause 3(1)." It places an even greater obligation on the Government of Canada to be sure that the policies to which Parliament is committing the Government and to which the Government itself is committed will be acted upon in the way of various specific proposals.

• (1630)

Motion No. 12 is my proposal for an explicit addition to the Bill designed to put into these obligations that the Government of Canada would accept, an obligation to act upon the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, specifically Section 27. This particular motion would commit the Government of Canada to develop policies and programs that assist ethnocultural communities to make larger contributions to the preservation and enhancement of Canada's multicultural heritage.

I would like to comment on the carrying of Motion No. 30 rather than Motion No. 32, proposed by the Hon. Member for Parkdale—High Park (Mr. Witer) and moved, by agreement, by the Hon. Member for Willowdale (Mr. Oostrom). Motion No. 30, moved by myself which was chosen over Motion No. 32, put into the preamble the language of Section 27 of the Charter in a way analogous to what was done in our consideration of the Official Languages Bill, Bill C-72, which was passed last week.

I think putting the language of the Charter into legislation is a useful exercise, so in Motion No. 12 I have endeavoured to commit the Government of Canada at the outset to acting on Section 27 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Motion No. 14 is designed to remove the word "promote" from several of the paragraphs in Clause 3(2) and insert instead the word "implement". Here again is a proposal that has come not only from the Canadian Enthocultural Council but from the various community organizations. If the Parliament of Canada is really serious about the multicultural policy we first adopted in 1971, we should have an actual obligation on Ministers and all Departments to implement the policy and to look for ways in which the policy could be made more real.

Motion No. 17, moved by the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi), is an alternative to the proposal in Motion No. 8. I endeavoured to take up the concern of the Canadian Ethnocultural Council to recognize explicitly in the Bill the importance of the youth of our country and to ensure that our multicultural policy was carried through with explicit regard to the youth of the country and their needs. One way to do that is to make it one of the principles on which the Government would be committed to act in the first section of Clause 3, which is where my Motion No. 8 stands. The other way to do that, of course, is to use Motion No. 17, putting it in as one of the obligations of the Government.

I would hope that recognizing the Government rejected my Motion No. 8, although it was initially on a voice vote, the House might have the will to take up Motion No. 17 and make it an obligation. It is, after all, a strong request from the young people who are active in the Canadian Ethnocultural Council to have their needs recognized. I look to the Minister and hope there might be some readiness to take up this particular proposal.

There remains then, only one other motion on which I would like to comment. Motion No. 19 was found to be out of order because it went beyond the scope of the Bill as the Government presented it. I want to note that the motion moved by the Hon. Member for York West takes up the first paragraph of my motion. I take it, then, given the ruling on Motion No. 18, that Motion No. 19 would have been found in order if it had only gone that far, although it would have been an exact duplicate. I endeavoured to go beyond annual plans to provide for review on all those activities oriented to the establishment of a commissioner of multiculturalism which, again, the Government has not taken up.

Motion No. 18 has a very useful proposal that the Departments of Government have an obligation to make plans annually in order to realize the multicultural policy of the country. In the context of my motion being ruled out of order, but Motion No. 18 being in order, I speak in support of that motion as well as in support of the motions on which I have already commented.

These are important motions to strengthen the Bill. Let me leave it at that and look to the comments of others. I trust we will have the support of the House for these motions to ensure that this historic Bill really becomes the kind of legislation it should be.

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Madam Speaker, I would like to address my remarks in the time allotted to Motions Nos. 10, 15, 17 and 18. Motion No. 10 which stands in my name is an attempt to make the language and commitment somewhat more specific. We have tried to move this intent at committee and today at report stage because I believe that if there is one ill with the Bill, it is its lack of commitment in terms of very specific, clear and committed language.

With respect to Motion No. 10, what I am endeavouring to do is to tie subsection (2) under the federal institutions to the earlier stated multiculturalism policy for the federal Government. The intention of Motion No. 10 is simply to review and to try to commit the federal Departments in a very specific way to the multiculturalism policy as articulated in subsection (1). Those words tying the federal departmental role to the federal policy is not stated explicitly. Rather than keep it vague and general in terms of having federal Departments expand and enhance multiculturalism, I would like to see the

role for the federal Departments tied to the very clear multiculturalism policy as articulated under subsection (1).

Motion No. 15 attempts again to expand on the principle and general scope of that particular clause on page 4, line 40. As it reads now, one of the roles of the federal institutions is to "promote policies, programs and practices that enhance the ability of individuals and communities of all origins to contribute to continuing evolution of Canada". I would also add the words "and that removed discriminatory barriers to their full and equal participation in Canadian society". This is an attempt to try to eradicate the specific problem that many Canadians all to often face in terms of discrimination in the workplace, in terms of vertical mobility and in terms of hiring practices.

The intent, as it now stands, generally addresses that concept. What I would like to do, and what many organizations would like us to do as a Parliament, is to make specific reference to the type of systematic barrier problems that Canadians face. Therefore, the intention of Motion No. 15 is to tie down explicitly the concept and make it very practical and specific, ensuring that one of our goals as a Parliament and as a Government is not only to talk about equality of opportunity but to do something about it and to come closer to ensuring that political, social and economical equality in our House and in our Constitution is predicated upon.

With respect to Motion No. 17, what I would like to replace is a reference under our federal institutions and our federal Departments, as the Canadian Ethnocultural Council's youth wing had advocated before the Standing Committee of Multiculturalism and before the legislative committee studying Bill C-93, to a specific reference and commitment to enhancing the policies, goals and objectives of multiculturalism specifically and target them to the youth of Canada. I think it is incumbent upon a Parliament and a Government to try to address the challenge that is inherent in different generations. That is to say that my parents may affix a certain definition and have a certain expectation of what the multiculturalism policy of the country ought to be doing. As a second generation Canadian I perhaps have a different expectation from a third or fourth generation Canadian. In addition to cultural retention perhaps, a third or fourth generation Canadian would also affix a political, economic and social expectation on the policy of the country.

• (1640)

I am not suggesting that one definition is wrong as compared to the other. What I am pointing to is that both definitions are valuable and relevant. Yet a different attitudinal approach is needed to provide a bridge between the various generations to ensure that the first generation and the second and third generations view the multiculturalism policy as a relevant instrument upon which to build a bigger, better and stronger Canada.

Therefore, I believe that the recommendation from the Youth Committee of the Canadian Ethnocultural Council is a very wise one. I ask the Minister and government Members to consider supporting Motion No. 17, a motion which tries specifically to have federal institutions carve out a specific and effective program to address multiculturalism among the younger elements of our society.

The last amendment in my name is Motion No. 18. It would add subparagraph (g) to Clause 3. It suggests that federal Departments develop annual plans for the implementation of the multiculturalism policy and report on such plans in their annual reports.

The objective of this amendment is to try to commit federal Departments in a very specific way. If there is a role to play for our federal Departments, and clearly there is, in terms of enhancing and exercising all our policies and programs, then multiculturalism should not be an exception to the rule. We should not leave it there generally. We should try to apply it in a very specific way so that our federal Departments constructively and explicitly try to project a vision, an action plan, a series of priorities they would like to accomplish in any given year *vis-à-vis* multiculturalism.

It is not good enough to have a Department, a Minister, a departmental head or a Deputy Minister say: "We adhere to the general policy". Instead, they should be saying: "What can we be doing? What should we be doing as one Department to fulfil the goals and aspirations embodied in a multicultural policy in a multicultural Canada? How can we advance it one step further?"

The Government has chosen not to accept the concept of having an official multiculturalism commissioner, as there is with respect to official languages. There is a piece of legislation in place which was debated only last week which empowers an official commissioner who is able to monitor in order to try to ensure that the Civil Service and Crown corporations are adhering to the official bilingualism policy. The Government rejected the same type of approach with respect to multiculturalism. I regret that very much. I will be alluding to it in much greater detail in my speech on third reading.

Because the Government has not accepted that, I believe that the specific requirement for all Departments to have a yearly plan which would be submitted to Parliament and to the Minister is quite important. It would not carry out the function that would have been carried out by a commissioner such as the Official Languages Commissioner who is independent and who must report to Parliament. Notwithstanding that deficiency I believe it is incumbent upon us to say to the Departments: "If there is going to be a role, then let us tie it down. Let us ensure it is part of a coherent strategy plan within the Departments so that we as parliamentarians can address the various Departments to see where those annual reports are and therefore evaluate whether we are doing a job that is justified or whether we are doing a job that could be improved upon".

I am pleased that Parliament was able to agree with respect to the whole question of the fundamental characteristic which I addressed briefly only moments ago since I thought we were

only debating Motion No. 4. It is an important step. It is a step the Liberal Party tried to have recognized in the Meech Lake Accord when we moved one specific amendment. It was to have in the opening clause of our Constitution a recognition that our two official languages and our multicultural society constitute fundamental characteristics of the same country. To suggest one is fundamental and the other is an element really implies a different status for the two.

While we are not changing the constitutional Accord, and while this Party is still committed to negotiating a Meech Lake Accord that would see the opening clause proudly recognize multiculturalism as a fundamental characteristic, I am pleased that in Bill C-93 we are recognizing that multiculturalism constitutes a fundamental characteristic of our nation. It is my hope that we can go from this one specific clause in this piece of legislation and transfer that feeling and emotion into our Constitution the next time Parliament deals with the Meech Lake Accord.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Madam Speaker, I rise to support the amendments that are being discussed, particularly the amendments moved by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp).

It is not difficult for Governments to enunciate policies and for Governments to try to implement those policies by passing legislation. Unfortunately, experience and history have taught us that we can have a law and a policy, but if the determination to see that those policies are carried out is not very firm, then not much happens.

I remind Hon. Members that long before this Parliament or any of the provinces dealt with the question of multiculturalism the Parliament of Canada, and I believe almost every province in Canada, enacted after a great deal of discussion and after hearing many representations, fair employment practices legislation and fair accommodations legislation. The Parliament of Canada and the legislatures of Canada enunciated the principle that to discriminate in the fields of employment or housing against a person or persons because of their race, religion or colour and, later, sex, was contrary to the law. That sounds fine, but if one looks at the reality one sees that very little in fact has been accomplished.

If a study were made of Governments, federal, provincial or municipal, to see how many public servants employed by the three levels of government come from visible minority groups we would all hang our heads in shame. In my own City of Winnipeg I am certain that, if I examined the people who worked for the police and fire department, I could count on the fingers of my two hands the total number of people working for those two departments who come from visible minority groups.

• (1650)

Last week my colleague, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—North Centre (Mr. Keeper), was urging Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation to use its influence to take action against the owners of rental housing because there is a great deal of evidence that they discriminate in renting apartments to native people. My colleague, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—North Centre, was correct in raising that matter. But I have to say with a good deal of dismay that I believe that not only was Canada Mortgage and Housing remiss, but so was the Manitoba Human Rights Commission, a commission set up in legislation in a province that has had an NDP Government for years. That commission should have been dealing with this question.

These are not easy matters. There is a great deal of prejudice among sections of our population. The whole point of that type of legislation, and the whole purpose of our attempt to deal with the reality of multiculturalism is to help the people from minority groups. My friend, the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi), stated that he is a first generation Canadian. I am a second generation Canadian. The fathers and grandfathers of some of the people whom I represent came to this country years ago, and some of the people I represent have come more recently in the last few years. They need assistance. They do not only need speeches telling them that we welcome them. They do not only need legislation which supposedly helps and protects them. What they need is real action on the part of Governments.

I say with a great deal of regret, and perhaps if I thought about it I could use much stronger language, that regardless of Party, Governments have not been as vigilant, as aggressive, and as determined as they should have been to deal with the type of discrimination that goes on.

Let me return to the debate when the Government brought in its Employment Equity Act. What is contained in the Act is fine as far as it goes, but the Act will be a failure because there is nothing in the Act that requires Departments to set targets, to attempt to reach those targets, and to report each year on how close they have come, or if they have come anywhere near to achieving the targets. If Departments are not implementing the policies that Governments have stated they believe in, then Governments can take the action to see that the type of principles set forth in that Employment Equity Act, and in the principles that are set forth in this Bill, become more than words in a Bill which gathers dust on the shelves of most law libraries in this country, but become a reality. That reality is extremely important and necessary for many people who live in this country.

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Madam Speaker, I have a few words to say about this legislation, and I do wish to make a few points with regard to the motions that we are presently dealing with, particularly Motion No. 14 put forward by my colleague. This motion is designed to commit federal institutions to implementing policies, programs and practices rather than simply promoting them.

The reason this motion is significant is that in presenting this notion I hear my colleague saying that Governments ought to take action and not only have great rhetoric with regard to

multiculturalism in Canada, and not only have the correct phrases when it comes to ethnic groups, but they ought to have programs that will make a real difference to the lives of people in the ethnic groups and communities in Canada. Some of the groups that exist in my riding have very high levels of employment, for example, the Philippine and Portuguese communities, and many other groups that are living in the inner city. Often members of those groups have professional qualifications acquired elsewhere which are not recognized in Canada. They have levels of unemployment that are unacceptable by Canadian standards and are certainly not reflected in the Canadian statistics that are issued and that become part of our television news.

Recently there was a report that unemployment in Canada is down to the lowest level in seven years. That is very impressive, but it is not the reality experienced by people in Winnipeg, in the inner City of Winnipeg, or in Winnipeg—North Centre. In ridings such as mine with very high levels of ethnic and immigrant groups, unemployment is more in the nature of 30 per cent rather than 6 per cent or 7 per cent, or whatever the official statistics are.

I do wish to compliment the Government with regard to its actions today. The Government has responded to the appeals from the ethnic and multicultural groups to put the words "fundamental characteristic" in the legislation, after much prodding from my colleague who is our critic in this area and prodding from the critic in the Liberal Party. The Government has seen the light and has introduced the words "fundamental characteristic" to describe multiculturalism rather than "fundamental element", whatever that was supposed to be.

I am pleased that the Government has responded to this prodding and has recognized that the multicultural nature of the country is a fundamental characteristic of the country. To me that means that we have a country and an ideal that respects the cultural heritage of each and every one of our citizens and groups, and that we have rejected the American notion of the "melting pot". We can have people preserve their language and culture and take pride in their origins. That is what "fundamental characteristic" means.

Now we have the ideal established, we need to get some muscle behind that ideal and at the level of the day-to-day lives of ordinary Canadians and new Canadians in order that it can make a difference in the type of jobs that they have, in the type of communities that they have, and in their equal access to opportunity and to a good life that they can enjoy in this country.

I must say that I welcome the fact that the Government has realized that it made a great deal of sense to put the words "fundamental characteristic" into the legislation. I am glad that the communities have had an opportunity to have their voices heard through the instrument of this Parliament. I hope this is only a first step and we will get down to very concrete programs. When ethnic groups and new Canadians are in the market-place, their qualifications will be recognized, their opportunities for employment will be equal to those of any other Canadian, and they can look forward to an equal place on the Canadian stage, regardless of how long they have been in the country.

I understand that this multiculturalism Bill is a first, and it is long overdue. We welcome the fact that it is here today and being debated.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It being 5 o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business, as listed on today's Order Paper.

• (1700)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS--MOTIONS

[*English*]

FEDERAL LANDS USE

SUGGESTED DESIGNATION OF MILITARY LANDS AS POTENTIAL PARKLAND

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider designating as potential parkland all military lands located in urban areas and presently used for military purposes, once their present use is discontinued.

He said: Madam Speaker, you may be wondering why this motion is on the Order Paper and up for debate today. The motive and the instigation is caused by the fact that we do have across the nation a number of places where the land is being used for very appropriate and understandable purposes, including military purposes. In some large urban centres in Canada you have an area the size of an airport in the heart of the city, an area that is coveted and looked upon by a number of potentially interested parties, if and when the day will come for these lands to be abandoned for present use by the Department of National Defence.

My message is an environmental one, related to land use in urban Canada. I will put it very briefly along these lines. There will be pressures on our publicly-owned lands, which are at the present time under the administration of the Department of National Defence, as to when they should be declared vacant. The pressure will be enormous, particularly for additional housing, as indicated by my colleagues in this House in recent months. They have actually urged, particularly in the case of the city I come from, that the Downsview lands be used for housing purposes.

There could be pressure for other uses, such as commercial uses, and initiatives that would somehow indicate the desirability of the development of these lands. The alternative that I would propose in this motion is that these lands be designated at the appropriate time. I suppose this would have to be done in co-operation with the municipal and provincial authorities in order to designate them as parklands.

What does that mean? It is the concept of parkland in the broadest sense of the word. It would mean a use of these lands dedicated to environmental education, in relation to kids, in relation to schools and in relation to the public at large, on weekends. In other words, these would be demonstration areas where the biological characteristics and eco-systems of that particular region would be explained, and the number of environmental protection policies and programs would be explained at all levels. Therefore, you would have a centre in this particular park where the public would have an opportunity to absorb and to become acquainted with the science and practical application of environmental goals and objectives. It would not be such a bad idea, judging from the success that this idea has had in certain cities in Europe.

Second, the land that would be given up by the military authorities at the appropriate time could be used for conventional parkland, with the amenities that go with a park, which I do not have to describe at length.

Third, there could also be a combination or an addition or a parallel use of this land devoted to recreation, particularly in downtown areas where the densities are high, where there are large number of apartment dwellers and where the ratio of population to open space would be such that it would require this type of recreational land use.

Fourth, perhaps the ultimate in land use these days in an urban setting, where possible, is to devote such lands the creation of urban wildlife areas. We have, as you know, a wildlife that is retreating from the built-up areas, for understandable reasons. These wildlife areas may be possible where the size of the particular land is large enough. The size of a military airport is particularly suited for such a purpose. It may be a very interesting initiative to devote that particular public land to the development and the enshrinement of wildlife for the enjoyment of Canadians living in that region.

It is our use of land, if and when it becomes available, that has a very clear, specific purpose, namely, that of enhancing the quality of life in Canadian cities and in urban Canada in a manner that perhaps would make some of our cities unique in the world.

We have the space. We have the opportunity to do it. I would suggest that this would be a very imaginative way of contributing to the uniqueness of our cities. True, the pressures will be enormous in opposite directions. There will be those who will want additional housing, and it could make for a very strong social argument in their favour. I do not deny that. There will be those who will want commercial development. There will be those who will be able to propose some very interesting industrial land uses. Nevertheless, the purpose of this motion is centred around the notion of creating parklands in publicly-owned lands in our urban cities, because that is where the pressure is and where the transportation tie-ups already exist. That is where the pollution at times is high and where you would want to create open spaces for the benefit of citizens living in that particular area.

I will stress it again, it is in our urban cities in the last two or three decades that we have seen a mushrooming of high-rise apartments, of high density dwellings, where the open spaces, the greenery, the yard, the front lawn of course exist only on a very minute surface, considering the number of people who live vertically above that specific property.

Therefore, the necessity of providing in certain urban centres additional open spaces cannot be denied, particularly if you come from Banff, like the Hon. Member across the aisle, or if you come from a community which is endowed with enormous amounts of open spaces, like Kapuskasing. I am talking of metropolitan centres that would include Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver, to mention our larger urban centres.

• (1710)

Why would one take the trouble to make this point? In December of last year the then President of the Treasury Board, the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski), released a press communique on a federal lands study in Toronto. It put forward three concepts which I would like to examine quickly and put on record with which I find myself in partial agreement and then in total disagreement.

Mrs. Browes: How can you do that?

Mr. Caccia: There are three, there is not one only. I will come to that.

The examination is limited only to federal lands in the Toronto region. It is a very interesting examination. The study is one which one no doubt must take seriously. I refer to the first page of the study where the main principles, the so-called guiding premises, are mentioned. The first one I find perfectly reasonable. It reads:

> The federal Government will continue to hold lands that are appropriate to its operational needs.

There is nothing wrong with that. That is a way of having an insurance policy 100 years from now when these lands will become available. It may be that at that time the population pressures will be such as to enhance rather than diminish the chances for these lands to become open spaces, recreational areas, parkland, urban, wildlife or environmentally educational centres.

The second principle reads:

> Lands not required for these purposes will be transferred to the appropriate jurisdictions or to other interests.

The words "other interests" trouble me a lot. I do not know how to interpret that. If it means a transfer from the federal level to a provincial or municipal level for public purposes, that is fine with me. I have no difficulty with that and I fully concur. But if it means transfer to private sector interests, then that is where we part company immediately.

The third principle reads:

Where the federal Government agrees to transfer land, it is obligated to act in the best interest of Canada as a whole—

Which is just fine. There is no problem with that. Then, this is perhaps why I was bit unclear earlier. It goes on as follows:

—including seeking full value of the land on behalf of Canadian taxpayers.

The full value aspect, Mr. Speaker, troubles me enormously. If it means monetary value, as I suspect it does, then we part ways again. If it means that values are related to the enjoyment of landscapes, wildlife, trees and open spaces, there is no problem with that. If that full value implies monetary values, dollars and cents, then I submit there is no real way of arriving at a full value on behalf of Canadian taxpayers because some of this land has been increasing in value year after year, decade after decade. Only upon a sale does it reflect the value. That is not good enough when it comes to public land.

In an attempt to summarize the explanation for this motion before you and before my colleagues here today, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the study carried out by the consultants for the disposition of federal lands at a future date is welcome as an initiative. It is good that we find out what the major criteria should be. It is also a good thing that we debate this, which is what is taking place today. We should put our views on where we agree and where we do not.

I submit, as I have already, that land pressures in our metropolitan centres as the years go by will increase enormously. Hence we will have pressures for development in the conventional sense, as we know it, be it housing, commercial or industrial structures and buildings. I submit there is an alternative and there is a very good one. It relates to the necessity of having an alternative to the strong trend of building highrises, high density and the concentration of population on our limited urban land base.

We should make provision in the long term as one generation providing for subsequent generations—for those in the gallery, their children and grandchildren—with open spaces that they will enjoy. There is nothing more impressive than to go through a city that is heavily built up like Paris, Rome, my home City of Milan, Berlin, London, New York—you name it—and see what a limited and valuable commodity it is to come across open spaces in the form of parks. When they were established the parks may have been at the edges of a city and may have been surrounded or within a very small community. Now, instead, these parks are surrounded by highrises and are located in a major population centre. They are, therefore, such a strong contrast with the rest of the urban setting that they become green oases, for lack of a better word.

I am trying to argue this afternoon that we should project our thinking in the future and plan to make the military lands located in urban areas, when they become available, into green oases, open spaces for the enjoyment of generations of Canadians to come.

Mrs. Pauline Browes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate on the Private Member's Motion today which has been put forward by the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia).

Canadians take a well deserved pride in the beauty of our natural landscapes and in the history of our nation. The Hon. Member is to be congratulated for reminding the House of this fact. As a former Minister of the Environment, the Hon. Member knows that the Canadian Parks Service of Environment Canada is the federal agency whose clear mandate is to protect outstanding natural areas and historic places of national significance across Canada. Furthermore, he knows that the Canadian Parks Service plays a vital role in the preservation of our national heritage for present and future generations.

While we would all wish to expand Canada's national park system, Mr. Speaker, the present motion before the House would be both inappropriate and unnecessary. First, let us consider the nature of our national park system. Environment Canada, through its Canadian Parks Service, protects our national parks for all time because they are representative natural areas of Canadian significance. The national parks system encourages public understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of this natural heritage so as to leave it unimpaired for future generations. You should note, Mr. Speaker, the emphasis on the word natural. To be suitable for consideration as a national park, an area must have experienced minimal modification by humans or, if significant change has taken place, it must have potential for restoration to a natural state. Military lands in urban areas would simply not meet these criteria.

I was surprised to hear the Hon. Member talk about the Downsview airport which is located practically in the centre of Metropolitan Toronto in the North York section. It seems to me that the area in Metro Toronto that should be preserved and is in that wild state now is the Rouge Valley and not the Downsview airport which is more appropriate for housing.

• (1720)

The Hon. Member said that there should be urban wildlife. The motto of the Save the Rouge System is: "Wild in the City". Indeed, there is a whole herd of white-tailed deer running through Metro Toronto, if you can believe that, Mr. Speaker. We want the deer to be preserved wild in the city.

In fact, it is self-evident that in all of Canada, the places the furthest removed from their natural states are urban military areas. Military lands located in urban areas would certainly not qualify for inclusion in our national parks system based on the essential criteria of sights representing unspoiled natural beauty.

However, the Canadian Parks Service, through its National Historic Parks and Sites Program, may designate and commemorate areas of national historic interest. This is accomplished only upon the recommendation of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, which is the advisory body

in such matters for the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan). To be selected for such commemoration, a place must be associated with an event or a movement which has shaped Canadian history, and/or illustrate effectively the culture of a pre-historic people or be associated with important archaeological discoveries.

Only places of extraordinary value to Canadian history are acquired and developed as national historic parks. All military lands are not intrinsically of national historic significance. They are not, nor should they be, automatically eligible for national commemoration.

This process is as it should be right now. Truly worthy sites of genuine national historic significance can be and are considered by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board. When these sites meet the proper criteria, they are given the appropriate designation. The system has worked and is working very well indeed. There is no need to tinker with it now, nor was there such a need when the Hon. Member who moved this motion served as Minister of the Environment.

To date, there has been excellent co-operation between the Department of National Defence and Environment Canada. DND is fully aware of Environment Canada's interest in and mandate for maintaining land of national historic significance. DND has routinely co-operated in the past by transferring to Environment Canada historically significant lands that were no longer required for military purposes.

In fact, military lands are already exceedingly well represented in Canada's historic parks system. DND has already transferred to the Canadian Parks Service some of the most important military sites in Canada. In fact, Canada's whole system of national historic parks and major historic sites began in 1917 with the transfer of Fort Anne in Nova Scotia from the Department of Militia and Defence to what was then the National Parks Service. Fort Anne was the first of our national historic parks.

From Signal Hill in St. John's, Newfoundland—where the final battle of the Seven Years War in North America was fought on September 15, 1762—to Fort Rodd Hill in Victoria, British Columbia—where batteries were constructed in 1895 as part of a coastal system to defend Esquimalt and Victoria—military sites, literally from one end of Canada to the other, have been preserved and are appreciated by hundreds of thousands of Canadians and foreign visitors each and every year.

Indeed, when it comes to military historic sites, Canada has been blessed. Seventeenth, 18th and 19th-century military history is well preserved and represented by national historic parks and sites. When one adds provincial sites to the list of federal lands of this type, we can proudly say that this aspect of history remains a living heritage accessible to all Canadians.

As all Hon. Members can see, it is clear that it would be totally inappropriate to turn over urban sites owned by the Department of National Defence for use as national parks because their value as unspoiled natural areas has been irredeemably debased. They would add nothing to our system of national historic sites which already include impeccable and comprehensive representations of our 17th, 18th and 19th-century military history.

Hon. Members can be assured that this Government will continue to ensure the preservation of nationally significant examples of Canada's military history as we have done so well in the past. For all these reasons, the motion put forward by the Hon. Member for Davenport is inappropriate and should be rejected by Hon. Members of the House of Commons.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Before continuing with debate, I would like to apprise the House of the following: I have received written notice from the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) that he is unable to move his motion during the hour provided for Private Members' Business tomorrow, Tuesday, July 12, 1988. It has not been possible to arrange an exchange of positions in the order of precedence pursuant to Standing Order 39. Accordingly, I am directing the Table Officers to drop that item of business to the bottom of the order of precedence. Since notice will be removed, the hour for Private Members' Business will be cancelled and, pursuant to Standing Order 39, the House will continue with the business before it prior to that hour.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway): Madam Speaker, I was not sure whether or not I would support the motion put by the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) until I heard the Parliamentary Secretary. She confirmed in my mind why I should support the motion, and I will tell her why in a minute.

The Hon. Member for Davenport was good enough, as he always is, to raise the difficulties involved in this issue. One difficulty he raised was the competition in land use in urban areas between land needed for housing and land that could be used, as he said, for environmental purposes or for parks. I personally do not think that the two are necessarily in conflict, but sometimes they can be partly in conflict. I have some concerns about that.

I thought that the Parliamentary Secretary was too bureaucratic and that there was too much of the DND in her response. I thought she mixed up the notion of national historic sites and national military sites, of all things, with what the Hon. Member for Davenport was trying to deal with. The Hon. Member for Davenport mentioned the use of lands under a number of criteria. He mentioned using land as an environmental centre, as conventional parkland, as a recreational centre, as a wildlife centre or as all of these. He suggested that we could use these military lands that are no longer used for military purposes for environmental purposes, but for different kinds of environmental purposes.

I do not think that the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary should dismiss this motion so quickly. She said that perhaps Downsview airport is more suitable for housing than it is for parkland

and she said that we should look to the Rouge Valley. I believe that is in the Hon. Member's riding, is it not?

Mrs. Browes: Very close.

Mr. Waddell: I figured that.

Mrs. Browes: You are supporting it?

Mr. Waddell: I do support it. I think it makes sense to use the Rouge Valley as a park. As a matter of fact, I was almost blown away by what the Hon. Member said. She said that there were white-tailed deer running through Metropolitan Toronto. I always thought that it was only people chasing money running through Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Jepson: There's a lot of wildlife in Toronto.

Mr. Waddell: I knew there was a lot of wildlife in Toronto, as the Hon. Member said. As a matter of fact, we have a little saying in Vancouver. Of course, I do not subscribe to it. They say: "They don't call it Hogtown for nothing". It is nice to know they have some deer and that everyone is not in a fervent rush to make money. When I think of Toronto, I do not think of Bambi, I think more of Godzilla. However, it is nice to know.

• (1730)

Here is where the Parliamentary Secretary is wrong. She said there were precedents for taking military land. She mentioned that the DND transferred military land to parks, so we have precedents. Let us not confuse it with military sites, though. I would rather have environmental sites, quite frankly, than more military sites. We would have more sites commemorating militarism. While we have to commemorate our past, the reality of military battles, let us not go overboard. My feeling was that DND would tend to want to have more military sites than environmental parks, so let us not dismiss the Member's motion. I think he has a good idea.

To give you an example. In my home City of Vancouver, right near where I used to live, there is a park called Jericho Beach. It was an active military site, and still is, although it is empty now. It was used during the war. You can see pictures of the old hangars and military barracks and so on. It is right on the ocean, just outside of English Bay, towards Point Grey and the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, a beautiful area. As a matter of fact, it was used for the Habitat Conference. The Hon. Member for Davenport mentioned an environmental centre. It was used as a people centre for the Habitat Conference 10 or 15 years ago. That was the beginning of the Stockholm environmental notion and the things we are dealing with today. We did a good job in Vancouver in having it there.

The other thing about Jericho Beach is that it has areas for recreation. I used to jog around there myself when I was in better shape before I came to Parliament and got out of shape. It was a good area to jog around. There was wildlife there and even the military people who were looking after it allowed some bogs and areas like that to continue to exist. They did not develop it all. There was and is wildlife today, bird flyways and so on. You have urban wildlife, the real kind, that is, animals and birds. That is a good example, and therefore I do not think the Parliamentary Secretary should decide this out of hand and take the bureaucratic line from DND. I think this is something worth looking into.

I congratulate the Hon. Member for Davenport because he is a former Minister of the Environment who has always had his heart in the right place on environmental issues. However, I wish he had enumerated in more detail the number of these military sites. He mentioned Downsview. I have seen Downsview from the air while flying across Toronto and I wonder what it is being used for. I would like to know the future plans for that area. I wish the Hon. Member had named some of the other sites across Canada because there may be other areas available. Let us enumerate them, let us see what uses they could be put to.

He also mentioned the report done by the Government on the federal land study in Toronto. I, too, have my concerns. We have a Conservative Government that likes to privatize government property for its friends in the private sector. It is a Government that you cannot trust. For example, it made promises to seniors that it would not deindex their pensions, and then turned around and tried to do just that. It made a promise there would be no free trade. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said he was against it, and then he brought in free trade. So it is a Government you cannot trust.

Mrs. Browes: On a point of order, Madam Speaker. I would like to remind the Hon. Member that he should stay on the topic of the motion we are discussing. I think he is veering off a little bit to the left, as he usually does.

Mr. Waddell: Madam Speaker, my point simply is that many of us, not just me, but many others in the country do not trust the Government to deal straightforwardly with matters. One of the problems in dealing with these particular lands is the federal land study in Toronto. We are concerned that instead of putting them to environmental or other uses such as housing, the Government might sell them to its friends. Let us look at the record. Look at the past. Look at what the Government has done.

I want to conclude by saying this. I think the Hon. Member for Davenport has made a good start. We really should look at and analyse these military lands. We should make the environment, whether it is a centre, a parkland, a recreation, urban wildlife or combination of them all, an important use. We have to weigh the housing usage factor. We have to weigh the use for commercial purposes and environmental purposes. I agree with the Hon. Member. I think the time has come to restrict urban growth and create more open spaces and enhance the existing ones in urban areas. That will enhance the quality of life, which is what we are all trying to do and what we are proud of having as Canadians. That is why I think

this is a very creative motion and it deserves a better look than the Parliamentary Secretary was prepared to give.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Luc Joncas (Matapédia—Matane): Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take part in the debate today on Motion 164 moved by the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia).

Madam Speaker, this motion by a former Minister of the Environment, well-intentioned though it may be, comes somewhat as a surprise. In any case, since the Hon. Member for Davenport must be aware of the federal policies relating to the Canadian parks system, he might have refrained from presenting this kind of motion.

Perhaps the Hon. Member is worried that Canada's military heritage is under-represented in our network of national historic parks.

Future generations need not worry. Since the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada was established in 1919, the number of historic sites, parks, monuments and canals has steadily increased. Since 1917, several old forts administered by the Army has been transferred to the National Historic Parks Branch.

Madam Speaker, perhaps I may recall that in the fifties, the federal Government has focused its attention on a number of sites, most of which were former military centres.

In fact, from the outset, co-operation between the Derpartment of National Defence and the department responsible for national parks was always excellent, and it still is today. Thanks to this mutual understanding, from the early settlement of this country to the beginning of the twentieth century, all across this country from Signal Hill, Newfoundland to Fort Rodd Hill, British Columbia, our national historic parks are a faithful reflection of the relationship between our country's history and its various regions. These parks give Canadians and foreign visitors a good picture of our military history in the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries.

Madam Speaker, the motion in its present form does not specify the historic value of these lands and fails to make any distinctions. In view of existing provisions for having any site of national historic significance taken into consideration, and since the motion fails to consider the value of the lands in question, a motion of this kind is useless as far as the preservation of our country's heritage is concerned.

It is not useful to create national parks, Madam Speaker, since it ignores the objectives and criteria of Environment Canada in this respect.

The purpose of creating national parks is to safeguard natural areas that are representative of this country so as to keep them intact for future generations.

It does not seem necessary to me to sustantiate for the House the fact that the motion introduced by the Hon. Member for Davenport does not meet the criterion of geographic representativeness; it also goes without saying that a former Minister of the Environment should know that military lands located in urban areas are far removed from the definition of a natural area. I ask you, Madam Speaker, what could be less natural than a city?

It remains passing strange, Madam Speaker, that this former Minister of the Environment, who has done so much for our common heritage could have drafted such a motion.

Canada has one of the most beautiful networks of national parks in the world. At the present time, this network comprises 34 national parks disseminated throughout our vast land. They cover 1.3 percent of Canada's overall territory.

Since this Government came to power, we have signed agreements and spent millions of dollars for the creation of new parks, such as at Moresby South in the Queen Charlotte Islands, on the Bruce Peninsula in Ontario, on Ellesmere Island in the Arctic, and more recently, in the Saguenay region in Québec.

In Quebec, our historical military heritage is far from being under-represented. For instance, we have Fort Lennox on l'île-aux-Noix, Battlefield Park and the walled fortifications of Quebec in the City of Québec, Fort No. 1 of Pointe-Lévis in Lauzon, the Chateauguay Battlements in Howick, and Chambly Fort in Chambly. All of these parks and historical sites bear witness to the military history of past régimes.

The public has shown a growing interst in such sites, and thousands of our fellow Canadians, as well as tourists from all over the world, seek them out for their beauty and for their historical interest.

We can assure the Canadian population that we are continuing and will continue to work for the preservation of our heritage and that we will also continue to improve our national parks network and our national historical parks.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, motion 164 introduced by the Hon. Member for Davenport is far from meeting the objectives which underly the creation of national parks and national historical parks, nor can it influence municipalities or provincial governments to preserve green spaces.

For all of these reasons, Madam Speaker, we suggest that the motion be defeated by this honorable House.

• (1740)

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Madam Speaker, I would like to say just a few words in support of Motion No. 164, on behalf of my colleague from Davenport (Mr. Caccia). I think that this motion raises some very important issues for people living in urban areas who have military facilities that are obsolete or declared surplus for government requirements and that must be redeveloped either for housing or in accordance with some municipal projects or

plans or that are to be used for roads or other purposes for all municipalities in the region.

I raise the matter because, first of all, it is of current interest in Ottawa—Vanier and, second, it has always concerned me. How are federal lands that are declared surplus disposed of and how are lands that were used for military purposes disposed of not only for the development of communities that identify with those facilities or have had to live with them for many years, but also how can nature parks and other natural areas, which everyone considers very important, be planned for our urban centres? There is a great need to maintain green spaces that everyone can enjoy and to give municipalities a chance to develop within their territory a place where people can do other things than playing war games.

Madam Speaker, Motion No. 164 from the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) reads as follows:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider designating as potential parkland all military lands located in urban areas and presently used for military purposes, once their present use is discontinued.

So this is a recommendation that the Government should take seriously and put on the agenda to see whether urban areas do require more facilities to meet public needs, before dismissing it entirely.

You know, Madam Speaker, in my riding, there is a property known as . . .

[*English*]

—DND property on Lees Avenue. It is known as the Armories property. I understand that some years ago this property was designated as surplus to federal needs in terms of military installations. Therefore, everyone and his neighbour has had his eyes on it and planning has been going on to take this property to serve transportation needs or other regional requirements. Much to my dismay no one in Government has seriously suggested that it be used for ecological environment parks or, even better, in downtown Ottawa, some good affordable housing.

This dossier has been with us for some time. Just for the sake of making it known that we do have a few sites in Ottawa Vanier which have been declared surplus, and in whose interest it is that they be preserved for public use, there are plans to declare the federal property known as the Armories as surplus and to transfer that property to the regional Government for a major road project through the area proposed by the regional municipality.

I wish to refer to a letter from the Alderman Nancy Smith of St. George's Ward, written to me on January 29, 1988. She says:

> I am writing you with regard to the DND property on Lees Avenue, otherwise known as the Armories property. It would appear that this property may become surplus in the near future.

She goes on to say that the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton may have access to that property to realign some of its road patterns in the area. She continues:

> The land in this area is zoned for residential. In particular, the DND site was reviewed at the time of the Ottawa East Neighbourhood Plan (1979 to 1980). It is zoned for family housing with a 35 foot to 45 foot height limit.

She went on to explain how important it is that there should be housing on that property.

• (1750)

The Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) stated that he would like to see any surplus federal lands now used for military purposes, when they became surplus declared to be environmental parks. I do not disagree with him that there is a need for environmental parks, but on that point I might debate his argument. There are some cities where there are several such military properties. I can think of at least two in my riding. The site on Lees Avenue, known as the Armouries site, could be used for good quality housing while giving the residents of Ottawa East a park at the same time. In other words, we could easily cope with both the housing requirements of the community and the park requirements of the children and residents of that area.

This is a good motion. It appeals to me because of its human approach to disposing of properties that the federal Government no longer needs. This could easily be taken up by the Government, to consider how the various cities, towns and urban areas where properties used for DND purposes that were declared surplus could be converted into parks or, for that matter, a mix of parks and housing. If that is the purpose at hand, then it has the full approval of all residents of Ottawa—Vanier.

Mr. Bob Hicks (Scarborough East): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate today. I congratulate the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia), a former Minister of Environment, for his interest.

I want to take this opportunity to point out what I genuinely feel are a few imperfections in what he is proposing. As a former Minister of the Environment, the Hon. Member for Davenport should know that this motion is neither feasible nor practical. The very wording of the motion, the way in which it is drafted, seems to fly in the face of government policies, both of this Government and of previous ones, for parks designation and for the disposal of surplus lands.

Let us look at the phrase "considered designated as potential parkland". The motion does not explain what this phrase means, nor does it say how such a goal can be achieved in law.

At present there is no provision either in the laws governing the selection or acquisition of our national parks, or in the parks policy of the Canadian Parks Service, for the designation of an area as potential parkland. After an area is selected for consideration as a national parkland on the basis of well defined criteria, it is either designated a park or it is not. There is no such thing now, nor has there ever been a designation for potential parkland.

Let us consider the selection procedure for designating a Canadian national historic site. This selection process is carried out by the National Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada. A site, which may have national significance, either as a location in its own right or in relation to a person or event of Canada-wide importance, is nominated for consideration by the board.

Nowhere in this process, which has been working smoothly and efficiently since 1919, is provision made for a designation as potential parkland.

Likewise, Motion No. 164 refers to parkland rather than national parkland or land for national parks. The mandate of the Canadian Parks Service concerns the establishment of national parks; that is, the establishment of parks as areas that have true national significance as a result of their superlative natural characteristics and unspoiled state. Surely a former Minister of the Environment should be expected to realize that the chances of any urban military land qualifying under the rigid criteria for national parks are extremely remote, to say the least.

Since this is the case, the Hon. Member for Davenport must be implying by the omission of the word "national" that the surplus land intended for designation as potential parkland is intended for municipal or provincial parkland. Surely it is not the role of the federal Government to tell other levels of government what they should or should not designate as parkland, either potential or not. If such a designation is meant to apply to urban areas for consideration by the federal Government as parkland it is meaningless, if it is meant to apply to provincial or local governments it is presumptuous.

The proposal of the Hon. Member for Davenport to designate surplus urban land of the Department of National Defence as potential parkland is simply not feasible. Moreover, it is unnecessary. There is a formal disposal process already in place to handle surplus DND land, and indeed all surplus land of the federal Government.

If the intent of Motion No. 164 is simply to designate surplus urban DND land as parkland in order to alleviate shortages of green space in urban areas, then the Hon. Member for Davenport could have perhaps stated his goal more clearly. In that case, however, he might have confronted the reality that municipal and provincial Governments already have the opportunity to obtain federal Government land once it is declared surplus. If they decide surplus DND lands are required for parks there already exist adequate and functional procedures to obtain such lands.

The intent of Motion No. 164 is clear, to say the least. As a measure to augment our national parks system it cannot work, because urban lands are unsuitable for use as national parks; as an instrument to improve the selection of historic parks and sites it is unnecessary; and as a means of increasing municipal urban green space it is inappropriate and ineffectual.

Canada's national parks system is one of the great glories of our country. Our national parks are a means of preserving, in their natural state, areas which are representative of the major natural environments of Canada. They are special places which protect part of the heritage of all Canadians, now and in the future. The first national park in Canada was established in 1885 to protect the then newly discovered Banff Hot Springs for public use. Now, our national park system encompasses 34 parks, which cover 1.3 per cent of Canada's entire land mass.

The official policy of the Canadian Parks Service sets as a goal the representation of each land and marine natural region of Canada by a national park or marine national park. However, many land and most marine natural regions are still unrepresented. This is a worth-while goal which this Government is diligently and constantly pursuing.

The present Government is proud to have added a significant number of new national parks to Canada's national parks system during the years of its tenure. Bruce Peninsula and Ellesmere Island are the new national parks or national park reserves the Government has recently created. Canadians can be assured that the Government will continue to build on this record of success and show leadership in continuing to improve Canada's national park system.

Unfortunately, Motion No. 164 will not bring us any closer to reaching any of these goals, nor can it possibly have any practical or additional impact on the preservation of urban green space by municipal or provincial Governments.

Notwithstanding the items I pointed out, I still congratulate the Hon. Member for his interest in the environment. Both my colleague, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Browes), and I have worked diligently on behalf of the Save the Rouge campaign in eastern Metro Toronto. We are sympathetic to all worth-while suggestions regarding the environment. Unfortunately, Motion No. 164 does not appear to be the vehicle for the end result that is actually sought by the Hon. Member.

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Madam Speaker, in the closing minutes of this debate on the motion put forward by my colleague, the Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia), a former Minister of Environment, I want to salute the best intentions that have gone into this motion in trying to humanize the large urban centres in this country with much deserved and needed parkland.

The City of Ottawa has attempted to combine green parkland with an urban use. I believe it has achieved a pleasant surrounding and ambiance.

Like my colleague, the Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier), let me also point out that I do not believe the entire surplus land—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Unfortunately, I must interrupt the Hon. Member. The time provided for

consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 42(1), the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-92, an Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It being 6 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 13(5), the House will now proceed to the taking of deferred divisions on Bill C-92, an Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act. The first vote will be on Motion No. 1. Mr. Foster moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-92 be amended in Clause 8 by striking out line 33 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"railway car during the pool period. The said sum shall reflect an equitable allocation of the costs incurred by the Board to maintain the country delivery points."

Call in the Members.

The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 438*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Baker
Benjamin
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Jewett
Keeper
MacLellan
Manly
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Ouellet
Penner
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell—28

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Coates
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Dantzer
Darling
Daubney
Desrosiers
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hockin
Hudon
Jardine
Jepson
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McCain
McDermid
McLean
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Plourde
Price
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current—Maple Creek)—76

• (1820)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Lewis: Madam Speaker, there have been discussions among the Parties, and I think you would find unanimous agreement to apply the vote that was just taken to the remaining motion under report stage of Bill C-92 and to reverse the vote for the concurrence motion on Bill C-92.

I think you would also find that that same procedure could be applied to the report stage motions on Bill C-129. In other words, the Government is against the motions; the Opposition is for them.

Mr. Gauthier: No.

Mr. Lewis: Fine, I understood—

Mr. Kaplan: Madam Speaker, I was absent while the preceding vote was taken. I would agree to this procedure provided that I was included as voting with my Party.

Mr. Charest: Madam Speaker, I must admit that I am not too sure what is going to happen. Somebody from the Opposition cut off the Minister of State, the House Leader for the Government, as he was about to propose something, and now it is not certain what will happen.

In the eventuality that the Opposition will come to its senses and agree to the proposition made by the Minister of State, and if ever the Hon. Member can get his act together, I will vote with the Government.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Chair understood that the vote which has just been taken would be applied to the question on Motion No. 3 standing in the name of Mr. Hovdebo, and that the vote in reverse would be applied to the concurrence motion, with the two additions of the Hon. Member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan) and the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport (Mr. Charest). That would take care of Bill C-92.

Therefore the next question is on Motion No. 3.

Mr. Hovdebo moved:

That Bill C-92 be amended by deleting Clause 8.

The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 439)

YEAS

Members

Allmand	Gray (Windsor West)	Penner
Baker	Jewett	Pépin
Benjamin	Kaplan	Prud'homme
Caccia	Keeper	Riis
Copps	MacLellan	Robichaud
de Jong	Manly	Rodriguez
Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)	Marchi	Skelly
Finestone	McCurdy	Waddell—29
Foster	Mitchell	
Gauthier	Orlikow	
	Ouellet	

NAYS

Members

Belsher	Harvey	Plourde
Blenkarn	Hicks	Price
Browes	Hockin	Reid
Charest	Hudon	Reimer
Clark (Brandon—Souris)	Jardine	Ricard
Coates	Jepson	St-Julien
Cochrane	Johnson (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)	Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Cooper	Joncas	Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Crofton	Kempling	Stackhouse
Crosby (Halifax West)	Ladouceur	Stewart
Dantzer	Lanthier	Taylor
Darling	Layton	Thacker
Daubney	Lewis	Towers
Desrosiers	MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)	Tupper
Domm	MacDougall (Timiskaming)	Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Duplessis	Mailly	Van De Walle
Edwards	McCain	Vézina
Ellis	McDermid	Vincent
Epp (Provencher)	McLean	Weiner
Fennell	Nicholson (Niagara Falls)	Wenman
Fontaine	Nickerson	White
Fraleigh	Oberle	Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek)—77
Friesen	O'Neil	
Girard	Oostrom	
Gormley	Pennock	
Gottselig	Peterson	
Graham		
Halliday		
Hardey		

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

Hon. Flora Macdonald (for the Minister of State (Grains and Oilseeds)) moved that the Bill be concurred in.

The House divided on motion (Mr. Mayer), which was agreed to on the following division:

Air Canada

(Division No. 440)

YEAS

Members

Belsher	Harvey	Plourde
Blenkarn	Hicks	Price
Browes	Hockin	Reid
Charest	Hudon	Reimer
Clark (Brandon—Souris)	Jardine	Ricard
Coates	Jepson	St-Julien
Cochrane	Johnson (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)	Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Cooper	Joncas	Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Crofton	Kempling	Stackhouse
Crosby (Halifax West)	Ladouceur	Stewart
Dantzer	Lanthier	Taylor
Darling	Layton	Thacker
Daubney	Lewis	Towers
Desrosiers	MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)	Tupper
Domm	MacDougall (Timiskaming)	Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Duplessis	Mailly	Van De Walle
Edwards	McCain	Vézina
Ellis	McDermid	Vincent
Epp (Provencher)	McLean	Weiner
Fennell	Nicholson (Niagara Falls)	Wenman
Fontaine	Nickerson	White
Fraleigh	Oberle	Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek)—77
Friesen	O'Neil	
Girard	Oostrom	
Gormley	Pennock	
Gottselig	Peterson	
Graham		
Halliday		
Hardey		

NAYS

Members

Allmand	Gray (Windsor West)	Penner
Baker	Jewett	Pépin
Benjamin	Kaplan	Prud'homme
Caccia	Keeper	Riis
Copps	MacLellan	Robichaud
de Jong	Manly	Rodriguez
Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)	Marchi	Skelly
Finestone	McCurdy	Waddell—29
Foster	Mitchell	
Gauthier	Orlikow	
	Ouellet	

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion carried.

* * *

AIR CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Friday, July 8, consideration of Bill C-129, an Act to provide for the continuance of Air Canada under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares thereof to the public, as reported (with an amendment) from a legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the report stage of Bill C-129.

Shall I dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The first question will be on Motion No. 2. Mr. Orlikow moved:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 6 by striking out line 27 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"those votes to not more than five".

The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 441)

YEAS

Members

Benjamin
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Jewett
Keeper
Manly
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell—13

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Baker
Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Caccia
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Coates
Cochrane
Cooper
Copps
Crofton
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Dantzer
Darling
Daubney
Desrosiers
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Finestone
Fontaine
Foster
Fraleigh
Friesen
Gauthier
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Gray
(Windsor West)
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hockin
Hudon
Jardine
Jepson
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Kaplan
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Mailly
Marchi
McCain
McDermid
McLean
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Ouellet
Penner
Pennock
Pépin
Peterson
Plourde
Price
Prud'homme
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
Robichaud
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current—Maple Creek)—94

• (1830)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost. The next question is on Motion No. 3. Mr. Orlikow moved:

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 6 by striking out line 34 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"sauga, which centres shall maintain their staffing levels equal to those attained in the 1987-88 financial year; and".

The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 442)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Baker
Benjamin
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
MacLellan
Manly
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Ouellet
Penner
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell—30

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Coates
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Dantzer
Darling
Daubney
Desrosiers
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hockin
Hudon
Jardine
Jepson
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McCain
McDermid
McLean
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Plourde
Price
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle

Vézina
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)—78

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost. The next question is on Motion No. 4. The Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) on a point of order.

Mr. Riis: Madam Speaker, I think you would find a disposition in the House to apply the results of the vote just taken to all remaining report stage motions and to apply the reversal of that vote to the concurrence motion on Bill C-129.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The House has heard the suggestion of the Hon. Member. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The next question is on Motion No. 4. Mr. MacLellan moved:

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 6 by adding immediately after line 37 at page 3 the following:

"(f) provisions restricting the Corporation from acquiring control, through ownership of shares or otherwise, in an air carrier providing international services under a licence issued pursuant to the National Transportation Act;

(g) provisions respecting the enforcement of the constraints and requirements imposed pursuant to this section."

The House divided on Motion No. 4, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 443)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Baker
Benjamin
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
MacLellan
Manly
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Ouellet
Penner
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell—30

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Coates
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Dantzer
Darling
Daubney
Desrosiers
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hockin
Hudon
Jardine
Jepson
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—
Conception)
Joncas
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McCain
McDermid
McLean
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Plourde
Price
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)—78

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost. The next question is on Motion No. 5. Mr. Orlikow moved:

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 6 by adding immediately after line 37 at page 3 the following:

"(f) provisions specifying that the six bases for Air Canada flight attendants at Montreal, Halifax, Calgary, Winnipeg and Toronto be maintained with the staffing levels of each equal to those of the 1987-88 financial year as a minimum standard."

The House divided on Motion No. 5, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 444)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Baker
Benjamin
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
MacLellan
Manly
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Ouellet
Penner
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell—30

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Coates
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Dantzer
Darling
Daubney
Desrosiers
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hockin

Hudon
Jardine
Jepson
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McCain
McDermid
McLean
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Plourde
Price
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current—Maple Creek)—78

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost. The next question is on Motion No. 6. Mr. Orlikow moved:

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 6 by adding immediately after line 37 at page 3 the following:

"(f) provisions requiring the Corporation to maintain and strengthen its role as a Canadian Corporation by ensuring that labour, equipment and services required by the Corporation be Canadian in origin wherever feasible and where not feasible that Canadian content be maximized as a part of such labour, equipment and services requirements;

(g) provisions requiring the Corporation to maintain existing Corporation standards respecting safety, maintenance and customer service;

(h) provisions requiring any subsidiary corporation of the Corporation to be bound by this Act including any subsidiary corporation which may be formed from or by the parent Corporation once this Act comes into force."

The House divided on Motion No. 6, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 445*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Baker
Benjamin
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
MacLellan
Manly
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Ouellet
Penner
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell—30

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Coates
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Dantzer
Darling
Daubney
Desrosiers
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hockin
Hudon
Jardine
Jepson
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McCain
McDermid
McLean
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Plourde
Price
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current—Maple Creek)—78

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost. The next question is on Motion No. 7. Mr. Orlikow moved:

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 8 by striking out line 18 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"shares of the Corporation up to a maximum of forty-five per cent of voting shares."

The House divided on Motion No. 7, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 446*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Baker
Benjamin
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
MacLellan
Manly
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Ouellet
Penner
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell—30

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Coates
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Dantzer
Darling
Daubney
Desrosiers
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hockin
Hudon
Jardine
Jepson

Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—
Conception)
Joncas
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McCain
McDermid
McLean
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Plourde
Price
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)—78

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost. The next question is on Motion No. 8. Mr. Orlikow moved:

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 10 by striking out line 26 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"the Corporation and the Commissioner of Official Languages shall include in the annual report a review of the performance of Air Canada in respect of attaining the goals and objectives of the Official Languages Act."

The House divided on Motion No. 8, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 447*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Baker
Benjamin
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
MacLellan
Manly
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Ouellet
Penner
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell—30

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Coates
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Dantzer
Darling
Daubney
Desrosiers
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hockin
Hudon
Jardine
Jepson
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—
Conception)
Joncas
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McCain
McDermid
McLean
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Plourde
Price
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)—78

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost. The next question is on Motion No. 9. Mr. Orlikow moved:

That Bill C-129 be amended in Clause 11 by adding immediately after line 4 at page 8 the following:

"(3) The Corporation assumes all assets and all liabilities of the Corporation held immediately prior to the day on which the Corporation becomes a corporation to which the Canada Business Corporation Act applies."

The House divided on Motion No. 9, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 448*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Baker
Benjamin
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
MacLellan
Manly
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Ouellet
Penner
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell—30

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Coates
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Dantzer
Darling
Daubney
Desrosiers
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hockin
Hudon
Jardine
Jepson
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—
Conception)
Joncas
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McCain
McDermid
McLean
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson

Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Plourde
Price
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)—78

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

Hon. Gerry Weiner (for the President of the Privy Council) moved that the Bill be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 449*)

YEAS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Coates
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Dantzer
Darling
Daubney
Desrosiers
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hockin
Hudon
Jardine
Jepson
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—
Conception)
Joncas
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McCain
McDermid
McLean
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Plourde
Price
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)—78

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Baker
Benjamin
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
MacLellan
Manly
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Ouellet
Penner
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell—30

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion carried.

* * *

• (1840)

ELDORADO NUCLEAR LIMITED REORGANIZATION AND DIVESTITURE ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Thursday, July 7, consideration of Bill C-121, an Act to authorize the reorganization and divestiture of Eldorado Nuclear Limited and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division at report stage of Bill C-121.

Shall I dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Accordingly the question is on Motion No. 3. Mr. Orlikow moved:

That Bill C-121 be amended in Clause 17 by striking out lines 21 to 24 at page 16 and substituting the following therefor:

"17. All sections shall come into force five years following Proclamation by Governor in Council."

The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 450*)

YEAS

Members

Benjamin
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Jewett
Keeper
Manly
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell—13

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Baker
Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Caccia
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Coates
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Dantzer
Darling
Daubney
Desrosiers
Domm

Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Finestone
Fontaine
Foster
Fraleigh
Friesen
Gauthier
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Gray
(Windsor West)
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hockin
Hudon
Jardine
Jepson
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Kaplan
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Mailly
Marchi
McCain
McDermid
McLean
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Ouellet
Penner
Pennock
Pépin
Peterson
Plourde
Price
Prud'homme
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
Robichaud
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current—Maple Creek)—94

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

Hon. Flora MacDonald (for the President of the Privy Council) moved that the Bill be concurred in.

Mr. Gauthier: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you will find unanimous consent to apply in reverse the result of the previous vote to this vote, with the addition of the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) who just walked in.

Ms. Copps: No.

Mr. Gauthier: We will leave her out.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The House has heard the suggestion from the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier). Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 451)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Baker
Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Caccia
Charest
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Coates
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Dantzer
Darling
Daubney
Desrosiers
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Finestone
Fontaine
Foster
Fraleigh
Friesen
Gauthier
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Gray
(Windsor West)
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hockin
Hudon
Jardine
Jepson
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Kaplan
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Mailly
Marchi
McCain
McDermid
McLean
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Ouellet
Penner
Pennock
Pépin
Peterson
Plourde
Price
Prud'homme
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
Robichaud
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current—Maple Creek)—94

NAYS

Members

Benjamin
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Jewett
Keeper
Manly
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell—13

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion carried.

* * *

CANADIAN MULTICULTURALISM ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-93, an Act for the preservation and enhancement of multiculturalism in Canada, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Keeper) had the floor and had finished his presentation the last time this matter was before the House.

Is the House ready for the question on the second grouping?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The first question is on Motion No. 10 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 12, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

• (1850)

The next question is on Motion No. 14 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 15 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 17 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 18 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The House will now proceed to the next grouping.

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon) moved:

Motion No. 20.

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 4 by striking out lines 9 to 16 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"4.(1) The Minister, all other Ministers of the Crown and all federal institutions shall implement the multiculturalism policy of Canada.

(2) The Minister shall provide advice and assistance to other Ministers in the development and implementation of programs and practices that achieve the multiculturalism policy."

Motion No. 21.

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 5 by striking out lines 17 to 21 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"5.(1) The Minister shall take appropriate measures to implement the multiculturalism policy of Canada and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, shall

(a) engage in an ongoing consultation with ethnocultural communities and multicultural organizations in finding the best means to achieve the multicultural policy;"

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West) moved:

Motion No. 22.

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 5 by striking out line 21 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"of the foregoing, shall".

Motion No. 23.

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 5 by striking out lines 18 to 21 at page 6 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) The Minister shall engage in ongoing dialogue with all provinces and territories respecting the implementation of the multiculturalism policy of Canada and may enter into an agreement or arrangement with any province or territory further thereto."

Motion No. 24.

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 5 by striking out lines 18 to 21 at page 6 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) the Minister shall engage in an ongoing dialogue with all the provinces and territories and enter into agreements with any or all of them whenever such agreements advance the multiculturalism policy of Canada."

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon) moved:

Motion No. 25.

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 6 by striking out lines 27 to 31 at page 6 and substituting the following therefor:

"6.(1) The Ministers of the Crown shall recognize the leadership role of the Minister in implementing the multiculturalism policy and shall, in the execution of their respective mandates, take the actions required to implement the multiculturalism policy of Canada."

Motion No. 26.

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 6 by adding immediately after line 31 at page 6 the following:

"(2) Each Minister shall develop an annual plan to advance the objectives of the multiculturalism policy of Canada within his department and indicate the resources required to achieve these objectives."

He said: Madam Speaker, this group of motions is designed to clarify the responsibilities of the Minister responsible for multiculturalism and other members of the Cabinet in acting on the statement of principles which Clause 3 has set forth so well in the Bill, but which in the draft that came to the House and in the Bill that came back to the House from the legislative committee still leaves all too much opportunity for individuals to act on the policy or to ignore the policy.

Because of the nature of these provisions, I provide as an example Clause 5, the first paragraph of which provides that the Minister shall take such measures as the Minister considers appropriate to implement the multiculturalism policy of Canada without limiting the generality, and so on. Then some specific statements are made. That particular phrase, "shall take such measures as the Minister considers appropriate", has impressed a great many people as opening the possibility to failing to respect the principles set forth in Clause 3, as opening the door to ignoring the multicultural policy, something which many observers seem to think has characterized government Departments far too often.

The need to strengthen various clauses of the Bill was recognized by the Canadian Ethnocultural Council in its own presentation on the matter which, under the title "Strengthening the Act, a Brief on Bill C-93", was made public in April of this year and said among other things in specific reference to Clause 5, paragraph (1):

> The opening paragraph of Section 5(1) could be worded in a more definitive manner as follows: "The Minister shall take measures appropriate to

implement the multicultural policy of Canada and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, may"

Similar suggestions have come forth for other clauses. Looking at Clause 4 of the Bill, the Canadian Ethnocultural Council has suggested that there might be a broadening of the ambit of the Bill by stating that the Minister, all other Ministers of the Crown, and all federal institutions shall implement the multiculturalism policy of Canada. It has been my response to these suggestions to put forward this series of motions, all of which deal in one way or another with ministerial obligation.

Motion No. 20 gives the Minister an active role by himself and with his cabinet colleagues. Motion No. 21, as I have already said, removes from Clause 5 any excuse for inaction and commits the Minister to ongoing consultation with ethnocultural communities and multicultural organizations.

I need hardly say that organizations nationally and provincially have been very concerned about the need for such close consultation. They have all too often been promised consultation by Ministers and then have not seen it actually carried out. Again, with its basis for the implementation of multicultural policy, I have endeavoured in Motion No. 21 to place that obligation on the Ministers so that they will actually realize, having read the Act once it is proclaimed, that these are the requirements of the position.

Motion No. 24 amends Clause 5 in order to ensure consultation with provincial and territorial Governments. I do not think it is any secret that the first federal-provincial meeting of Ministers responsible for multiculturalism, a meeting which the Hon. Member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta) carried out as the first multiculturalism Minister of this Conservative Government, was thought by people in some of the provinces as a very important meeting in forcing provincial Governments to give attention to multiculturalism and in encouraging them to press on with the elaboration of their own policies. Recognizing from our side that this policy of 1971 needs to be pushed on in the various jurisdictions of Canada, an obligation to have such meetings with provincial and territorial Governments could be of great value.

• (1900)

Finally, in Motions Nos. 25 and 26 I have attempted to amend Clause 6 in order to strengthen the obligations of all Ministers of the Crown to advance the multiculturalism policy. In Motion No. 26 I have attempted, again deliberately, to ensure that Ministers' Departments develop annual plans designed to ensure that the multiculturalism policy, to which lip service is so often paid politically, and to which governments have ostensibly been committed for many years past, is actually achieved in practice and becomes the basis for action in the various Departments of the Government.

These various motions are designed to strengthen the Bill and ensure it is a reality for the federal Government.

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Madam Speaker, I would like to address two motions of the group that I proposed on behalf of the Liberal Party, that is to say, Motions Nos. 22 and 23. Before doing that, I would like to say that I support my friend's Motion No. 26 in that it is very similar to the motion I moved earlier, a motion which was ultimately defeated, to try to get Ministers and their Departments to develop annual plans to foster and enhance multiculturalism not in broad general strokes but in very specific and tangible ways.

With respect to Motion No. 22, in essence it seeks to change very weak wording to very strong and committed wording. Clause 5 of the Bill talks about ministerial obligations. It says the Minister "may" take such measures as the Minister considers appropriate to implement the multiculturalism policy of Canada, and so on. I propose here, as I have in other areas of the Bill, to change the word "may" to "shall".

Some Members might think that is nit-picking. Some people might think that it is being too particular. I suggest it is not. From the opening paragraph to the closing paragraph of the Bill we have a lot of words which should have been changed to make the Bill more forceful, more secure, more tangible. We should avoid talking about doing something or wanting something done, and instead ensure that it will be done. It has to be seen as an obligation on the part of the Minister to fulfil a number of multiculturalism policies that I concur in. However, if the language suggests that the Minister "may" do it if he or she wants to, then you have a situation where one Minister of one Party will do it and a subsequent Minister of the same Party or of a different Party may not. That leads to inconsistencies and differences in the implementation of programs. The language in the Bill is crucial if we are to maintain consistency, commitment, and national standards.

Motion No. 23 refers to Clause 5 of the Bill which says again the Minister "may" enter into an agreement or arrangement with any province respecting implementation of the multiculturalism policy of Canada. My motion would have the Bill say that the Minister "shall" engage in ongoing dialogue with all provinces and territories respecting implementation of the multiculturalism policy of Canada and so on.

There are two key points to this motion. The first one concerns changing "may" to "shall". The first conference called by the then Minister, the Hon. Member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta), was I believe held in 1985. There have been no other meetings since then. It would have been very valuable and productive to have had a commitment to annual meetings of First Ministers on such an important issue. As it was, it was a one-day wonder and nothing was produced. There was no tangible follow up to that meeting. Had there been another set of meetings in 1986, 1987 and again this year there would have been action on a number of priority items. As it was, it was an initiative by one Minister that simply went nowhere.

The second point of my motion concerns the territories. Right now the legislation stops at provinces. I note that the Minister of State for Multiculturalism (Mr. Weiner) is in the

House right now and I applaud him for being here. I ask him to consider adding the word "territories" to the Bill. I ask myself, why leave out two territories when we are talking about a national policy? We sometimes hear calls from the wilderness, if you will, where people feel that they are being left out of the process. There is some justification for that feeling, particularly when we look at the Meech Lake Accord and other issues. This is a case in point. The legislation speaks only to arrangements on multiculturalism with the provinces. I suggest it would be in keeping with this country's history to include the territories in any discussion of multiculturalism.

I hope the Minister and his Government recognize the failure, and I am not saying it was intentional, perhaps oversight is a better word, in leaving the territories out. I ask the Government to remedy that by including the territories in discussions with the provinces.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The first question is on Motion No. 20 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 21 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11) the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred. The next question is on Motion No. 22. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

• (1910)

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11) the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 23. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11) the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 24. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11) the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 25. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11) the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 26. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11) the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

We will resume debate on Motion Nos. 27 and 28.

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West) moved:

Motion No. 27.

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 7 by striking out lines 37 to 45 at page 6 and substituting the following therefor:

"7.(1) The Minister shall establish a council to advise and assist the Minister on the implementation of this Act and any other matter relating to multiculturalism and the Council shall be constituted as follows:

(a) to be called "Canadian Multiculturalism Advisory Council";

(b) to consist of 56 members with the following distribution; British Columbia-7, Alberta-4, Saskatchewan-3, Manitoba-4, Ontario-16, Quebec-12, New Brunswick-2, Nova Scotia-2, Prince Edward Island-2, Newfoundland-2, Yukon-1, North West Territories-1;

(c) to have an executive committee of 1 member from each province;

(d) to have a membership which reflects the multicultural diversity of Canada;

(e) appointments to the Council shall be made by order in council from among nominees recommended by organizations of ethnocultural minorities and other organizations working in the area of multiculturalism.

(2) The members of the Council shall consult with ethnocultural communities in their provinces on a regular basis and transfer grassroots advice to the Minister.

(3) The Council shall make an annual appearance before the appropriate Committee of the House of Commons.

(4) The Council shall make an annual report to the Minister and a ministerial response to its report shall be made public.

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon) moved:

Motion No. 28.

That Bill C-93 be amended in Clause 7 by striking out lines 37 to 45 at page 6 and substituting the following therefor:

"7.(1) The Minister shall establish an Advisory Council to assist the Minister and Government in implementation of this Act and any other matter relating to the multiculturalism policy of Canada.

(2) The members of the Advisory Council shall be appointed by order in council from nominees elected by the various ethnocultural communities and national multicultural organizations."

Mr. Marchi: Madam Speaker, I would like to address my remarks to Motion No. 27, which is one of the last two amendments at report stage. Motion No. 27 refers to the section in the Bill which addresses the Canadian Multiculturalism Council. The CMC, or the advisory committee, is a body established by the Government to advise the Minister of the

day on issues affecting the multicultural policy of the country. I have proposed a much more description and, I believe, a much more effective direction to the CMC as it now is.

Clause 7(1) of the Bill says:

> The Minister may establish an advisory committee to advise and assist the Minister on the implementation of this Act and any other matter relating to multiculturalism and, in consultation with such organizations representing multicultural interests as the Minister deems appropriate, may appoint the members and designate the chairman and other officers thereof.

The language is noncommittal. The word "may" is used which does not commit the Minister to any specific action. A different approach to implementation may be taken by subsequent Ministers, thereby confusing the entire CMC as we know it today.

In addition to proposing in Motion No. 27 that "the Minister shall establish a council to advise and assist the Minister", I go to some length in proposing the shape of the Canadian Multiculturalism Advisory Council, the number of members, the issue of an executive committee, the fact that the membership should reflect the diversity of the Canadian mosaic, and that appointments should be made from lists submitted by the various organizations across the country in order to ensure that the people appointed to this committee will reflect the diversity which exists in Canada and will be in touch with the communities which they purport to represent.

These amendments reflect the proposals which were made for the Canadian Multiculturalism Advisory Committee by the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism which the Government rejected.

It is particularly important that we have an executive comprised of one member from each province. This will eliminate having a large organization coming to Ottawa to meet and advise the Minister. I do not think that large numbers are as effective as a smaller group. In Motion No. 27 I suggest that the council be formed of the 56 members which I propose: seven from British Columbia, four from Alberta, three from Saskatchewan, four from Manitoba, 16 from Ontario, 12 from Québec, two from New Brunswick, two from Nova Scotia, two from Prince Edward Island, two from Newfoundland, one from the Yukon, and one from the Northwest Territories. I recommend that only one member from each province and territory form an executive to come to Ottawa. This will reduce the expense and will enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of that body.

The other important element is that appointments by the Minister to the Canadian Advisory Council on Multiculturalism should be rooted in the large number of organizations which are working on behalf of multiculturalism across the country. It is now alleged, unfortunately, that many of the appointments tend to be very political and partisan. In fact the Vice-President, Mr. Peter McCreath, acknowledged, in a paper to which I will be alluding later, that the current CMC is nothing more than an appendix of the current Government.

I am not suggesting that that kind of political partisanship did not take place in previous administrations—it did. I am suggesting that we should rise above that in order to appoint people who can enhance and propel the policy of multiculturalism in the future. I am not suggesting that the current membership of the existing CMC is not interested in multiculturalism. However, there is a perception in the country that they tend toward having a political partisan base.

• (1920)

There is a real concern that members who are appointed to this committee to represent one cultural group or community are not known to that group or community. They ask what is the purpose of having a committee of individuals who are not rooted in the actual communities and cultural groups themselves to advise the Minister and the Government. I believe my amendment would attempt to redress that perception which has existed for a number of years. Our obligation is to eradicate that perception. In that way we will build confidence and a positive perception of government institutions.

Motion No. 27 is an attempt to go beyond the proposition in Bill C-93, to make it more of a commitment so that the Minister will, rather than perhaps, appoint a committee. It is an attempt to root the membership from actual membership lists provided by groups and organizations across the country. It provides for a specific membership allotted to the provinces and territories and that there be an executive committee.

If we follow this course, I believe we will be in better tune with the workings of government machinery and in better tune and synchronization with the aspirations of communities across this country.

Hopefully the Government will see the benefit of such a proposition, which was included in the unanimous report of the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism which urged the Government to reform the area of the advisory committee in a very real and profound way so as to remove the very negative way many people viewed the appointment of individuals to an important body.

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Madam Speaker, the last two motions before us for debate deal with the constitution of an advisory body to the Government, particularly to the Minister of State for Multiculturalism (Mr. Weiner). This is a matter of great importance. Given the changes that have occurred in the Bill, presumably on the suggestion of the Minister or the will of government Members, it is particularly important to deal with this matter in a responsible way.

I recognize that the motions with which we were dealing a few moments ago deal with the commitment of the Minister of Multiculturalism's policy and that Conservative caucus members believe the Bill does not need to be strengthened in those areas. However, I want to ask some serious questions of the Minister and seek to persuade him and his colleagues of the possibility of changing their minds on this matter.

When the Bill first came to the House, Clause 7 read: "The Minister may establish a council to advise and assist the Minister on the implementation of this Act and any other matter relating to multiculturalism". When the committee considered this particular clause in the Bill, the Conservative members, who were the only ones present that afternoon, decided to change "council" to an "advisory committee". Frankly, the logic for that never became clear to me. It might be worth the Minister's taking a few moments to explain why an advisory committee would be a preferable change.

The Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) already referred to the long history of a consultative committee on multiculturalism. It became the multicultural council, and the present council has been advising Ministers for some years. While its members have been reappointed and some new ones added since the Government took office in 1984, there has been a good deal of continuity from its first constitution to the present one. It has been an advisory council throughout this period and, admittedly, it has tended to be perilously close to the Minister's pocket in many ways.

It has rarely said anything in public. I believe the only time the multiculturalism council to the present Government said anything in public was when it decided to, I might say, shoot its mouth off in support of the Government's failure to act on Japanese Canadian redress. Many Canadians would regard that as a rather lamentable statement.

While it has done important things for Government, it has not really lived up to the advisory council nature that one would have expected.

Perhaps the Minister is suggesting that since the council does not do much it may as well be turned into an advisory committee, to make it even more in house. The Member for York West quoted, in a document sent to a previous Minister, the vice-chairman's description of the Canadian Multicultural Council as being all Tories working for the re-election of the Government. I want to say quite advisedly that I do not believe that is true of all the members of the CMC. I am certain some of them are not card-carrying members of the Conservative Party, but are members who are really committed to multiculturalism and for whom the re-election of the Government is less important, if I may say, than the realization of the multicultural policy. I suggest that to change the multiculturalism council to an advisory committee seems a rather serious demotion.

What alternatives exist? We are dealing here with two motions. The Member for York West has spoken well to his proposal. I was involved in the elaboration of that proposal as a member of the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism. Obviously, I think his motion is quite good.

I chose not to become involved in the details of numbers and constitution concerned with executive committee and so on. As a member of the standing committee I am not withdrawing my support from those detailed proposals with which the standing committee dealt, and will likely support this motion. In my motion, however, I endeavoured to turn the advisory council to the Minister into a council that would be explicitly advisory to the Minister and to government.

Let me take a moment to read Clause 7 in part as it would read if my motion were accepted. Clause 7(1) would read:

> The Minister shall establish an Advisory Council to assist the Minister and Government in implementation of this Act and any other matter relating to the multiculturalism policy of Canada.

Clause 7(2) would read:

> The members of the Advisory Council shall be appointed in order in council from nominees elected by the various ethnocultural communities and national multicultural organizations.

There is a deliberate attempt in the first paragraph to establish a body that will be advisory to the whole Government, not simply to the Minister. I think that would make it a more public body than has been true of the consultative councils on multiculturalism before and the present multiculturalism council as such. In considering such a body, we might have an expectation of something like the Advisory Council on the Status of Women. In fact, I thought quite explicitly of that model in another area. In that case, of course, there were national organizations which thought it advisable to have an action committee in communities and nationally to ensure that the Government was sufficiently pressed. However, the Advisory Council on the Status of Women has had research capacity. It has, I believe, a full time chairperson and staff who carry on the work. I think that provides a model which is really far preferable than an advisory committee as presently stated in the Bill.

• (1930)

With respect to the second paragraph, I have been quite concerned to ensure this body would relate to the communities. Whether people were all Liberals in the past and all Conservatives now, and I do not suppose it would be either of those situations, what was, I fear, all too often the case was that persons, for whatever reason—primarily, I suppose, they had to be known to the politicians—did not necessarily translate into being well positioned in the communities and well aware of what the people wanted. There was in fact quite a real danger that the persons who made up this so-called advisory council to Government were not equipped in their experience and involvement to be the best of advisers to Government.

Therefore in both of these motions, and in the report of the standing committee, there is an attempt to ensure that these persons will be nominated by the communities and, of course, appointed by Order in Council of the Government of Canada to constitute such an advisory body. In fact, in the case of the Manitoba Intercultural Council there is precisely such a body. The majority of the members of the Manitoba Intercultural Council are in fact members of that council on precisely this basis. That ensures that the council is well grounded in the communities and equipped to speak for them, which I think is the all important thing.

I hope the Minister may comment at least briefly on his own vision of the advisory committee. If the arguments my colleague and I have been making for a different structure were to impress him, perhaps he would be interested in taking up one or the other proposal as he has done once or twice already this afternoon.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The question is on Motion No. 27.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on motion No. 28.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at report stage of the Bill now before the House.

The first question is on Motion No. 7.

Call in the Members.

The House divided on Motion No. 7, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 452*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand	Foster	Orlikow
Axworthy	Gauthier	Pépin
Baker	Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)	Prud'homme
Caccia	Kaplan	Riis
Copps	Langdon	Robichaud
de Jong	MacLellan	Skelly
Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)	Marchi	Waddell—24
Finestone	McCurdy	
	Mitchell	

NAYS

Members

Belsher	Hockin	Reid
Blenkarn	Jardine	Reimer
Browes	Jepson	Ricard
Charest	Kempling	St-Julien
Cochrane	Ladouceur	Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Cooper	Lanthier	Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Crofton	Layton	Stackhouse
Dantzer	Lewis	Stewart
Darling	MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)	Taylor
Duplessis	MacDougall (Timiskaming)	Thacker
Edwards	Mailly	Tupper
Ellis	McDermid	Van De Walle
Fennell	Nicholson (Niagara Falls)	Vincent
Fontaine	Nickerson	Weiner
Fraleigh	Oberle	Wenman
Friesen	O'Neil	White
Girard	Oostrom	Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek)—63
Gormley	Pennock	
Gottselig	Peterson	
Graham	Pietz	
Greenaway	Plourde	
Gustafson		
Halliday		
Hardey		
Harvey		

● (2000)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier), on a point of order.

Mr. Gauthier: Madam Speaker, I believe there would be a disposition to apply the vote that has just been held to all subsequent motions and, in reverse, to the concurrence motion.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is there unanimous consent?

An Hon. Member: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): There is not unanimous consent. The Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis).

Mr. Riis: I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker. I assumed that we would be applying the results of the vote to all subsequent motions at report stage as well as applying it in reverse order to the concurrence motion.

However, if that is not the case, we ought to have another vote on the concurrence motion. Our intention would be to apply this vote to all of the subsequent ones, including the concurrence motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Consequently, the vote which has just been taken will be applied to Motions Nos. 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28. For the concurrence motion we will be using the same vote but in reverse. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

An Hon. Member: No.

The House divided on Motion No. 8, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 453*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Kaplan
Langdon
MacLellan
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Skelly
Waddell—24

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Dantzer
Darling
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hockin
Jardine
Jepson
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McDermid
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Tupper
Van De Walle
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current—Maple Creek)—63

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 454*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Kaplan
Langdon
MacLellan
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Skelly
Waddell—24

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Dantzer
Darling
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hockin
Jardine
Jepson
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McDermid
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Tupper
Van De Walle
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current—Maple Creek)—63

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 12, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 455*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Kaplan
Langdon
MacLellan
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Skelly
Waddell—24

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Dantzer
Darling
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hockin
Jardine
Jepson
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McDermid
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Tupper
Van De Walle
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)—63

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 14, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 456*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Kaplan
Langdon
MacLellan
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Skelly
Waddell—24

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Dantzer
Darling
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hockin
Jardine
Jepson
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McDermid
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Tupper
Van De Walle
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)—63

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 15, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 457*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Kaplan
Langdon
MacLellan
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Skelly
Waddell—24

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Dantzer
Darling
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hockin
Jardine
Jepson
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)

MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Mailly
McDermid
Nicholson (Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Tupper
Van De Walle
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek)—63

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 17, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 458*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Kaplan
Langdon
MacLellan
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Skelly
Waddell—24

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Dantzer
Darling
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hockin
Jardine
Jepson
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Mailly
McDermid
Nicholson (Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Tupper
Van De Walle
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek)—63

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 18, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 459*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Kaplan
Langdon
MacLellan
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Skelly
Waddell—24

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Dantzer
Darling
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hockin
Jardine
Jepson
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Mailly
McDermid
Nicholson (Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Tupper
Van De Walle
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek)—63

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 20, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 460*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Kaplan
Langdon
MacLellan
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Skelly
Waddell—24

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Dantzer
Darling
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hockin
Jardine
Jepson
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McDermid
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Tupper
Van De Walle
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current—Maple Creek)—63

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 21, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 461*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Kaplan
Langdon
MacLellan
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Skelly
Waddell—24

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Dantzer
Darling
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hockin
Jardine
Jepson
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McDermid
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Tupper
Van De Walle
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current—Maple Creek)—63

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 22, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 462*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Kaplan
Langdon
MacLellan
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Skelly
Waddell—24

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Dantzer
Darling
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hockin
Jardine
Jepson
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McDermid
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Tupper
Van De Walle
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current—Maple Creek)—63

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 23, which was negatived on the following division:

Canadian Multiculturalism Act

(*Division No. 463*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Kaplan
Langdon
MacLellan
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Skelly
Waddell—24

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Dantzer
Darling
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hockin
Jardine
Jepson
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McDermid
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Tupper
Van De Walle
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)—63

The House divided on Motion No. 24, which was negatived on the following division:

The next question is on Motion No. 24, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 464*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Kaplan
Langdon
MacLellan
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Skelly
Waddell—24

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Dantzer
Darling
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hockin
Jardine
Jepson
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McDermid
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Tupper
Van De Walle
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)—63

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 25, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 465*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Kaplan
Langdon
MacLellan
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Skelly
Waddell—24

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Dantzer
Darling
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hockin
Jardine
Jepson
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McDermid
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde

Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Tupper
Van De Walle
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)—63

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 26, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 466*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Kaplan
Langdon
MacLellan
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Skelly
Waddell—24

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Dantzer
Darling
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hockin
Jardine
Jepson
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McDermid
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Tupper
Van De Walle
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)—63

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 27, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 467*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Kaplan
Langdon
MacLellan
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Skelly
Waddell—24

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blenkarn
Browes
Charest
Cochrane
Cooper
Crofton
Dantzer
Darling
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hockin
Jardine
Jepson
Kempling
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mailly
McDermid
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Tupper
Van De Walle
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)—63

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 28, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 468*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Caccia
Copps
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Gauthier
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Kaplan
Langdon
MacLellan
Marchi
McCurdy
Mitchell
Orlikow
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Skelly
Waddell—24

NAYS

Members

Belsher	Hockin	Reid
Blenkarn	Jardine	Reimer
Browes	Jepson	Ricard
Charest	Kempling	St-Julien
Cochrane	Ladouceur	Scott
Cooper	Lanthier	(Victoria—Haliburton)
Crofton	Layton	Scott
Dantzer	Lewis	(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Darling	MacDonald	Stackhouse
Duplessis	(Kingston and	Stewart
Edwards	the Islands)	Taylor
Ellis	MacDougall	Thacker
Fennell	(Timiskaming)	Tupper
Fontaine	Mailly	Van De Walle
Fraleigh	McDermid	Vincent
Friesen	Nicholson	Weiner
Girard	(Niagara Falls)	Wenman
Gormley	Nickerson	White
Gottselig	Oberle	Wilson
Graham	O'Neil	(Swift Current
Greenaway	Oostrom	—Maple Creek)—63
Gustafson	Pennock	
Halliday	Peterson	
Hardey	Pietz	
Harvey	Plourde	

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications), on behalf of the Secretary of State, moved that Bill C-93, an Act for the preservation and enhancement of multiculturalism in Canada, be concurred in as amended.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Minister of State on a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: Madam Speaker, there have been discussions among the Parties. I think you would find consent for third reading to proceed immediately. I have discussed it with the other Parties, and I think that there may be Members who wish to address this matter beyond the hour of ten o'clock. We have agreed not to see the clock at 10 p.m.

We have also agreed that if a recorded division is demanded, such recorded division would be deferred until 3 p.m. tomorrow, and that there will be no quorum calls during that time. In the event that the proceedings should finish before 10 p.m., there would be no further business called by the Government and we would call it 10 p.m.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The House has heard the suggestions of the Hon. Minister of State. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Member for Saint-Denis on a point of order.

Mr. Prud'homme: Madam Speaker, who ever said that the Official Opposition never co-operates in helping process legislation in an easy fashion?

• (2010)

Miss MacDonald (for Secretary of State of Canada) moved that the Bill be read the third time and passed.

Hon. Gerry Weiner (Minister of State (Multiculturalism)): Madam Speaker, I rise today with great pleasure to participate in the final stages of the debate of Bill C-93, the Canadian multiculturalism Bill. I want to tell you how proud I am to be the Minister of State for Multiculturalism during the final passage of this historic Bill.

This is a world-class Bill. It is a first of its kind. It is the solemn recognition by the Parliament of Canada on behalf of all Canadians of the fundamental importance of multiculturalism in our society. It gives concrete expression to the multicultural guarantee contained in Section 27 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. There are so many people I could thank for their work, foresight, and dedication in making this Bill possible, but I would like to single out two of them in particular: Mr. George Corn, immediate Past President of the Canadian Ethnocultural Council—

Mr. Prud'homme: Hear, hear!

Mr. Marchi: Hear, hear!

Mr. Weiner: —whose steadfast dedication for so many years has been an inspiration to so many, and David Crombie who, as Secretary of State, introduced the Bill on December 1 last—

Mr. Prud'homme: A great guy; he was too good and that is why he left.

Mr. Weiner: —and whose vision of being Canadian is a vision which encompasses us all.

I have followed the debate on Bill C-93 from its introduction to today. I have been impressed by the thoughtfulness of the many witnesses who came before the legislative committee. I have also been impressed by the thoughtfulness of the hundreds, yes, thousands of Canadians who have written both to me and to my predecessor. Underlying those submissions was the recognition that now was the time for the Canadian multiculturalism Bill.

Now is the the time for the Parliament of Canada to come together to recognize the multicultural reality of this nation and to celebrate our multicultural heritage.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, we have before us a Bill that provides an approach to multiculturalism based on co-operation, incentive, consensus and choice. We have before us a Bill that is a solemn recognition of what we are building together, all of us, in this great country of ours.

My appearance before the Legislative Committee at the beginning of April was one of my first official functions as Minister of State (Multiculturalism). On that occasion I indicated my intention of working with the Committee to improve and reinforce the Bill and make it more understandable to all Canadians. That is exactly what the Committee has done. It has reinforced the Bill, from the preamble down to the very last clause.

[*English*]

We were searching for the best way of expressing in this Bill our belief that multiculturalism is part and parcel of our Canadian identity and heritage. I feel that we settled on the best wording, that multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic of our heritage and our evolving identity.

We sought a way to make even stronger the system of parliamentary accountability which is at the heart of this Bill. I think we found that way by the amendment that the Government of Canada and all its institutions shall undertake their responsibilities relative to the implementation of the multiculturalism policy of Canada. This one simple amendment gives concrete force to the commitment of the whole of the Government of Canada. We have not needed to resort to complex technicalities to deal with what was basically a very simple problem. As I have said, we will have in this Bill a very forceful parliamentary accountability process for the implementation of the multiculturalism policy of Canada. The combination of a Minister directly responsible to Parliament, clearer and more direct obligations for all Ministers and all federal institutions, a professional full-time departmental secretariat, a strengthened ministerial advisory committee, and a key scrutiny role for the standing committee make for a powerful, effective, yet co-operative approach to multiculturalism.

All across our nation Canadians are supporting Bill C-93. They see a Government that has listened and has worked to improve this Bill. They see a Government that is reaching out to all Canadians, offering everyone the vision of a new and stronger Canada. Just last week the Canadian Ethnocultural Council, whose members were all here today and may still be here, I hope, voiced enthusiastic support for this Bill and its speedy passage. They support this Bill because we worked co-operatively with them to strengthen it. This is what accountability to Parliament is all about. We have just proved that this Bill works. It works right now.

Some of my colleagues across the aisle still want some kind of formal commissioner with broad coercive powers. They seek to transplant an organizational model that suits one setting into new ground. What they have failed to recognize is the fundamentally different situation for the implementation of the multiculturalism policy in Canada in comparison with putting in force the Official Languages Act and carrying out the protection of fundamental human rights under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Canadian Human Rights Act, where the aim is to remedy breaches of legally established individual rights.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the implementation of the multiculturalism policy will build upon many of the above-mentioned factors. Many of the problems Canadians face involve discrimination based on race, colour, and national or ethnic origin, and the Canadian Human Rights Commission has been mandated to meet those problems head-on. The Commitee amended the preamble to Bill C-93 to remind Canadians of the importance of the role of the Commission in the fight against discrimination.

[*English*]

This Bill encompasses a broad line of commitments, commitments which start in the preamble itself, which are expanded upon and given reality in the broad policy commitments contained in Clause 3(1) of the Bill, and which are made specific obligations for federal institutions in Clause 3(2). The Bill contains a very clear system of responsibilities and accountability for me as Minister and for every one of my ministerial colleagues. That accountability system is to the Parliament of Canada.

I do not feel we need import into this very clear system an external compliance and monitoring agency. Such would be contrary to the very spirit of this Bill. This Bill is about the primacy of Parliament, and surely we in Parliament can monitor our own affairs. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we are serious about the very heart and specific commitments that we are making. That is why I was delighted to announce that we will be spending $192 million over the next five years to implement the new directions of the multiculturalism policy of Canada, an increase of $62 million in new funds for multiculturalism.

I have reoriented the programs of the multiculturalism sector to reflect the major themes of the Bill. Three areas are paramount: race relations and cultural understanding; heritage, cultures, and languages; and community support programs. That is also why I am establishing a multiculturalism secretariat to assist other federal Departments and agencies to implement the multiculturalism policy and to assist me in my important duty of reporting to Parliament on its implementation.

In our first Speech from the Throne delivered in the autumn of 1984 we identified certain key priorities. Two very important ones were, and remain, national reconciliation and social justice. This Bill before us today is about both these objectives. National reconciliation is all about being Canadian together. We can achieve our dreams. The Canadian multiculturalism Bill is part of this process.

This Bill is also about social justice. It stands as a landmark of a positive and pro-active approach to equality rights. We already have in the Charter, the Canadian Human Rights Act, and the employment equity legislation, a powerful set of anti-

discrimination instruments, but we need a pro-active policy approach by the Government on behalf of all Canadians to break down the barriers and misunderstandings that have sometimes kept us apart. That is provided in the Canadian multiculturalism Bill.

We pledge to ensure that federal boards and agencies reflect the multicultural reality of our society. We have kept that promise. In a little over three years we have doubled the number of ethnocultural appointments to important positions on boards, commissions, and agencies of the Government of Canada. We introduced the first numerical objectives for the Public Service for the hiring of visible minorities to strengthen and complement our existing programs for women, disabled persons, and aboriginal peoples. Our employment equity legislation and policies have taken our priority of social justice into the workplace.

• (2020)

Equality of participation is our objective throughout federal jurisdiction: the Public Service, federal contractors, and federally-regulated industries. This Government has been opened up to cultural and racial minorities as never before, and we shall continue to do so. That is fairness and it is a major step toward equality of opportunity, toward social justice, and toward national reconciliation, the things which were and remain key priorities.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, we are crossing the threshold of a new era within our federation. We are also entering into a new era in international relations. The years to come will reveal unprecedented perspectives of growth, prosperity and peace.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Multiculturalism Act is another symbol of that new era. It sets the tone. It recognizes our diverse origins, the fact that we and our ancestors come from the four corners of the earth, and it charts the course to be followed by all Canadians.

[*English*]

During the second reading debate on this Bill, the Hon. David Crombie quoted Dr. Barbara Ward, the noted British economist who has described Canada as the world's first international nation. I would like to take a moment to reflect on what that really means. It means that Canada is in essence a microcosm of the world. Other nations look to us for leadership in the areas of human rights and equality rights.

The passage of this Bill will send a signal to every corner of the globe that Canada truly is a land of equality and opportunity. We will show clearly that Canada is a land which respects and cherishes individual liberty and allows every person the freedom to cherish and maintain his or her own heritage.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it is with confidence that I call on all Canadian men and women to support the ideals and the principles set forth in the Canadian Multiculturalism Act. They reflect the cultural and racial diversity of our society; they show both where we have come from, and our course for the future.

[*English*]

This Bill is about co-operation and building together. It is about what makes Canada a very special nation. It is about our future.

The debate on this Bill is drawing to a close in the House of Commons, and I call on all Members from both sides of the aisle to join with me in affirming the principles of this Bill and in supporting this historic piece of legislation. I hope the Members of the other place will give this Bill speedy passage so that very soon the Canadian Multiculturalism Act will be law.

We are a nation of peoples from all corners of the globe. We believe in living together and working together as a family of individuals, and we are secure in our diversity. We are proud of our equality and we are confident in our future.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York-West): Mr. Speaker, I also am very proud to speak on this Bill tonight because the principle expressed in this Bill is very important for our whole nation, for all the regions of our country and for all Canadian citizens who come from all over the world. It is a Bill which is very agreeable to many people throughout the country, but it is a Bill that this Parliament had the opportunity to improve, to strengthen by amendments, and thus to establish as a very sound piece of legislation which we can be proud of and which will guarantee multiculturalism a permanent future in this country.

[*English*]

I too am pleased to speak on third reading stage of Bill C-93, the Canadian multiculturalism Bill because the principle and the concept which underlie the multiculturalism Bill is one that I believe all Members from all sides of the House subscribe to and will defend and promote. However, the Bill could have and should have been made better.

This multiculturalism Bill was a window of opportunity that would have provided this Parliament, and particularly this Government, with the opportunity to listen to Members of the House of Commons, to members of the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism who tabled a unanimous report, and to the multitude of organizations which came before the Government and the committee to request and demand a number of things that would create the national fabric of multiculturalism in a piece of legislation.

While I agree with the principles and the concepts of the Bill, and while I certainly agree with some fundamental parts of it, I believe very sincerely and deeply that this Government to a certain degree missed an opportunity to try to deliver a piece of legislation that would have captured the imaginations

and furthered the aspirations of the current generation of Canadians and would have protected and embodied that enthusiastic support for future generations of Canadian citizens.

Bill C-93 is not a new initiative. It is not a unique undertaking. It had its roots and its beginnings in Bill C-84 which was introduced in the last Parliament and unfortunately died on the Order Paper after first reading because of the impending election. It was introduced by the then Liberal Minister, the Hon. David Collenette. It was not the entire answer. I admit and recognize that, and I have said so in debate in committee and in Parliament in the last number of years. Yet it was an important first step toward recognizing the need for an independent, comprehensive, strong and vibrant multiculturalism Bill which would provide a legislative framework around policies and programs. It would provide that the policies and programs could not be here today and gone tomorrow with another Government. Somehow, they would become part of the legislative foundation upon which this country is built.

I believe the proof of that innovative idea of 1984 was that after the 1984 election, the Hon. Member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta), the then Minister, sent Bill C-84 across Canada to various organizations and communities. He asked them for their input so that together we could build upon the strength of the 1984 legislation and try to correct the weaknesses.

It has been almost four years since this administration took office. This Bill provided the first opportunity we have had to discuss a major undertaking in multiculturalism policy. It has taken quite a while. It has taken almost the entire mandate of this Government to bring this Bill to fruition through a number of successive Ministers.

Beyond the speeches and rhetoric that come along with being an elected representative, beyond the speeches we hear from government Ministers who go across the land to various functions and picnics, I ask myself, as many other Canadians are asking themselves: "What other new directions have been taken in enhancing multiculturalism in the last four years?" What new initiative or expansion of existing programs was announced by the Government in 1984 when it assumed the national leadership of our country? I ask the Government how far the cause of multiculturalism has been advanced beyond what it found when it assumed office?

• (2030)

The answers to those questions go beyond the debate which has taken place over the last number of hours today and the second reading debate some months ago. Apart from that, however, I think there has been a vacuum in innovative and creative leadership on our multicultural policy that has been caused in part by the revolving door of Ministers we have seen in this portfolio during the four years of Conservative government. First, the Hon. Member for Lisgar assumed the portfolio, followed by the Hon. Member for Halton (Mr. Jelinek), then the former Member for Rosedale, and now the current Minister from Montreal. That revolving door of Ministers has not engendered confidence among Canadians in this policy, or encouraged consistency. Each new Minister has different priorities which he or she wishes to pursue. That has not made for a very strong, consistent, or effective multiculturalism policy over the last four years.

I believe the successes of the Conservative Government in multiculturalism policies have been very few and far between. The Government has essentially tried to put its own brand on the directorate and failed. The Hon. Member for Lisgar had his difficulties. The Hon. Member for Halton wanted to introduce a "multiculturalism means business" policy and that did not fly.

Compare all that to previous Governments. Some people have asked why the Bill was not brought in earlier. That is a good question. Why was this not done earlier? Yet if we look at the record of previous Governments and the evolution of the various programs affecting multiculturalism, it speaks to a certain commitment and momentum that went beyond rhetoric.

For example, the first multiculturalism policy was enunciated in this House in 1971 by then Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau. In 1972 we saw the first Minister of State for Multiculturalism appointed. In 1973 was established the Consultative Council on Multiculturalism, the first advisory body to the federal Government on issues pertaining to multiculturalism. Then we had the cabinet decision to offer financial assistance to the performing and visual arts programs and projects. We had creation of the intercultural communications program, creation of the writing and publication program, and creation of the Canadian ethnic studies program.

In 1977 we saw the cultural enrichment program approved by Cabinet. In 1981 we had the first national conference on immigrant women, held in Saskatoon. There was the first national conference on heritage languages. The first national conference on multicultural heritage and education was held in Winnipeg. In 1981 we saw establishment of multicultural centres to allow individual ethnocultural communities to share resources and expertise and also help the voluntary sector organizations working in the area of cross-cultural communications.

In 1981 the Government included in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms Section 15 which prohibited discrimination because of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, or religion. Then of course there was Section 77 which ensured that the Charter would always recognize the multicultural heritage of Canadians. Also in 1981 we saw the national program to combat racism and a new race relations unit was established.

In 1982 Cabinet approved a doubling of the budget from $11.4 million to $25.4 million to allow for new initiatives and new programs in the social development area and to augment support for cultural retention. There was also the first national symposium on race relations and the law held in Vancouver. The first national conference on minorities and the media was

held in Toronto. There were guidelines issued on representative depiction of cultural diversity in the advertising of all government Departments, and funds provided for special training courses for visible minority Canadians in co-operation with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

In 1983 the then Minister responsible for multiculturalism introduced a notice of motion for the appointment of a special all-Party parliamentary task force on the participation of visible minority Canadians in Canadian society, to examine the situation of visible minorities and to look for constructive ways of improving race relations. That was approved by Parliament in June of 1983. Following that, we had the report *Equality Now*, tabled in March of 1984, and the Government response was tabled in June of that same year.

To go back to 1983, the Liberal Cabinet reaffirmed its commitment to cultural retention by tripling the funding and providing for inflationary increases for heritage language funding. New moneys allowed for the production of Canadian teaching materials as well.

Then we had the establishment of the national resource centre for heritage language at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. There was the announcement of a strategy for inclusion of visible minority Canadians in the affirmative action programs of the Public Service, by the then President of the Treasury Board.

In 1984 there was new emphasis on making all sectors of Canadian society more aware of the multicultural reality which is Canada. There was a national conference focusing on business, communications, and culture. Encouraged by the then Minister, the Canadian Advertising Advisory Board established an informal referral service to advise members on the use of visible minorities in the general field and profession of advertising. New moneys were allocated and funds spent for visible minorities in a disadvantaged position as a result of institutional discrimination and racial biases. Then of course, as I mentioned, there was introduction of the multiculturalism Bill, as well as Criminal Code amendments to strengthen legislation against dissemination of hate propaganda in Canada.

Also in 1984, in co-operation with chiefs of police, there was the first national symposium on policing in a multicultural, multiracial society, held in Vancouver. The Cabinet at that time committed a further $5 million endowment to serve as a continuing and dynamic memorial to the courage and perseverance of the nisei generation of the Japanese-Canadian community, and to support initiatives developed by concerned Canadians to combat systematic racism in our society.

That, briefly and not all encompassing, is an example of what I meant by the evolution and building up of multiculturalism policy by previous Governments. I believe that exercise of establishing a foundation and building upon it has not occurred in the last four years of the current Government, until this piece of legislation was brought forward. Why? Before the last election it was very clear that the then Opposition had very ambitious programs, projects, promises, and dreams for multiculturalism policy.

• (2040)

In fact, on June 2 at a major conference in Toronto, the then Opposition Leader, today's Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), and the first Minister responsible for multiculturalism under the 1984 administration, made 46 different promises in the field of multiculturalism. They talked about cultural retention, the maintenance of liaison between government officials and the directorate, a review, increased funding, and new programs. As I look at the list of promises made, I ask myself how many of these promises were acted upon.

At that particular conference the Hon. Member for Lisgar committed that if he were to become the Minister the budget of the multiculturalism directorate would be doubled. As we debated the Estimates in 1985, 1986, and 1987 we saw that the budgets were, in some cases, lower than in previous years.

The lack of follow-up on promises cannot be better depicted than by the Japanese Canadian redress issue. The then Leader of the Opposition, the present Prime Minister, on the last day of the previous administration in Question Period, criticized the then Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, for not having gone far enough on the issue of Japanese Canadian redress. The then Opposition Leader made it a national issue, not only by raising it in the national forum but by committing himself, his Party, and his government-to-be to a process of negotiation, apology, and compensation which went beyond what the Government of 1984 was prepared to deliver. He made that a campaign issue and raised it at various campaign stops.

For four years since then the promise has been continuously avoided and ignored. At no time, for instance, did the Prime Minister meet with the National Association of Japanese Canadians despite calls, letters, and urgings from Ministers and members of the Opposition to indicate that he would have been able to offer some mobilization, some encouragement to break the log-jam which has existed for the last four years.

The first Minister of multiculturalism, the Hon. Member for Lisgar, promised negotiations when he came into office and then backed away preferring to hide behind discussions. The Hon. Member for Halton was Minister of State for Multiculturalism at the time. When he addressed this issue it seemed to me that he was more interested in trying to divide that community and in moving away from the commitment made to negotiate with the National Association of Japanese Canadians. Rather than doing that, there were questions about whether the NAJC was the dutifully elected body to speak on behalf of the Japanese Canadian community.

We then had the former Member of Parliament for Rosedale who brought an informal and gutsy approach to his service in this Parliament. I have a great deal of respect for him. In his capacity as Mayor of the City of Toronto he

captured, to a certain degree, the imagination of his generation in the sixties and seventies. He brought that refreshing attitude to this Parliament. However, when all the dust had settled on the issue of Japanese Canadian redress, the matter was not moved ahead. It was stagnating in a corner of Canada's Parliament. The current Minister is the fourth Minister to initiate discussions on Japanese Canadian redress.

I am not suggesting that the previous administration was pure on this issue. I disagreed with the previous administration's conclusion about redressing the past. I have tried, in my capacity as a Member and as the critic on multiculturalism for the Liberal Party, to overcome that position. I have tried to send the message that political Parties are able to change, are able to recognize that the policies of a previous time are not meeting the needs and aspirations of the current citizenry and leadership within the Japanese Canadian community. We were prepared to move.

However, the real issue is with the current administration. The previous administration, rightly or wrongly, took a position and defended it. This administration, led by the Prime Minister, took one position before the election and a different position for four years running. There is a question in terms of the acknowledgement, apology, and compensation, and then there is the process. The substance was never given an opportunity to materialize because there was no legitimate process allowed for that substance to be agreed upon.

I tell the Prime Minister, as rumours about an impending election circulate around the country and certainly around this Chamber, that it would do honour, not only to this Government but to this Parliament, to try to put behind us a very sad and sorry chapter in Canadian history, to try to recognize that injustice and to enable the 10,000 to 12,000 Canadians of Japanese ancestry who survive from that time to see the day when the pain in their bodies and souls will, to a certain degree, be eradicated.

I suggest that the process must be given a chance in order for a solution to be reached. The Minister and the National Association of Japanese Canadians must meet and set out the parameters. That must be followed up by negotiations with officials from both parties. Those officials must then go back to their respective organizations and analyse what happened during the bargaining session. The Minister and the national association must then come back together and try to resolve the differences which may still exist.

If there are still differences at that time, the Prime Minister should be involved in order to try to overcome the hurdles and the gulf between the NAJC and the Conservative Minister of multiculturalism. If that is not satisfactory we should consider a third party, be it a committee of this House or a one or two-person commission.

I understand the frustration with yet further study, further commissions, and further committees. However, we need to resolve this issue. It is simply too important to allow it to languish on the Order Paper, in the corridors, and in the endless meetings which have taken place on this issue. This is one issue which must be resolved. It points to the lack of leadership and commitment which has symbolized the multicultural policy of the Government.

Another aspect which deals with resolve and commitment is that of funding for the Department of Multiculturalism. Within a conference back in June, 1984, the Government of the day was saying that immediately upon assuming office it would double the budget of the multiculturalism directorate as did the Liberal Government in the mid-1980s. It was the smallest directorate of any federal Department, with an expenditure of $24 million or $1 per year per person on a per capita basis.

• (2050)

In this year's Estimates we were debating expenditures of a Department that had less moneys granted it this year in the Estimates than in 1985 or 1986. Not only did the Government fail to keep up with the cost of inflation, it failed to keep up with real money from previous years. In the last three to four years communities have pleaded with the Government and expressed their concerns. Members of the Opposition and government members on the standing committee have urged the Government for more funding.

Suddenly, with rumours of an impending election, the Minister has decided to increase the budget. That increase does not necessarily take place this year, but it is a commitment by Parliament for the next five years. Suddenly the Government will increase the funding.

Some may ask why we are complaining if this answers our concerns and the community and the Department are promised more money by the Government. Our complaint is that the budget of this Department continues to be hooked to the roller-coaster cart of an election. For some years the Department's budgets were smaller than those of the previous years. We argued against this in the House and in committee as well as throughout the country. It is quite a coincidence that suddenly the budget is increased right before a general election. The fact that this increase is a commitment by Parliament for five further years is unsatisfactory. I do not know of many other Departments that receive their financial backing in such a manner.

We have argued for a continuing, secure and encompassing set of financial resources to build the infrastructure of a Department that will not have to languish for four years with a budget that increases during election time and comes down the roller-coaster on the other side of the election. That does nothing for program delivery, for efficiency, or for the confidence Canadians will have in a Department that is well run and well managed.

The same can be said for the recent announcement increasing the advertising budgets for the third language media. The third language media plays a significant and increasing role in trying to bring the works of the federal Government and

Parliament closer to the readers of their newspapers and to the audiences of multilingual and multicultural radio and television programming. They have been complaining for a number of years about cut-backs by the Government in terms of advertising and that the money has been going primarily to English and French media. They have been complaining that there should be advertisement from all federal government Departments rather than simply the federal multiculturalism Department. The Government has ignored these complaints for three and a half years. Suddenly, again by coincidence, a few weeks ago at a major conference in Toronto the money was found to increase third language media advertising.

I am not arguing against further increases. I am not arguing that those important media outlets should not receive Government support like other newspapers and radio and television stations. I am asking that we try to stop delivering funding to the multicultural portfolio in that fashion, to get away from the short-term frills to buy favour with various constituencies at election time, and to replace it with a more long-term, genuine and comprehensive budget that will probably do more, even if the funds are smaller, than those promised during an impending election.

Not only would we have a program and a Department that could build upon its success, it would go a long way in removing the emotional cynicism that exists in certain quarters of this country about the role of a federal multiculturalism policy. One cannot put a price on the kind of educational direction that would attempt to convert those who may be suspicious of the value and advantage of such a policy.

That confidence was not engendered by the actions of some members of the Canadian Multiculturalism Council, an advisory group of individuals who give of their time and their energies to try to promote and enhance a multiculturalism policy. For the most part, they do a very credible and proud job.

However, that confidence was not instilled when, on February 24, 1986, the Deputy Chairman of the Canadian Multiculturalism Council, Mr. Peter McCreath, wrote a confidential memorandum to the then Minister of State for Multiculturalism, the present Minister of Supply and Services. He basically admitted from his own perception that the Canadian Multiculturalism Council was nothing more than an outreach of the Conservative Government. Clearly, that is not its role.

He stated on page 2 of his memorandum that there were three strains of commonality among the members of the Canadian Multiculturalism Council: "One of them is that they are all committed supporters of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada, the Government of the Right Hon. Brian Mulroney and the Minister of State for Multiculturalism".

He went on to say: "Our voluntary commitment to the Government and our wish to see it survive beyond the next general election together gives us the luxury of being able to assess the situation and present our recommendations solely in the context of what we truly believe is in the best interest of Canada and of the Conservative Government of the day".

As if that were not enough, he said: "Whatever weaknesses may be inherent in any recommendation to government from the CMC, they at least reflect and form advice and opinion from a selection of the Government's principal supporters across Canada".

That advisory committee to the Government of Canada is there to mobilize that assistance and advice, to percolate those ideas and aspirations from the grass root community organizations and various cultural constituencies across the country. That kind of manipulation, promotion and position by that advisory council is an abuse. That is not the purpose of the CMC. It is not there to protect and support, at any cost and at any interest, the particular political expediencies of one particular Party. The Canadian Multiculturalism Council exists to advise the Government on the best policy of multiculturalism. Yet, when individuals like the Deputy Vice-Chairman articulates very clearly, not once, twice, but three times, in the body of his memo that he considers the CMC as principal supporters of the Conservative Party there is something wrong.

• (2100)

There is something even more wrong when the Minister of the day, the former Member of Parliament for Rosedale, refused to remove that individual, not so the individual would not be able to serve the Government or the country or his interests in the area of multiculturalism, which I am sure he has done, but to send a message to Canadians that the Minister and the Government disavow themselves from the views of this individual. That was not done despite repeated urgings in Parliament, in committee, and in personal correspondence. That is the deep hurt. One would have thought there would have been the political courage to stand up and say: "No, that is not what the CMC stands for".

In September, 1986 some people suggested that that perhaps was an inadvertent slip by one Member and that it was water under the bridge, but we received a document from the Metro Toronto caucus of the Conservative Party. Outlined in a secret memorandum to the Minister was a number of different topics including immigration, internal communication, media, multiculturalism, appointments, prime ministerial and ministerial scheduling. It is a memorandum that is shocking in terms of the recommendations. Under immigration, for instance, the memorandum talks about trying to take advantage of ministerial permits. It states that Canada issued approximately 6,500 ministerial permits in 1985. Of these, only some 10 per cent were issued by the Minister's office. The balance was used by visa officers, CIC, and departmental staff. It states the political potential of ministerial permits is obviously being allowed to fall by the wayside. What this memorandum is saying in between the lines is: "Let us Conservative Members suggest who the ministerial permits should go to in order to help us win some friends".

The memorandum goes on to say that the perception of Tories sidling up to communities in the ethnic areas and opening the floodgates at our borders, as it were, can severely damage enthusiasm for the Party at the traditional grass roots level and thereby nullify any gains in the newer communities. It states that a watchful eye must be kept on the creeping hostility to immigrants which, especially in times of economic duress, is nearly fully dormant and represents a political back lash if acceptable selection standards are not maintained. The Conservative approach to immigration, therefore, must successfully combine intelligence with understanding and selectivity with compassion. Firm but fair was the slogan that was recommended.

The memorandum goes on to talk in terms of the media. It states the long-standing neglect by Tories of the third language press must be reversed before the next general election. That is exactly what happened only a few weeks ago. Good relations with third language media must be achieved if breakthroughs in Metropolitan Toronto's ethnic ridings are to be expected. Ministers, Members, the PMO, and the Party should all contribute to the current political effort aimed at ethnocultural communities and respond to the need to develop a detailed strategy on the federal level pertaining to the ethnic media.

The memorandum goes on to state that the value of the third language media in communicating government policy is generally not recognized. Advertising budgets do not allow for the publicizing of ethnic appointments. MTV suffers from a lack of advertising support from the Government, and given the station's plans to develop into a network, the problem of bad revenue causes considerable political damage.

The memorandum goes on to talk about multiculturalism. The Conservative caucus in Metro Toronto states in the opening paragraph that the committee believes that the articulation of a distinctive Conservative policy on multiculturalism is overdue and as such an urgent priority. Ethnocultural communities must be made to understand precisely why they should give their ballots to the Government rather than to the opposition Parties.

In terms of funding, what I find to be very offensive is the paragraph where the memorandum states that trends in funding of various ethnocultural groups were the next topic examined by the committee. It was stressed that there should be nothing arbitrary about funding cuts or increases. "Liberal funding patterns", whatever that means, "should be disposed of and a politically intelligent PC pattern should take their place. This may be accomplished by a gradual process of funding cuts and reallocations". Some grants managed there are properly reflective of ridings and the ethnic element within them. There was a strong feeling that leadership on grants should come from the caucus and from committees. "Members of Parliament who have access to grant cheques to present at ethnic functions should endeavour to take advantage of such opportunities". The memorandum goes on and on in terms of the very offensive approach and attitude taken in this report toward multiculturalism, appointments, and the role of the Prime Minister in trying to target a number of various ethnic communities that I could read into the record but will not.

I believe it goes to show this Member of Parliament the type of mind-set that exists above and beyond perhaps the general rhetoric that we hear in terms of a multiculturalism Bill.

The former Minister of State for Multiculturalism, the Member of Parliament for Rosedale, initiated the multiculturalism Bill last year, after work was done by the previous two Ministers under this Conservative administration. That Minister was actually opposed in concept to a multiculturalism Bill. Despite the introduction of a Liberal multiculturalism Bill in 1984, despite the commitment of the Members of Parliament for Lisgar and Halton, the former Member of Parliament for Rosedale was against the concept because he preferred—and I suppose the Government preferred it—instead of operating under a Multiculturalism Bill to make amendments to the Citizenship Act under the guise of multiculturalism. They thought that would be good enough.

I believe the former Member of Parliament for Rosedale essentially moved on a multiculturalism Bill only after he discovered that the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism was in fact studying and making a report upon which the major recommendation would be a comprehensive and significant multiculturalism Bill. At that time the Minister shifted his commitment. The committee and various organizations such as the Canadian Ethnocultural Council and others who supported the committee's ideas and visions were really responsible for moving the Government into building from that 1984 Bill and trying to crystallize this piece of legislation in Canada's books.

As I mentioned, the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism, which was representative of all three political Parties, provided a very detailed examination into the whole area of multiculturalism. In the end, it gave the political green light to this Government and to this Minister to proceed on a very comprehensive Bill that would encompass and embody the type of aspirations existing in the country among various member communities. That committee report was not an attempt simply to put on paper a few ideas or to try to stitch together a number of recommendations. It was the product of a very long and detailed process. It was a report that was established after the committee held 16 public meetings and heard from a variety of witnesses, including verbal testimony and briefs from such groups as the Canadian Ethnocultural Council, as well as responses from 20 different federal Departments, about where they thought multiculturalism should go in terms of their respective Departments.

• (2110)

Another major source of input was from the written briefs that the former Minister, the Hon. Member for Lisgar, requested and received from various organizations. These briefs were obtained and distilled as information pertinent to the area of study and reference.

Extensive information on multiculturalism and related policies was also obtained from the multiculturalism sector. A further major source of information was the consultative meeting on race relations hosted by the multiculturalism sector in August of 1986, and other documents. Then, of course, there were the various meetings of the committee *in camera* to try to digest all this information into a coherent direction.

The committee on the multiculturalism policy, a separate minister for multiculturalism, as well as a separate official multiculturalism commissioner would report to Parliament. There were recommendations built on those three general areas which ran deep in terms of the feelings that communities had and in terms of the goals and objectives that organizations brought to the committee. We made a number of recommendations, 18 in all, ranging from provincial and municipal policies to a separate line Department, to a multiculturalism commissioner, to an Act respecting multiculturalism, and so on. The committee took great pains to try to leave no stone unturned. We made an additional 44 recommendations concerning the Nielsen Task Force that related to multiculturalism and the federal policy.

We talked about a separate Department and not ghettoizing Canadians who were neither of English nor French origin. We talked about a separate line Ministry to offer additional political clout in the corridors of power in Ottawa. We talked about a revamped and separate line Department, not with fundamentally new moneys that would be spent irresponsibly at will but a realignment of existing and old moneys to be combined into a forceful mechanism that would deliver the programs with much greater efficiency and with much greater pride. We talked about bringing the program under the wing of Employment and Immigration, the Department of Secretary of State, Communications and Culture, about bringing it under one roof and referring to it as a separate Department of Multiculturalism.

To move those moneys and those programs under one Department was very symbolic. It would show that the Government of Canada took multiculturalism seriously. It would put it on an even keel with other Departments. It would see the Minister of State become a senior Minister. It would have a Deputy Minister of multiculturalism on an even keel with other Deputy Ministers.

That would not ghettoize multiculturalism as we have heard from the Government. In fact, to keep the *status quo*, to refuse to think about these reforms, is to ghettoize the multiculturalism policy. This would not be the be-all and end-all in terms of this realigned Department. It would be a transitional point going from a directorate of multiculturalism to a separate ministry to, one day, a Ministry of culture. That would have seen the integration and embodiment of culture and multiculturalism. That would have been the evolution of this Ministry and of this policy rather than allowing it to be jeopardized in one small corner of the federal Public Service. I believe that that type of movement would have crystallized a progressive vision of where multiculturalism is and, more important, where it can go rather than simply saying that to put it in a separate Department would be to ghettoize it. The inverse is correct.

In terms of an independent commissioner of multiculturalism, the committee was very forceful. We believe that an independent commissioner would get away from the partisanship of the annual report of a Minister. One Minister rarely slaps another whose Department may not be up to speed in terms of the policy of multiculturalism. This would get away from the fact that the Minister does not have the time, the resources or perhaps the willingness to go through the Public Service, Crown corporations, or public institutions, to ensure that their hiring practices and programs reflect and are in keeping with Canada's multiculturalism policy. The commissioner would be accountable to Parliament, not to a Minister, the Department or the Government, and through Parliament to the people. That is what the committee envisioned.

I ask myself why the Government was so fundamentally opposed to the concept of an official multiculturalism commissioner. Why are we in favour of an Official Languages Commissioner? Why are we in favour of giving additional powers, ones which we passed only last week, to the Official Languages Commissioner to investigate various complaints made with respect to our official bilingualism policy? If we had not seen fit back in the 1970s and only last week to recognize the value of having an Official Languages Commissioner, and if we recognized that official bilingualism would not be possible unless we had a proper bureaucratic structure for it, along with a proper budget and a proper Act, then bilingualism would not be the reality that it is today. As a citizen back in the 1970s I supported that policy. I was proud to stand up in my place last week to vote in favour of Bill C-72. Bilingualism is a fundamental characteristic of the country. If we say that multiculturalism is a complementary fundamental characteristic of the country, as are its aboriginal people, then why is the Government so much opposed to the concept of an independent commissioner?

In the amendments which were rejected in committee and in our pleas to the Minister we missed an opportunity to establish such a commissioner. If the Bill goes through this evening, as I believe it will, and when it receives approval from all sides of the House, as I believe it will, then the whole discussion of a separate line Department and the whole discussion of an official multiculturalism commissioner must be at the top of the priorities list when we try again to improve and to build upon this multiculturalism Bill.

I am saddened that we have not done it in this first window of opportunity. The possibility was there. It was particularly there among the members of the standing committee. It was there within the constituencies. It was there within the major organizations which tried to lobby the Government in terms of delivering the aspirations that they knew existed in their communities. There was a national consensus. I feel saddened that the Parliament of Canada, and in particular this Government, was not able to harness that consensus and pass those very important parts of the committee report.

• (2120)

Not only were the recommendations of the Opposition or various Members of Parliament ignored, but also the recommendations a number of major organizations. Most of them are voluntarily organizations whose members give up their time and energies to meet on Saturday afternoons, travel to Edmonton for their annual meeting, or come to Ottawa for consultations to meet with Members, Ministers, and bureaucrats. They too were not listened to.

I was somewhat amused when the Minister of State for Multiculturalism (Mr. Weiner) stated that here was a Government that was prepared to listen and to act. That is not the case with respect to the recommendations, studies, and statistics that were drafted and presented to the Government.

One of those major organizations, the Canadian Ethnocultural Council, a number of whose representatives are in the gallery this evening and watching this debate on Bill C-93, in a major report dated April, 1988 made a number of very important recommendations and suggestions for amending Bill C-93. In its executive summary on page 1 it stated: "the Bill is currently a statement of wishes and ideals. The amendments we are suggesting will ensure that the Bill is meaningful and effective". The Council went on to provide three priority resolutions: the whole question of fundamental characteristics, which we were able to achieve today in a spirit of co-operation from all three sides; a clear commitment to implement the multiculturalism policy in Section 3.2, which was not delivered upon; and the monitoring of the implementation of the Act by an independent officer modelled along the same lines as the Official Languages Commissioner, which was not acted upon. Those are the three major recommendations.

The council also has a summary of recommendations from 1 through 14. How many of those recommendations found themselves into the finality of this Bill? The Council also listed other issues that it considered important in terms of crystallizing important concepts in principle in the Bill: the question of multiculturalism funding; the question of a separate Department; the question of the charitable tax status; and the question of the cabinet committee on multiculturalism, and a multicultural institute.

The Minister stated that he listened. He certainly did not listen very much to this report or to any other major report that tried to move the Government in recognizing that national consensus.

Then there are the committee hearings. First, the Government did not want to send Bill C-93 to the permanent Standing Committee on Multiculturalism. It preferred to send it to the legislative committee. In my humble and respectful submission, it received very shoddy treatment. From the first day of the meeting of the legislative committee it was very apparent to me that the priority of that legislative committee, dominated by Conservative Members of Parliament, was simply to get this Bill back into the House for report stage as quickly as possible and at any cost.

Witnesses were not allowed to come before the legislative committee. Scores of witnesses wrote in stating that they would like to present recommendations. They were not allowed to appear. Many witnesses said: "If you are not going to allow us to appear, then have the committee travel and come to see us". That was also refused. In this first major multicultural legislation in four years witnesses from across the country were denied legitimate and justified opportunities to give their input and recommendations.

The committee was in such a hurry that it closed off debate and did not want to listen to any further witnesses. When my colleague, the New Democratic critic on multiculturalism, was not able to attend a drafting session of the amendments, the committee did not even have the respect to hold a meeting the next day in order that my hon. friend was able to attend. That is how quickly the Conservative Government wanted to get this Bill back into the House. The opposition amendments were moved in committee by government Members to attempt to defeat them in order that those amendments would not be able to see the light of day during report stage.

I do not think that that speaks highly of the motives and of the genuine interest in upgrading and amending and offering an input in partnership with constituents and organizations that enhance multiculturalism. They are the people in the trenches outside Parliament who translate the policies that we talk of into a crystallization of reality on the streets of this country. I say those things, not as a Member who is simply attempting to "cry the blues" but as a Member who is trying to have the public recognize that the process followed in this first multicultural legislation was very different from the course and the processes that have been followed in other pieces of legislation, which in some cases although important legislation were not as significant to the national fabric as this particular piece of legislation. In my opinion that process was not honoured to allow maximum participation of constituents to enhance and better a piece of legislation.

I am pleased that the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport (Mr. Charest) is present. I look forward to hearing his debate. I am sure that he is not familiar with the process that took place. If he has any questions he can rise.

Mr. Charest: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There is a rule in the House that has been long established and usually respected by Members of Parliament that when they address an issue or a piece of legislation they make their remarks pertinent to the piece of legislation.

I wish to point out that the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) has made so many long and vented complaints about the Government and partisan remarks that I do not think he is serving well the multicultural community that he pretends to serve. His real objective is to discredit the Government, and that has become very obvious. We can only regret the fact that he has made such a cheap issue out of a piece of legislation which he from time to time pointed out was the first of its kind. The Government and other Members from all sides

of the House merit some congratulations, but instead we get this type of rhetoric.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Minister may want to enter debate. That was not a point of order. The Hon. Member for York West.

Mr. Marchi: Madam Speaker, I make no apologies to that Member or to any other Member for my actions and my commitment. I look forward to him rising on debate and respecting other Members. I look forward to his vision of the contributions of multiculturalism. I encourage him to rise as an individual and have the courage of his own convictions rather than take cheap shots and then return to signing his mail for his own Department, as much as that is important to do. I ask the Hon. Member to rise and discuss multiculturalism and to show the House his commitment, actions, and philosophies. If he wants to take shots at Members of this House, if that is his preference or obligation, I encourage him to do so.

Mr. Charest: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not wish to belabour the point, but the fact is that I think the same rule to which I referred a couple of minutes ago applies. The Hon. Member should keep his remarks relevant to the question before the House. I might add that we have a very competent and good Minister of multiculturalism whose remarks I fully adhere to.

• (2130)

Mr. Marchi: Madam Speaker, I apologize. The Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport is quite correct. My comments were irrelevant when I referred to him. He pointed out that I should get back to relevancy, and I will do so.

The other aspect that I wanted to point out was that the proof of the discontent is not only lodged with members of the Opposition or Members on this side of the House. One only has to look at a number of witnesses and organizations that have commented on Bill C-93. I draw the sports Minister's attention to these individuals. Are these individuals wrong as well? Are these individuals and organizations also misguided?

We have individuals like Lorne Waldman of the Jesuit Centre for Social Faith and Justice, who said: "I am in agreement with the position taken by the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism and am in particular in agreement about the need to create a Commissioner for Multiculturalism. I believe that the role of such a Commissioner ought to be clarified and strengthened".

Dr. Bhausaheb Ubale, Commissioner for the Canadian Human Rights Commission, said: "The proposed Multiculturalism Act changes nothing and it is not historic as the Minister calls it. It is purely symbolic. It is old wine in a new bottle."

Daniel Iannuzzi, President of Multilingual Television and editor of a weekly Toronto Italian newspaper, *Corriere Canadese*, said: "What we need is the recognition that multiculturalism is an integral part of Canadian society—the Bill does not allow for such an interpretation."

The Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism and Citizenship said: "The decision not to establish a Ministry as it was recommended by the standing committee is unacceptable and it only demonstrates the lack of leadership commitment for multiculturalism as a fundamental goal for Canada."

Michael Lanphier, for the Refugee Documentation Project of York University, said: "It is recommended that a new Department of Multiculturalism become the lead Ministry in negotiating an enhanced role for multiculturalism in every federal department".

The Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants said: "The establishment of a Commissioner of Multiculturalism along the lines of the Office of the Commissioner for Official Languages, could greatly assist in monitoring and encouraging the implementation of a multiculturalism policy."

The National Congress of Italian Canadians said: "We believe a Commissioner of Multiculturalism will bring the important elements of visibility and a greater accountability to the implementation of multiculturalism policies."

Lewis Chan, President of the Canadian Ethnocultural Council—and formally he made the statement when he was vice-president—said: "It is a shining symbol, and certainly a step forward, but it is a symbol without substance."

The Canadian Multilingual Press Federation said: "By implementing only one of the major recommendations of the committee report, the Government is offering Canadians virtually nothing new from the policies established in 1971."

The Canadian Hellenic Congress said: "David Crombie has rejected the idea of a new Department of Multiculturalism. The current treatment of multiculturalism policies within the Government of Canada is unfocused and underfunded. We doubt that the passing of the proposed Act in its present form will do much to focus or strengthen such policies."

The Hellenic-Canadian Federation of Ontario said: "We are profoundly disappointed by the Government's recent legislation on multiculturalism. We are displeased by this action of the federal Government, which undermines the work of the standing committee, and amounts to nothing more than window-dressing. Indeed, it simply reiterates what exists in federal practices. Unfortunately, there is nothing in the recent draft legislation on multiculturalism of substance for the people of this country."

Those are some of the comments, not of opposition Members but of organizations, of living and breathing entities in our constituencies and across our country that have a deep feeling, as deep a sense of feeling for this policy as any individual in this House. Those kinds of statements were also reflected by a number of the major medias. One has to read the headlines in major medias like *The Ottawa Citizen*, which call this Bill an empty promise on multiculturalism. It said, "This Bill will be a

disappointment to Canadians from all ethnocultural backgrounds. It fails to give teeth to the fight against prejudice and racism and, on the other hand, it makes an irresponsible promise on language that could rekindle old arguments. In sum, it is a mish-mash of circle squaring ambiguity and clumsy opportunism."

The Globe and Mail: "Multiculturalism bill gets cool welcome". The Montreal *Gazette*: "Multiculturalism bill ignores proposals by panels of MPs". The Vancouver *Sun*: "Ethnic bill called symbol over substance". The Vancouver *Sun*: "Ethnic bill gets mixed reviews". The *Telegraph-Journal* from New Brunswick: "Multiculturalism bill criticized". *The Globe and Mail*: "A multicultural mist". The *Star-Phoenix* from Saskatoon: "Multiculturalism legislation ignores major recommendations". *The Chronicle-Herald* from Nova Scotia: "New multiculturalism act short on means to implement programs". It goes on and on.

Again, these are not commentaries from members of the Government or on the opposition side; these are from individual organizations and media outlets across the country that have taken a look at this piece of legislation and have made a commentary.

I wanted to summarize some of my thoughts and try to crystallize in a few words what one has experienced over the last three and a half years in this administration leading up to this Bill. The concept of the multiculturalism Bill and the Canadian Multiculturalism Act was an important and significant one. I am saddened to witness that that window of opportunity was not utilized in a more profound way and in a more genuine fashion, in a way that there was a national consensus in the community and within Parliament.

I believe, notwithstanding those shortcomings, that it would be somewhat irresponsible for Members of this House or political Parties to try at the very least to deny the creation of a new Bill and of an Act. As I have stated—and it is very obvious—I would have preferred, as many other organizations, to be able to stand this evening and pass and approve a multiculturalism Bill that came a lot closer to reflecting the aspirations and desires of a country and of a collection of ethnocultural organizations from one coast to another.

I suppose that those ideas and visions that are not embodied and encompassed in today's Bill will become a reality that future Parliaments and a future Government may wish to have and hopefully will be successful in attaining.

I am pleased to have at least played a small part in the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism that tried to show the way for this Government to follow. I am also proud to say that it was a very co-operative committee including Members from all sides who I believe worked very well together. I also commend the members of the Government on the committee for having stayed the course and for having proposed and worked with members of the Opposition in providing a unanimous committee report that really showed the way which the Government should have embraced.

Notwithstanding that, I am pleased to have participated on that committee. I recognize that there is much more work to be done in the area of this multiculturalism Bill. I suppose the constituencies and the member organizations will see this as a start, as a beginning that needs to be worked upon as the initial foundation to hopefully what will become a much more durable, encompassing and dignified Bill, an Act that reflects the aspirations and the work of Canadian citizens from all walks of life, from all backgrounds in Canada, right across the regions and territories.

• (2140)

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Madam Speaker, perhaps Members will allow me to comment on how pleased we all are that I am restricted to 20 minutes—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): —and will have to be concise. I know, Madam Speaker, that you wished I had unlimited time because I could use it well. I shall endeavour in a few minutes to consider the question that faces us on the third reading of Bill C-93 as the position we want to take.

Beginning more seriously with my observations, I feel honoured to speak at third reading debate on Bill C-93 on behalf of my colleagues and to consider the place that we should give to this Bill in the evolution of Canada's multicultural policy. We were very critical of the Bill at various points. That was true as we began consideration of the Bill at report stage.

Even though we have reached debate on third reading this evening immediately following report stage consideration, it is necessary to step back a bit and consider what we have been doing and what we have as the end result. We have to say that the Bill could do much more but, as everyone will concede, half a loaf is better than none. My friend, the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) spoke of a window of opportunity. I am not very inclined to that kind of language. I think we could have seen another Government doing it much better. I would have liked to see a New Democratic Government providing the kind of multiculturalism Bill that would give structure and strength and put the policy in action, but we have not been given that opportunity by the people of Canada.

Mr. Charest: And you had such a good start to your speech.

Mr. Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): We are in the seventeenth year of the multiculturalism policy. This is the first time we have had a Bill carried to this extent. Given the years in which the Liberal Governments did not produce and what the Conservative Government has chosen to put forward, we are considering it in that kind of context.

It would be appropriate to recognize the fact that we are a nation that requires a multiculturalism policy. Surely recognizing that it is in the seventeenth year of the policy that we are debating, we can look back and recognize that in 1971, when

the policy was announced in Parliament and accepted by all of the Parties represented at the time, there was a recognition of diversity of this country which made it necessary to move beyond the establishment of the policy of official bilingualism to provide for diversity that involved other elements.

As a matter of fact, in those years the people of Canada began to realize—we discovered last week that they still do not all realize it, by any means—that Canada could not exist simply as an English-speaking country and accepted a policy in which the federal Government would seek equality of French with English. Governments moved very quickly to recognize that it was not possible to see the country in bicultural terms. In those same years during which the policy of official bilingualism was established, the people of Canada began to recognize that there were fundamental realities, elements one might even say, in terms of the aboriginal peoples of this country who would go on and not be assimilated and who asserted their distinctiveness. We have been involved in these years since 1969 and 1971 in coming to grips with that.

We recognize that the policy of official bilingualism found expression in a Bill as early as 1969, and that a Commissioner of Official Languages was established to ensure that the policy of official bilingualism would be respected by federal institutions. It has never been easy work. Commissioners have often faced challenges in government and outside government in asserting that policy, but there was a commitment to it. I think one can relate those events of 1969 to 1971 and the succeeding years and the limited action that occurred on multiculturalism with events of the 1980s when, in the course of constitutional renewal following on the referendum in 1980 and the development of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, repatriation of the Constitution occurred. In the initial drafts there was not provision for the aboriginal peoples, nor any recognition of multiculturalism.

Those elements were added to the Charter. In Section 27 we have the important statement that the Charter shall be interpreted in such a way that it preserves and enhances Canada's multiculturalism heritage. At that point the Province of Quebec was left out of developments. Though the policy of official bilingualism was established in the Charter, there still remained work to be done.

Obviously I do not have time this evening to do anything like justice to what has occurred in the last year or two in this area, but there are many questions. I mention this as a way of suggesting a completing of the process in recognizing the linguistic duality of our country as a fundamental characteristic and making other provisions for the history of Québec within Canadian society. That struck many people as inadequate. I mention it this evening because at report stage on a Bill that did not deal properly, so many people felt, with the fact of ethnocultural racial diversity in this country, we have succeeded by one means or another through the co-operation of the three Parties in having fundamental characteristics put into the Bill. That is a very important achievement, and one of the developments out of report stage that allows me to be less critical of the Bill than I was when it was first tabled back in December, 1987.

It remains that though we have made various kinds of progress in recognizing diversity in our country, it was as late as 1987 that we had a Bill, and it is as late as 1988 that we are debating this particular Bill which still has the kinds of limitations that force one to speak of half a loaf and is reason to leave too many Canadians still feeling that the Government of Canada does not recognize diversity in anything like the way it should.

Perhaps I can consider the evolution of ideas about multiculturalism in this Parliament and relate those critically enough to the Bill again, because that too is appropriate at third reading debate. Suddenly in June, 1985 we had a standing committee struck. That was an important development however it occurred. I would like to have the inside story of that told to me sometime, but the standing committee was struck and got to work. It succeeded over the next two years in developing the agenda for multiculturalism policy in a report that was supported by all members of the committee and issued in June, 1987. The standing committee made recommendations on the means that we saw the Government of Canada requiring in order to take in all the fine principles of 1971, all our perceptions of diversity in this country. There was a need to ensure that the Government of Canada respected that diversity.

As the Hon. Member for York West has already noted, among the most important suggestions is the proposal for a full-fledged Department of Multiculturalism with a Minister and a Deputy Minister. We have a proposal for a commissioner of multiculturalism who would ensure that this Department, all other Departments of Government, and all federal institutions would respect the policy first enunciated almost 17 years ago and only now being legislated. There were proposals for a genuinely representative advisory council, for a centre for multiculturalism.

These various proposals are the ones that I had in mind at the outset in saying that another Government might have seen—though the Liberals for years past had not and the Conservatives have declined to see it—the challenge and have acted on it in a full and significant way.

• (2150)

What happened in committee represented a refusal by the Government to act on the understanding that all the members of the standing committee had arrived at. After all, that committee, like all the other standing committees, was composed of seven members: five government members, one Liberal and one New Democrat. Private members in the government caucus had come to realize the necessity of these institutions.

When the report was released, it was distributed widely in Canada. I took the liberty, after some of the events including the refusal in the committee to face up to the experience of

racism in Canadian history, which left me in no doubt that we had to say these things and to press for firm action by the Government on multiculturalism, to issue my own minority report entitled "The Living Diversity: Multiculturalism for All". It was designed to comment on the work of the committee and to press on the report.

These reports were circulated widely in Canada. Then the Standing Committee finally began its consultations to learn what persons in the various provinces and the great cities of our country thought about our recommendations, the extent to which they supported them. When we began that process in the City of Toronto, we found ourselves being upstaged by this Bill, Bill C-93, which the Government suddenly tabled. This Bill declined to take up the challenge in the way all the members of the standing committee thought it should.

At those first sessions in Toronto we found group after group supporting our report and critical of what the Government put forward. It was felt to be largely a symbol, as the now President of the Canadian Ethnocultural Council, Lewis Chan, said so very well at the time. Many of those who appeared before us had these things to say.

The National Congress of Italian Canadians pointed to the subversion of the consultation process that was taking place and the fact that the Government had tabled a Bill which laid out a much more restricted and constrained statement of multiculturalism than the standing committee had wanted. There could be little doubt that the attempt to achieve a large statement of multicultural policy and to provide the machinery required to ensure that it is respected across all the institutions of the federal Government had failed.

In the work of the legislative committee there were similar shortcomings. There were suddenly constraints put on the number of witnesses we could hear in Ottawa. Suddenly we were rushed into consideration of amendments and that whole sorry process of defeating a large number of amendments in my absence and in the absence of the Liberal member of the committee took place. I will not make very much of that because report stage in the House today compensated for what went wrong in committee. That is why the process has taken the time it has in the House today. It is because the committee process was abused.

The reality is that this country cries out for action on a multiculturalism policy. The demographic realities of the country and the diversity of our great cities, a diversity that is being added to as Canada continues to respect its place as a country to which refugees, persons in danger of life and limb, can come, cry out for this multiculturalism policy. As immigration continues and as the great cities and regions of Canada become more and more diverse, society cries out for the policies to which we are supposedly giving our support in this Bill. Yet, there is so little in the way of assurance beyond what is given to us in language as weak as Clause 6, for example, which provides that Ministers of the Crown other than the Minister "shall", in the execution of their respective mandates, take such measures as they consider appropriate to implement the multiculturalism policy of Canada. I suppose Ministers never take action that they consider inappropriate, but to have an invitation to find things inappropriate in the very language of a Bill leaves me gravely concerned about what we are doing.

This, of course, is the context within which one has finally to decide what to make of the Bill, what kind of position to take. I note that there has been a good deal of support, although sometimes I wonder about the support that there has been in the ethnocultural communities. Who can blame them? They have watched for years while the Liberals did nothing until they brought out that draft in 1984 which was so much weaker than this Bill. Nothing happened and then there were three years or more of this Government. One cannot blame anyone in the communities for thinking that they had better grab what they have now.

The Hon. Member for York West put a number of things in a critical light by quoting all kinds of persons. Of course, I put my critical observations on the record last December. The Canadian Ethnocultural Council was very critical of the Bill at the time, as the Hon. Member knows.

In nearing the conclusion of my comments, I think it is appropriate to note that the Canadian Ethnocultural Council put out a release on Tuesday of last week in which it announced its support for Bill C-93 and urged all three Parties to ensure early passage of it. The President, Mr. Lewis Chan, said:

> Bill C-93 is much stronger today than when it was introduced seven months ago. It is a now in a form that we can support and in a form that we would want to see entrenched in law. The Government and opposition parties have listened to us and improvements have been made.

The release goes on to note three priority amendments. The first is a stronger commitment to implement multiculturalism, the priority involved in the change from "should" to "shall" in Clause 3. Second is the importance of having "fundamental characteristic" rather than "fundamental element" in the Bill. As I have already said, we finally achieved that this afternoon.

Third, there is the concern about an independent mechanism such as a commissioner to monitor the Act's implementation. The reality is that we failed in that area. We failed not so much because the Government was unwilling to spend the money, it seems. The Minister will have five officials in his Department involved in monitoring across the Government to ensure that Departments respect the policy. This is obviously an attempt to provide push from the Minister's quite junior position within the Department of the Secretary of State, and it is a long way removed from the kind of independence the Commissioner of Official Languages has.

We have quite simply failed to move the Government in these areas. We clearly have at best—a phrase I have used other places and it would only be fair to use it here—the first half of what could be quite a good Bill. As far as it goes, it is a pretty good piece of legislation and that is reason for supporting it.

My colleague talked about a window of opportunity. As I said before, I am not prepared to go so far as to use that phrase. The fact remains that a Government has chosen to bring forward a Bill which does at least this much in the way of legislating multiculturalism. For that reason, my colleagues and I intend to support the Bill and to vote for it.

We have no illusions about what we have actually accomplished. We still fear that we are far too close to symbolism rather than to real power in achieving multiculturalism. Few things could impress me as strongly in this area as the process in which we have been involved in the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism over the last months of trying to come to grips with what began when the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) sent a letter to provincial premiers urging them to boycott events organized by three Canadian Sikh organizations. The committee has attempted to meet with the Minister to have him clarify what he is about. He continues to insist that it is entirely a matter of terrorism and has gone to another committee instead of coming to meet with us.

We have endeavoured to force the Minister and to press the Department to recognize that he is not dealing simply with Canadian Sikhs but with other communities: Armenian Canadians, Ukrainian Canadians, Baltic Canadians. I think the Department of External Affairs has failed the Canadian people and has refused to respect multiculturalism as a commitment of the Canadian Government. It has done that time after time. When the Minister refuses to appear, continues to show contempt for us, sends the Associate Undersecretary of State for External Affairs—actually, we demanded that he come—who is constrained by the strait-jacketing that such officials experience when they speak in public, then that is just one more piece of evidence of why we need much stronger legislation. It also illustrates why, although I will vote with my colleagues in supporting the Bill for what it does, the next Government will face the challenge of achieving what the ethnocultural communities of this country want.

• (2200)

I recognize the constraints on time and the fact that you have been generous with me for an extra minute or two, Madam Speaker. Thank you very much for the opportunity to say these things about the Bill. We are doing something that people will regard as historic. Given that, why should those efforts be as limited as they are so very often in this country? Why can Canadians not achieve the kind of greatness they want and have achieved in multicultural policy?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Questions or comments? Debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Madam Speaker, I am sorry, but I did understand that according to the agreement we concluded earlier, everyone would get a chance to express his point of view on this Bill today. I know it is late. I understand my colleagues' impatience. I will try not to impinge on their time, and I will even endeavour not to use up all of the time allotted to me. But still, as a parliamentarian, and I am probably among those who have served the longest here, I would like to make a few brief historical references to ensure that Canadian men and women who are listening to us, and Quebecers among them, understand fully that the process of building Canada is an ongoing, daily affair.

Before I make those remarks, however, I would like to very succinctly—and this is probably the specific reason which led me to ask for the floor—pay tribute to my colleague and friend the Member for York-West (Mr. Marchi) for the truly extraordinary work he has accomplished not only in the course of the past four years in Parliament but in all of the tasks which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) entrusted to him. He has discharged his duties in a remarkable way. His single-minded diligence could almost serve as an example for his colleagues, and I think he will not mind, nor will he take it as a form of misplaced paternalism if I pay tribute to him tonight and thank him on behalf of my party for the extraordinary effort he expended in his work.

As you know, Madam Speaker, and I will not attempt to be a historian tonight, this land of ours was at first Indian and Eskimo land, became a French and then a British colony, moved quietly toward partial autonomy and then obtained its independence and was governed by a great Prime Minister; all of our prime ministers were great in their own way.

He wanted to make his mark on the Canadian character of our institutions. We experienced . . . I experienced the era of the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. And so two languages and two cultures were to flourish in Canada, under Mr. Pearson.

Notice this development: two languages and two cultures. As though our first citizens simply did not exist! Make no mistake, we have a heavy responsibility to our first citizens. They may have been unhappy recently because they felt excluded from Meech Lake, and I will come back to that in a few minutes, but things must be seen in the context of the evolution of our country. Mr. Pearson felt, at that time, that there was a problem and called on eminent persons such as Jean-Louis Gagnon, Jean Marchand, André Laurendeau, Mr. Dunton, and several others to take a close look at this Canada that was evolving over the years and to attempt to define it.

Then there was the great Canadian flag debate, to make the flag authentically ours, which takes nothing away from the devotion some may feel for the flag of others.

Then there was the national anthem. I was directly involved as a member of the committee chosen by Mr. Pearson. It took 15 years until Canada's national anthem, which had been sung since 1880, was made official, as the committee recommended, in 1980.

Then came Mr. Trudeau, and I want to pay him tribute. In the early 1970s, he said, "Yes, bilingualism and

biculturalism!" But there is something new in Canada, a growing phenomenon that enriches us, namely the contribution of other communities. We therefore proclaimed that it would be better for this country, which we wanted to be bilingual and bicultural, to be known as bilingual and multicultural. It is a policy I believe in, one that I defend in French in Quebec. It is not easy and that is why I do so in French.

[*English*]

I just said in French that it is sometimes not easy to defend multiculturalism in the province of Québec. I believe, and I repeat again, that if my name were "Prudomski" or "Prudomian" I would not understand why I should be less Canadian than those beautiful young Pages with us tonight who may be of English or French origin. We are all going to be equal and happy on an equal footing or we will not have a harmonious Canada.

How do we manage to have that harmonious Canada? It is true that the continuation of the Canadianization of our institutions has helped. After having proclaimed that Canada was bilingual and multicultural, we saw the repatriation of the Constitution and the creation of a Charter of Rights which is not yet complete. As long as you have in the Charter a clause saying "notwithstanding", we know it is not a complete charter. Any Government, federal or provincial, could use it, but hopefully not abuse it, until some day we amend that part of our Charter of Rights.

Then we have Meech Lake. That is not perfection on earth. Many people feel left out. However, it is a step toward a better Canada, a greater Canada, and a more Canadian country, more Canadianization of our institutions. It is going to be unique, so I am not going to quarrel with the Minister and the Government, saying that this piece of legislation could be better. It is not a finality, it is a step in the right direction.

• (2210)

I hope that Canadians will understand that the true meaning of the step which we have before us tonight is to remind Canadians to have the sensitivity to understand the feelings of others, to make them equal partners regardless of their colour or origin. If this piece of legislation helps, I will do as my colleague from the NDP and our able critic, the Member for York West (Mr. Marchi), has done and vote for it. Even though we may have liked it to be different, it is a step in the right direction.

The French and English call themselves the two founding nations just as though the Indians and Eskimos did not exist. I find this expression a little bit arrogant. Max GrosLouis is a proud Indian leader in the City of Québec from the Hurons. He always laughed when he heard me make big speeches about the two founding races. He looked at me from his height of almost six feet six, he clapped his hands and said, "Ha, ha, ha, where do I fit in this?" That really affected me. I realized that I lacked sensitivity to the Indians and I learned more about them, I learned to include them and to respect them.

What about those who came after the French and the English? They are so numerous now. We have an example in Toronto, everyone wants to be a candidate. I thank them because they want to take an equal part in the process. My colleague from Holland, who is not in our Party yet, is smiling. This is the new Canada that we are building together. There will be an election called soon, maybe this week, maybe next week, maybe next spring. There will be new candidates from new countries to which we are not accustomed in this House of Commons. We will have to adjust.

Mr. Oostrom: I hope they will be allowed to buy memberships.

Mr. Prud'homme: I do not want to reduce this very important debate to the gutter. I will discuss that later. The Member may make comments on my speech after I am done.

I welcome ahead of time the new Canadians who are going to run for office. Who knows, I may not be here to do so when they arrive. I know they are going to help build a new Canada. They must feel equal regardless of their name, their country of origin, the colour of their skin, or the God to which they may like to pray, or even if they choose not to pray. That is the kind of Canada we must learn to build together.

If legislation such as the Bill we are about to vote on helps Canadians to reflect, that is good. It is permissible to dream. While I am speaking I am thinking of one of my passionate dreams, which is that maybe someday we will not need this kind of legislation, that there will be a day when Canadians have learned to respect each other so much that we will not need such legislation. We will understand that it is natural to allow Canadians to run for any office, to have the feeling that they are as important as anyone else, that they have as much chance as anyone to be nominated to any position. That is the feeling that we must develop together.

I know the Minister very well and he is not going to say that this legislation is imperfect, he will say that it is outstanding. However, I have learned to be more "conservative" as I have gotten older. This step will have to be ameliorated in the future by others.

Many amendments were put forward by the multicultural groups of Canada and were not accepted by the Government. Many amendments were put forward by my colleague, the Member for York West, and the critic from the third Party. Regardless of the fact that they were not accepted, we will vote for the Bill.

I hope that by attracting the attention of Canadians to such legislation we will also bring to their attention the importance of respecting people who are not of French or English origin. Those of French and English backgrounds have a responsibility, not only to respect the newcomers but to remember that when the French came here there were already people here. It is our duty also to respect them.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Waddell: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Waddell: You didn't here the noes.

Mr. Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Madam Speaker, we would like to have an opportunity to vote on the Bill as per the understanding which was put forward earlier today that we would have that opportunity after three o'clock tomorrow. Can you tell me whether it is possible to request that even though—

Mr. Skelly: Waddell said no.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): No one—

Mr. Waddell: I yelled no.

Ms. Mitchell: We all yelled no.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Mailly: Madam Speaker, I do not know if there was an agreement for the vote to take place this evening, but I believe that the Opposition whip could perhaps enlighten us on that.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I think I can answer the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary's question. No, there will not be a vote tonight. There is an understanding that, should a division be requested, it would be held at three o'clock tomorrow afternoon. My only problem at this time is that I did not hear anyone say no even though I did ask the question twice. If the hon. gentleman will just show a little bit of patience and not jump up for a fourth time, I am quite prepared, if the House agrees, to say that there will be a deferred division to be held at three o'clock. The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Madam Speaker, I think it would be fair and appropriate to put the question, to call for the "yeas" and "nays", and then we will see if there are five Members who want a recorded vote. Personally, I would pass the Bill as is, but if some Members want to vote, I am prepared to do so tomorrow, as specified in the agreement. Let the debate end tonight after ten o'clock, we would disregard the clock, and any vote requested would be deferred until three o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

If a vote is requested, I have no objection to that.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I just hope that everyone will understand the difficult situation in which the Chair is right now. As nothing was heard, the motion was declared adopted and the Clerk read third reading of this Bill.

• (2220)

However, if there is unanimous consent to go back, I will do so.

All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion, the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Pursuant to Order made earlier this day, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred until tomorrow.

Pursuant to Order made June 23, 1988, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 10.21 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, July 12, 1988

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to Petition Nos. 332-4759, 332-4814 to 332-4818 inclusive, 332-4820 to 332-4822 inclusive and 332-4827 to 332-4829 inclusive.

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present three petitions signed by residents of the City of Winnipeg, Selkirk and a number of other cities. The petitioners say that the Conservative Government had no mandate from the Canadian people to conclude a free trade agreement with the United States and, as the proposed trade agreement would deny Canada the policy freedom to determine its own economic future and undermine our ability to build a society distinct from that of the U.S., they humbly pray and call upon Parliament to dissolve and allow the people of Canada the opportunity to accept or reject the proposed free trade agreement during a national general election.

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition on behalf of a number of residents from my constituency who state that the paramount right to life is vested in each human being and that the word "person" applies to all human beings. They hope the House will prepare legislation to the effect that unborn persons shall be afforded the same right to life as all others in Canada. The signatories are from such places as Nelson, Riondel, Harrop, Procter, Trail, and Castlegar.

REQUEST FOR DESIGNATION OF ROUGE RIVER VALLEY

Mrs. Pauline Browes (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, it is a great honour and privilege to present a petition on behalf of residents of Scarborough, Don Mills, North York, and Toronto who join with thousands of supporters and volunteers in supporting the Rouge Valley in Scarborough as a unique and precious natural area.

They say that protecting the endangered wildlife and wilderness areas in the Rouge Valley is in the national interest. They join with the Scarborough City Council, the federal Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan), the Save the Rouge Valley System and the Coalition of Scarborough Community Associations in working to save the Valley. They petition the Parliament of Canada to work with the Government of Ontario to establish the Rouge River Valley as a Canadian heritage land or a provincial park.

• (1110)

IMMIGRATION—SPONSORING OF RELATIVES

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by some 700 residents of the City of Toronto, in addition to ones previously presented in the same form. They point out that on October 30, 1987, the then Minister of State for Immigration promised unmarried sons and daughters of all ages would be considered as members of the family class of immigrants, that married children and brothers and sisters in the assisted relative class would get 15 points instead of 10 points.

These petitions were gathered during the past months and weeks and, of course, they will be pleased to have the Minister's answer at last, though it was originally promised in several months.

They also point out that two years ago the then Minister of Justice promised that the unfair distinction between Canadian citizens and permanent residents of three years or more would be eliminated so that both these groups would have equal rights to sponsor parents of any age, and that this promise has not yet been fulfilled. Therefore they call upon the House to ensure that the Government will fulfil its promise now.

PROHIBITION WITH RESPECT TO KNIVES

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a number of petitions from my riding and other ridings in the Greater Vancouver region. As well, there are over 100 names from Ottawa, Scarborough, Etobicoke and Toronto.

All these people are very concerned with the high incidents of crimes, including murder, robbery and sexual assault, that are committed with knives. This is on the increase in all major

cities across Canada. They call upon the federal Government to amend the Criminal Code to prohibit the carrying of knives by citizens in public places, with some exemptions.

RESEARCH INTO PREVENTION AND CURE OF SCHIZOPHRENIA

Mr. Peter Peterson (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present three petitions today signed by constituents from Hamilton West and the surrounding area. The contents of all three petitions are the same. They call upon the Government of Canada to increase funds in order to increase research necessary for a cure to the disease schizophrenia.

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition from petitioners who are concerned that Canadian sovereignty is being threatened by the proposed trade deal. They believe that the present Government has no mandate to negotiate and complete a trade deal with the United States.

They call upon Parliament to ensure that a national debate takes place on this trade deal during a national general election.

IMMIGRATION—SPONSORING OF RELATIVES

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from a number of residents from Kelowna and other parts of British Columbia who remind the House of Commons that on October 30, 1987, the then Minister of State for Immigration promised that unmarried sons and daughters of all ages would be considered as the family class of immigrants and that married children and brothers and sisters in the assisted relative class would get 15 points instead of 10 points when assessed for immigration to Canada. These petitioners express a number of other concerns and they are asking the House to take steps to make sure the Government fulfils these promises now.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Shall all questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976

MEASURE TO AMEND—CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS

The House proceeded to the consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-84, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976 and the Criminal Code in consequence thereof.

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to move on to debate today the Government's position on Bill C-84. As I have said frequently, Bill C-84 forms with Bill C-55 a complementary package that will create a fair, effective way of ensuring that the rights of genuine refugees and our international obligations are respected.

Equally important, we must take the necessary legislative steps to ensure that abuse of the system does not occur.

[*Translation*]

Bill C-84 must be passed without delay so that the attempts that have repeatedly been made to abuse the refugee determination process can be counteracted. The passage of Bill C-84 is also necessary to ensure that the measures proposed in Bill C-55 will be effective once they are put in place. That is why I consider these two Bills to be a legislative package.

Madam Speaker, I would like to note that one of the controversial points in Bill C-84 was the empowering of the Minister to order ships turned back on the high seas if they were transporting people who hoped to claim refugee status in Canada. Today I want to announce a sunset clause that will do away with this power six months after the passage of Bill C-55.

[*English*]

I just want to make it clear that we are proposing a sunset clause that will eliminate the power to turn away ships six months after proclamation of Bill C-55. In the interim, the Government is also proposing an amendment limiting the power to turn back ships to those carrying illegal migrants which are intercepted outside our 12-mile limit. In addition, we are proposing, for consistency with Bill C-55, that only the Minister will be able to exclude security risks from Canada.

The Government believes that the deterrent measures in Bill C-84 provide ample power to discourage the increasing abuse of our refugee determination system. These measures include increased penalties for the organizers of illegal migration and for their accomplices, including the imposition of ten-year jail sentences and fines of $500,000; heavier fines for transportation companies that bring undocumented arrivals; increased powers to detain security risks and unidentified arrivals; exclusion of security risks and criminals from the determination process; increased powers of search and seizure; improved electronic surveillance capability.

The net result of these measures will be a refugee determination system better able to help those truly in need and to handle the unprecedented global pressures we are now facing. We will face these problems with legislation that respects the Geneva Convention, respects our Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and respects our humanitarian traditions in Canada.

In conclusion, it is my hope that now that our response to Bill C-84 can be seen to be fair and reasonable the other place will see fit to move with dispatch on Bill C-85 so that we can begin the process of putting it in place.

I move:

That a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this House agrees with amendment 1 made by the Senate to Bill C-84, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976, and the Criminal Code in consequence thereof, but disagrees with amendments 2(A) and (B) and with the earlier amendments 5(B) and (C), on which the Senate insists, because this House believes they contradict the principles of the Bill for the following reasons:

Amendments 2(A) and (B) would reverse the policy on which the Immigration Act, 1976 was based, which policy was not changed in the Bill as passed by this House. The amendments jeopardize the possibility of successfully prosecuting persons who profit from organizing illegal migration and from counselling fraud among refugee claimants.

Earlier amendments 5(B) and (C) arise out of Senate amendment 5(A), which is amended by this House, and are inconsistent with that amendment.

And, that this House agrees with the principles set out in amendment 3 and in earlier amendment 5(A) on which the Senate insists, but would propose the following amendments:

Amendment 3 be amended to read as follows:

"Strike out lines 14 to 16 on page 24 and substitute the following:

Referred to in paragraphs 19(1)(E), (2)(A) and 48.1(c) and subsections 39(2), 40(1), 41(1), 82.1(2), 83(1) and 91.1(1), and any such power,"

Earlier amendment 5(A) be amended to read as follows:

"Strike out lines 13 to 30 on page 8, and substitute the following:

91.1(1) Subject to subsection (1.1), where the Minister believes on reasonable grounds that a vehicle within twelve nautical miles of the outer limit of the territorial sea of Canada is bringing any person into Canada in contravention of this Act or the regulations, the Minister may direct the vehicle not to enter the internal waters of Canada or the territorial sea of Canada, as the case may be, and any such direction may be enforced by such force as is reasonable in the circumstances.

(1.1) The Minister may make a direction under subsection (1) where the Minister is satisfied

THAT

(A) the vehicle can return to its port of embarkation without endangering the lives of its passengers;

(B) All passengers who seek Convention refugee status and are nationals or citizens of the country where the vehicle embarked them have been removed from the vehicle and brought into Canada;

(C) The country where the vehicle embarked its passengers is a signatory to the Convention and complies with Article 33 thereof; and

(D) The country would allow the passengers to return to that country or to have the merits of their claims to Convention refugee status determined therein.

(1.2) Where the minister believes on reasonable grounds that a vehicle within

(A) The internal waters of Canada, or

(B) The territorial sea of Canada

Is bringing any person into Canada in contravention of this Act or the regulations, the Minister may direct that the vehicle be escorted to the nearest port of disembarkation and any such direction may be enforced by such force as is reasonably necessary."

That concludes my response, Madam Speaker. I believe if you seek the opinion of the House you will find we have unanimous consent to add an additional amendment to this Bill.

• (1120)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Minister is seeking unanimous consent to add another amendment. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Heap: Madam Speaker, I wish to give unanimous consent on the understanding that there will be occasion for debate with respect to the additional motion the Minister has moved.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All motions put to the House are debatable. Of course, the Hon. Member can have this assurance. The Hon. Minister may proceed.

Mrs. MacDougall: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of State for Employment and Immigration (Mrs. Vézina):

That Clause 8 of Bill C-84 be amended by striking out line 17 on page 9 and substituting the following:

"portation by sea.

4) If, during the second session of the thirty-third Parliament, Bill C-55 entitled An act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976 and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof is assented to, this section shall cease to be in force six months after the day on which that Act comes into force."

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The debate is on both motions.

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise on behalf of the Liberal caucus to respond to the latest response of the Government concerning Bill C-84 which was introduced about a year ago. I think it is fitting that on the very anniversary of the boatload of Sikh refugee claimants landing on the East Coast of our country that we would be, first, debating a Bill that was intended to be an emergency and, second, that we would be talking specifically about the whole proposal of turning back boats and the sunset clause introduced by the Minister a few moments ago.

I would also like to pay tribute to the Senators, both the Liberal Senators and government Senators, who have worked very respectfully and thoroughly in providing a forum for organizations and groups from across this country.

Now that the dust has settled with respect to the so-called emergency, the so-called crisis, the national call for Parliament to convene to pass emergency legislation, members on the government side and, indeed Canadians, have been able to

reflect on last summer's activities, the manipulation of the situation, and the creation of hysteria. After several months of reflection and taking a proper perspective on the situation, I believe all government Members and groups now believe that the tabling of such Draconian legislation was not only a disservice to the best traditions which define this country, a country which has offered international leadership to our partners and allies around the globe, but it was also an overkill in terms of the very proponents of the legislation contained in Bill C-84.

That is the reason that Members in this House and Members in the other place, as well as groups across this country, have tried to address what I believe is the worst performance of any government in dealing with immigration and refugee matters. I believe to call a national emergency based on 147 individuals is a shame for this Government and, unfortunately, a shame for this country.

It was only several years ago that the Government, supported by the same citizens, progressively and very courageously participated in a world-wide effort to find homes for the so-called Vietnamese boat people. This country accepted close to 106,000 Vietnamese boat people over the course of approximately a year and one-half. Half of them were sponsored by the Government and the other half were sponsored by individual communities. Only a few years later, last summer, based on 147 individuals, at a time when the Government found itself in the doldrums of the popularity polls, it moved in an unprecedented and very shameful way.

There have been efforts by Members in this House and in the other Chamber, as well as Canadians from coast to coast, to amend and ameliorate a bad piece of legislation. We tried to bring it into conformity with the standards and traditions of our country in terms of immigration and refugee policies. We did so not because, as the Government suggests, we somehow want to legitimize abuse. No one in this Chamber or in this country is in favour of illegitimate refugees, immigrants, or profiteers who simply make their living by taking advantage of desperate human beings in very difficult circumstances. No one in any part of government, whether it is a Department dealing with pensions or UIC, immigration or refugees, condones the undermining of our rules and regulations. However, having said that, nor do we consent to the stripping away of the regulations and the laws to which we adhered which took such a long time to develop and nurture. The fights and debates to get where we are in terms of our processes and in terms of our laws were not an overnight success. It was not an easy debate. In a short span of time we have sacrificed the work and the efforts of so many people and so many previous Governments. In the process we have jeopardized our reputation abroad.

• (1130)

Every legal expert who came before the legislative committee, the standing committee, as well as before the Senate committee, said that many clauses both in Bill C-84 and Bill C-55 are very much unconstitutional and violate the Charter of Rights and Freedoms which we passed as a Parliament several years ago. The importance of that testimony is in terms of what will happen if the courts agree with the body of opinion presented by legal experts, a nearly unanimous opinion which predicted that if this legislation becomes law it will be challenged in the courts and the courts will uphold those challenges.

What then will the Minister say to Canadians? What then will the Government say to the country when its policies are paralysed as a result of verdicts rendered by various courts? It will then have done the country a greater disservice since in paralysing our policies in the courts public confidence will not be there. Instead of public confidence there will be public cynicism rooted in the belief that the Government was trying to correct a situation but in so doing has made it worse.

Therefore what we were trying to do—and we make no bones about it—was to prevent a piece of legislation from being tied up in the courts and in the result having our system undermined by a court decision. One of the fundamental, if not the foremost, priorities as a Parliament is to draft good legislation, legislation that is in keeping with the first law of the land, our Constitution. If we have doubts about a law's constitutionality, or if we have doubts about the Department of Justice not being in accord with the Department of Immigration, and if we have not seen the justice opinion, if the Government has not had the courage to show its critics and cynics that the decision was rooted on sound judicial ground, then we have an obligation as a Parliament to try to correct that flawed legislation.

In the Minister's response of a few moments ago we saw the same inflexibility that she demonstrated in her response to Bill C-55. When she responded to Bill C-55 it was as a new Minister of Employment and Immigration. She is now somewhat more seasoned. She has had an opportunity to grasp a very difficult portfolio. No one pretends that this portfolio is an easy one with which to contend. However, in the Minister's response we see the same business-as-usual attitude. In her response to Bill C-84 she has failed to break the log-jam concerning two critical areas of concern. The first area of concern is the question with respect to turning back a boat. However, at the end of her remarks today she added an interesting and puzzling footnote with respect to a sunset clause on which I will comment later.

The real stumbling block for most Canadians was caused by the provision to turn a boat back and the aiding and abetting provision whereby individuals and church organizations, including priests and nuns who may be helping refugees come into Canada, will face a potential fine or imprisonment. Those were the two hang-ups that the country had with Bill C-84. Rather than try to ameliorate the two in a real fashion the Minister has chosen to ignore the testimony, the articulate, emotional and passionate pleas that organizations have made for months on end. As well she has rejected the compromises

that were put forward by the Senate in its last response to Bill C-84.

The present Minister is the fourth Conservative Minister to hold the portfolio of immigration. There were expectations that she might bring a more moderate view to the Ministry, that she might be more open and flexible to a Canadian compromise in order to de-escalate the polarized views created by this legislation. There is disappointment that she has been unwilling to tackle head on these two very fundamental and serious shortcomings in Bill C-84.

I compliment the Minister on her acceptance of the first and third amendments proposed by the Senate which at the very least in an eleventh hour compromise suggests that if the Government is to refuse any individual entry into the refugee determination process on the grounds of a security threat the Minister is the only person able to bar that individual proceeding through the process. Before this legislation any official was able to exclude an individual. The Minister has accepted a compromise, an eleventh hour suggestion from the Senate which states that only the Minister's signature will be an authorization for a person to be excluded.

I would ask the Minister to be concerned with the proposal which would exclude individuals from the refugee determination process based on information we may receive from other Governments. I also point out that Belgium is the only country in the western world which rejects individuals based on security information provided by other Governments. I would ask the Minister to be concerned about information we may receive from other Governments.

After all, what constitutes a security risk or a security threat in the eyes of another Government? If South Africa were to provide our government officials with evidence that Nelson Mandela was a subversive, a law-breaker in South Africa, then would that constitute barring Nelson Mandela from our refugee determination process? I use that example to suggest that many individuals who may be political refugees and who escape the country of their torture or their harassment may be pursued by those very same government officials who pushed them to seek refugee status in the first place.

Political refugees are the worst public relations campaign for any country. Therefore if we have political refugees who come to this country or others then we can bet our bottom dollar that the countries from which they are running will disavow the refugees' claims these individuals will make. The Governments of the countries from which these individuals flee will try to discredit and undermine those individuals who in the eyes of a dictatorship or a military regime bring instability and pressure as well as media and world attention to their policies.

• (1140)

That is why I moved an amendment during the debate at third reading which suggested that if the Government feared that someone was a security threat, then it should not listen to the advice of some government abroad or information that came to it via a number of different foreign sources, but rather it should issue a security certificate which would be reviewed by the Security and Intelligence Review Committee. Automatically SIRC would conduct an oral hearing, and the Cabinet would be able to argue the case in front of SIRC that this individual is a security threat. If it can be proven at that particular hearing that this individual is a security threat given the proper protections, then this individual will be removed from our country and forbidden re-entry. That would be a guarantee that foreign governments would not provide fraudulent information upon which we would exclude this individual from the refugee process. I draw that information and concern to the attention of the Minister now that she will have the sole privilege of disallowing individuals from participating in the refugee process in Canada.

Amendment number two from the Senate concerned the aiding and abetting section. Unfortunately, the Government refused to budge on the Senate compromise and on the repeated concerns of the Senate and other groups and individuals in the House who were attempting to convince the Government that it would be morally unjust and legally obscene to fine or imprison individuals from churches and organizations who assist refugees with resettling in Canada. The Government proposes to make it an offence against the person who counsels or advises the individual with improper or illegitimate travel documents and the person advising that individual may face criminal prosecution. The Senate attempted to convince the Government to make it an offence for individuals, or members of churches or organizations who counsel unfounded cases with no credible basis, or who counsel in a clandestine manner.

The operative phrase in the Government's legislation now becomes the whole question of travel documents. The Government is saying if an individual does not have proper travel documents and is assisted by an organization, a priest, or a nun to come into this country, then those people assisting the individual will now face imprisonment or a fine.

I would like to point out to the Government that that is going in the wrong direction. A legitimate refugee is more inclined to not have correct documentation. A true refugee who is facing abuse or torture will not have had the luxury or the time to go to an embassy or consulate and pick up the appropriate visa before coming to Canada. If a person is fleeing a military or dictator régime that is harassing this individual then it might be incumbent upon this legitimate refugee to make an illegitimate travel document in order that they can escape the country of torture and abuse as a first step to entering Canada.

We have suggested that in most cases legitimate refugees would be the ones who do not possess real travel documents, but yet they possess a real refugee claim. Fake refugees may be coached into having the appropriate travel documents, but do not have a legitimate case for refugee status, particularly if they are being coached by those who are professional in the art

of manipulation and of profiteering from individuals who face difficult circumstances abroad.

Therefore, why penalize churches or organizations that may be assisting an individual to come into the country? Regardless of the travel documents that he or she may be carrying with them, why penalize those legitimate elements in society who have tried to lend a hand and provide a bridge and a home to those who are fleeing and who are homeless?

Churches have been at the forefront of feeding the hungry through food banks, finding homes for those who live on streets or in parks, assisting senior citizens, the disadvantaged, and the poor. Why penalize those elements in churches and organizations who try to help another worthy cause, namely, those fleeing from persecutions and who are trying to find what you and I have, Madam Speaker, and what we all too often take for granted?

The Minister and the Government have said: "Don't worry. We will never use this particular clause against a church. We will never fine a priest. We will never imprison a nun. We will never undermine an organization that is legitimate". That is not how laws are constructed in this country. Legislation is not passed based on the intentions of one Minister. Today what might be the good intentions of a Minister, tomorrow might be the bad intentions of another Minister, or in 10 years' time from now. We in the House must debate and pass legislation, and analyse that legislation based on the force of this law or of the proposed law, and on the legal force and letter of this proposed law it would be criminal to persist in justifying the indefensible, and in defending and promoting that this piece of legislation should be getting the support of this Parliament and the other place.

I regret that the relatively new Minister did not have the moral fortitude to admit that that clause is onerous, offensive, and is a slap in the face to those voluntary organizations that do not have any malice or criminal intent, and have no profiteering intent, but simply try to lend a helping hand to those whom they feel are deserving of that assistance. Rather than encouraging and applauding those efforts, the Government is potentially prepared to penalize those important efforts across the country.

The other amendment that the Minister refused to accept from the Senate was amendment No. 4. This clause allows the Government to turn ships around. In amendment No. 4 the Senate attempted to amend this very sensitive clause by having the Government recognize that, if it wanted to discourage those captains and profiteers and that type of manipulative business, then the ship must be escorted into port. This would provide the opportunity to impound the boat, sell it, and proceed with prosecution of the captain for having dumped a human cargo off a coastline of our country, or attempting to subvert our regulations and laws. That would send a clear message across the Atlantic or the Pacific. If there was another captain who was prepared to set sail with another human cargo, that captain would think twice when hearing the news that another captain or his friend lost his boat and is now facing a fine or imprisonment. That would be the deterrent that we would be looking at as a country and as a Parliament.

• (1150)

Instead, the Government, in refusing amendment No. 4, continues to argue that the deterrent would be to turn back the boat. I suggest that that is not the case. If you were to simply turn back a boat on which you or I were the captain, then what is the risk involved for us as a captain navigating that ship? Assuming that we collected the cash from those individuals for that Atlantic or Pacific journey, we would have the money in our pockets and 50 per cent says that we will dump the people on the coastline successively and, at the very worst, the other 50 per cent risk is that the Coast Guard finds out and turns the boat back, without even looking at who is on board, but simply turns it back.

What is the big risk for the captain? He has his money. He either dumps the human cargo further offshore or returns them to the point of departure or brings them to another country. There is nothing to lose for the captain because he has made his dollars and, indeed, has probably made big dollars.

The Government wants to discourage these manipulators, as it should, by throwing the law book at them with all the force and determination. We urge it to bring the boats in, impound them, and charge the captains. That will send a strong message. Instead, how did the Government respond? Not only did it say that it would be better to simply turn the boats around, but it began to define what areas of the sea it would be doing it in.

For instance, the Government, in the response just tabled by the Minister, suggests that between 12 and 24 nautical miles it can turn back a boat if it is satisfied with four conditions. One of the conditions is the seaworthiness of the boat and the fact of there being no danger to the lives.

Now, how are they going to make that determination 12 to 24 miles out at sea? If it is foggy and raining and the waters are choppy, what are they going to send; the Minister in a boat to determine how seaworthy the ship is? How are we going to see the condition of the ship? How are we going to make a determination concerning who is on the boat or what the health of those passengers is or how much food or water is left on that boat if we turn them around? What we are talking about is a very illogical determination that we have to make, almost impossibly, out at sea. That is what is being asked for in this one clause.

The second condition is to suggest that passengers who seek conventional refugee status and are nationals or citizens of the country from which the ship departed are removed from the boat and brought in. What do we do then? Again, in the middle of the night, we send a boat out to sea and we ask for identification. What if there is no identification, no travel documents, and people suggest that they came from a certain country and that they are nationals of a certain country, or lie

or mislead simply to get onshore? How are government officials supposed to validate who is from where and when, out at sea in the middle of the night?

The third condition is to suggest that if there are individuals on that boat who come from countries which participate in the Geneva Convention, then those people should be sent back and not be removed by the boat. How do you manage to make that determination by going through the boat in the middle of an evening with perhaps documentation that is not up to par? A boat goes out, brings back some people and a determination is made that these are individuals who are nationals from countries which do face refugee problems. They leave the rest on board based on another determination saying: "Well, you come from a country where you have your own refugee process and you respect the Convention, so we are sending you back." How can they verify on the spot, at that moment, out at sea who is who?

The fourth condition is to suggest that they are going to allow the people to go back if the country they are coming from will allow them to return. Again, what are they going to do? If people on the boat say: "Well, I come from Belgium, I come from Argentina", what is the Minister going to do? Will she call the Ministers in Argentina and Belgium overnight and say: "Are you going to allow these people to return?" How are they going to make a determination at sea regarding which country and which Government will allow a person to return? To return means nothing. It does not mean to admit. There is no legal force in having a person return. That could simply mean return them to the country and the shore, keep them at the airport or the port and then send them packing.

The real problem in all these four conditions is how do you make a determination in the middle of the sea, between 12 and 24 miles, after you have stopped a boat, that these four conditions are being lived up to? How can any Government pretend to be satisfied by incorporating these four conditions concerning turning back a boat? These four conditions are an insult to people's intelligence in this Chamber and across the country. I would suggest that no government official would dare try to verify these four conditions in the middle of the sea, 12 to 24 nautical miles outside of this country. It is simply incredible. They are passing it off as legitimate proposals.

The Minister should have a serious rethinking and re-evaluation and not try to pass off the very humorous—they are not even that. They are serious. If this is going to become the legislation of this country, it is going to be very serious and indeed a shame to try to make these conditions verifiable in the middle of the sea.

Then they talk about internal waters. Concerning internal waters and up to 12 miles, they basically have the same philosophy. In that particular amendment, the Government is saying that between our internal waters and 12 miles the Government may bring a ship into port. Well, the word "may", of course, is very weak. It means, by the same token, that a ship within those waters may be turned around as well. If you are going to turn them around between zero and 12 miles, where are the conditions? You do not have conditions, first, and second, if you did have conditions, as badly and as poorly and as illogically drafted as the first set of conditions, then those are not a safeguard in terms of trying to validate who is on board, whether the passengers are refugees, whether they are safe, and to impound the boat and fine and imprison the captain.

The Government, while trying to define between 12 miles and 24 miles on four flimsy conditions, is really saying the same thing: "Give us the power to turn boats around". The Senate is suggesting, and we are suggesting that that is not the answer to illegitimate smugglers, because it does not offer a penalty harsh enough, because you cannot get the captain or will not be able to impound the boat, and second, how do you process potential refugees on a boat? How do you turn that boat around? How do you allow those people to return when you do not even know if they are going to be returning to face continued persecution or possible death?

Therefore, the logical and humane thing to do would be to accept the boat and escort it under Canadian supervision into our port, allow the cases to be processed and allow the captain and the boat to be penalized to the extreme. That would be the solution rather than the response that the Government has proposed to us this morning, which I believe is very silly and in essence saying the same thing by using different legislative language.

• (1200)

Concerning the zero to 12 miles the Government uses the language "may bring a ship into port". I will be moving an amendment at the end of my comments to change the word "may" to "shall". At least within internal orders and up to 12 miles the law of the land will be that if you see a boat you will bring it into port, not return it, but "shall bring it into port" so you will offer the processing and the punishment that should be facing the captain and crew.

The Government through the Minister a few moments ago moved a very puzzling and seductive sunset clause. After just arguing the case for turning back a boat, after the sophistication of between zero and 12 miles and 12 to 24 miles, after a full year of the Government defending the absolute need for turning back boats, the Minister now says that the Government will be prepared to consider a sunset clause. The Government is saying that if Parliament gives us Bill C-55, the Government will drop the turning back the boat provision six months after that legislation comes into force. The big question is why do that at this stage. If you accept the point that you need two pieces of legislation, one for reforming the processing—which is Bill C-55—and one for discouraging smugglers, why after arguing for a year does one at the eleventh hour, after offering the stick and carrot routine to the Senate, let go of the carrot? Something is wrong.

Either the Government could have admitted that turning back the boat was a very wrong and misguided provision or the Government could have defended it, if that is what the Government wanted to do. Instead the Government has chosen perhaps the worst of all possibilities. It has defended its right to the end today by rejecting amendment No. 4. It then offered the carrot by saying if you give us Bill C-55, we will strike that provision from the books. It is a very seducing carrot that I do not regard as completely being respectful. The Government is mixing the two Bills and is using potential lives at sea as the bargaining chips for it to get through the House and Parliament another piece of legislation. That is bargaining of the lowest kind.

When the Government accepted the principles of having a deterrence and a processing Bill, we advocated that if those two went together we would have one Bill, striking the clause of turning back the boats because that is a wrong direction for this country to go on refugee legislation. If the Government is interested in making that seducing deal with the other place, and it is trying to get Bill C-55 through so it can strike the provision, why make a deal in terms of the provisions in Bill C-55 where there is inflexibility?

If you accept at this stage that you will not be able to turn back boats, why did the Government not accept that principle a year ago when we urged it not to have that provision and urged the Government to have people processed as the Government will have us do if and when Bill C-55 becomes legislation? The Government will now strike the provision. I too would want that provision struck from our laws and books. One can argue that even if this is a very immoral way of bargaining, using people as leverage to try to strike a provision that was wrong from the first, it would still be laudable to have that provision off the books. I am also asking at what price and at what cost is the Government asking us to do it and in what manner is the Government trying to strike it from the books by trading it with another piece of legislation rather than having the principle and the gumption to stand up and say that that particular clause is wrong, we will eradicate it; there are no conditions; there are no strings attached; it will not become part of our legislation?

While I do not want to see that provision in the law books of the country, I find it very disturbing the Government would use desperate people as leverage to strike something that was wrong to start with.

We still have two onerous provisions; aiding and abetting and the turning back of the boats. In terms of aiding and abetting, it is useful to remind ourselves of the words spoken by Nancy Pocock from the Inter-church Committee for Refugees. She was recently given a prestigious award for her work in the area of refugees. She said:

> If my Government tells me it is a crime to help these people, I will have to say I am obeying a higher law and I am going to continue to help them when they need me.

We should think about that, Madam Speaker. We should also think about the words spoken by Mr. George Cram also from the Inter-church Committee for Refugees. He spoke about turning back boats and said:

> When we had the boat crisis in 1979, we went and saw boats being pushed off the coast of Malaysia. We saw boats being pushed off various countries around the Southeast Asia and we saw refugees dying. Why? Because the boats were not allowed to land.
>
> We are creating that. We are doing precisely what we spoke about in the United Nations in horror, that when boats carrying illegals are not allowed to land, they die.

Finally I refer to a letter that was just sent to the Minister. I believe a photocopy was sent to myself and my colleague, the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap), the critic for the New Democratic Party. This letter reads in part:

> I am very concerned about the possible passage of Bills C-55 and C-84 as they are in their present state... I also have a great fear that our international reputation for humanitarian conduct has already been somewhat eroded. At this moment, since I volunteer with the resettlement of refugee women, I am not too proud to be a Canadian. I would like to be able to hold my head up high when and after I assist these women to deal with the rules we make in this country.
>
> I trust that you will pay attention to our concerns re. the refugee Bills. Canadians have done years of hard work to achieve for Canada its reputation as a good citizen among other countries. Let's not destroy that now!

That letter was written by Maria Lanthier of the City of Toronto.

I believe those three individual quotes summarize how we feel about this legislation. We hoped that the Minister would have amended those two onerous clauses so we could preserve a domestic system that would do us honour but at the same time would protect our international reputation as Mrs. Lanthier has so articulately spelled out in her letter. We will then continue to be leaders of good policy around the world. We would be trying to build an international resolve for strengthening rather than weakening the international leadership for assisting refugees throughout the world.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau):

> That the proposed motion to amend Clause 91.1, subsection (1) of Bill C-84 be amended as follows:
>
> "(1.1) The Minister shall make a direction under subsection (1) where the Minister is satisfied
>
> THAT
>
> (A) The vehicle can return to its port of embarkation without endangering the lives of its passengers;
>
> (B) All passengers who seek Convention refugee status and are nationals or citizens of the country where the vehicle embarked them have been removed from the vehicle and brought into Canada;
>
> (C) the country where the vehicle embarked its passengers is a signatory to the Convention and complies with Article 33 thereof; and
>
> (D) the country would allow the passengers to return to that country or to have the merits of their claims to Convention refugee status determined therein.
>
> (1.2) Where the Minister believes on reasonable grounds that a vehicle within

(A) the internal waters of Canada, or

(B) the territorial sea of Canada is bringing any person into Canada in contravention of this Act or the regulations, the Minister shall direct that vehicle to be escorted to the nearest port of disembarkation and any such direction shall be enforced by such force as is reasonably necessary."

The key change, as I articulated earlier, is to change the word "may" to the word "shall" which would have the force of ensuring that any boats within 12 miles of Canada which approach with refugee claimants will have to be brought into port so that the refugee claimants may be processed and the captain thoroughly punished, fined and imprisoned and the boat sold. In this way, we may send a real message that there is a front door for refugee determination and that those who take the back door will pay a very severe price.

• (1210)

That is the direction in which this Parliament should be going. That is progressive legislation for this Government to build on the success and tradition of our victories in refugee legislation. The Government should not shame them by undermining them and by tearing apart the resolve that took years of building and debating.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): At this point, the Chair would like to suggest to the Hon. Member that the Chair will reserve for a while on this amendment. We will continue debate and the Chair will get back to the House as soon as possible.

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Madam Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to speak again against Bill C-84 and particularly against the Minister's message to the Senate the second time around answering to their second attempt to reduce the wrongs of this Bill.

The Minister's message continues injustice to refugees. It continues, contrary to her opinion, to flout the United Nations Convention in the opinion of those who are expert in the matter. It continues to flout the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada that provides to everyone physically in Canada the opportunity to make a refugee claim and it continues to visit special indignity and insult and injustice on Canadians who help real refugees.

This arises out of a so-called emergency 11 months ago when about 174 dark-skinned people came in a boat to the East Coast and asked for refugee status. That was regarded as an invasion. Although the Minister preferred to talk about thousands and tens of thousands, it was 174 people with dark skins whom the Minister used as the excuse for this unjust legislation.

I will not repeat the long list of people who came as individuals or as representatives of the churches and other public bodies to testify against this Bill, and who sent letters and petitions and who organized rallies against this Bill. In contrast, none, not one came from the public to support this Bill, only the Minister and those officials who had helped to write it. The fact is that that opposition has not gone away and the Canadian Council of Churches has vowed that it will raise hundreds of thousands of dollars to make it possible to fight these Bills in court on the basis of Charter challenges.

I will point out the errors in the Minister's response. I will point out also the need that before this Bill and Bill C-55 should be proclaimed, the Minister ought to clean up the overseas refugee selection process as suggested in a report which I delivered to her yesterday morning. I will intend also to offer two amendments.

The Minister has accepted the first amendment proposed by the Senate, but unfortunately, that amendment in itself, as proposed by the Senate, introduces a new kind of injustice into what we are doing here, a new kind of injustice into the Bill. I refer to the words which say that a person may be excluded from the right to make a refugee claim if the Minister certifies that allowing him to go through the refugee process would be contrary to the public interest.

It is bad enough, as was previously being done, to say exclude him if the Minister certifies that he is a security risk. It is bad enough because there is not due process of law for that person within Canada to defend himself. But to say, as the Minister and the Senate say in Section (c), a person that they will exclude from that right guaranteed by our treaty with the United Nations, will exclude a person described in paragraphs 19(1)(e), (f) or (g), 27(1)(c) or (2)(c), if the Minister is of the opinion that the application of Sections 45, 48, 70 and 71, the refugee process, to that person would be contrary to the public interest.

There are certain security and criminal concerns that are to be recognized and are recognized within the process that Canada agreed to 20 years ago with the United Nations that should be examined after a person has made a refugee claim and been heard, not before. But this goes much further even than the previous bad legislation proposed by the Government because this does not rest on security at all. The Government simply says: "We think it would be contrary to the public interest".

For example, if a man called Santokh Singh asks for refugee status, and if the Indian Government makes it known that it would not like it if he were given refugee status, and if Canada is seeking certain fat computer contracts with the Indian Government, then apparently it might be urged by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) that his colleague, the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mrs. McDougall), should not allow that person to make a refugee claim. It might be bad for business.

Or, for example, if the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Friesen) feels that such a person has unsatisfactory ideas, that such a person is perhaps an existentialist or belongs to some philosophical group such as the ones the Hon. Member condemned in his speech a few weeks ago, that Canada should exclude that person and that he would no doubt try to persuade the Minister to say that that person should be excluded on the

grounds that it would not be in the interests of the public of Canada to allow an existentialist to enter Canada. He has a lot of other people whose ideas he does not like as well, but the existentialist was the one that made even the Parliamentary Secretary laugh a few minutes ago.

This is contrary to the Charter, many of us believe, because that person in Canada has certain rights of equal treatment and due process under the Charter. Unfortunately, by the rules of order, I cannot offer an amendment to this because this was amended not by the Government but by the Senate, no doubt after consultation.

The second response to the Senate is to kill the Senate's attempt to soften the Government's section which criminalizes thousands of respected Canadians for doing what is admired by most Canadians and what has been admired by the Government of Canada and what has been admired by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees in giving Canada the Nansen Medal. They did not give it to the Government, fortunately. They gave it to the people of Canada for doing the very thing that this law would turn into a crime, helping a person, who did not already have a visa to do so, to come to Canada to claim refugee status.

• (1220)

It has been further demonstrated in the report I gave to the Minister's office yesterday that in places like El Salvador or Guatemala, bona fide refugees, people who have reason to fear persecution by their Governments and their death squads, are often afraid to seek a visa to enter Canada because the Canadian offices are watched by the secret police of those countries. Therefore, they have no choice but to come here without a visa. Those are the people against whom the Government has directed Bill C-84.

It has also directed the Bill against those who help those people in any sense. It has created a new offence. The Government claims it was always an offence, but that claim is patently false because no prosecution was ever attempted during the decade the existing legislation was in force. This penalty applies to people, as mentioned by my friend, such as Nancy Pocock who received the Pearson Peace Medal, who openly help these people get to the nearest Canadian Immigration Office at a point of entry to claim refugee status in spite of the fact they had not been able to get visas. This Bill creates this new offence and the Government tries to conceal that fact by claiming all it is doing is increasing the penalties. That is patently false because the penalties could have been increased without creating a new offence.

Then the Government undertakes to amend an earlier Senate amendment which it had rejected some months ago, but this time with rewording. What the Government is saying is that it wishes to allow these ships to enter under certain conditions and with certain considerations having been looked at in advance. I will not go into all of the conditions proposed in the revised 19.1(1) of the Minister, but I do wish to point to subsection (d) where she says the Minister must be satisfied that the country to which the boat would be sent back would allow the passengers to return or to have the merits of their claim to convention refugee status determined therein. That is worthless from the point of view of saving the life of a real refugee. They can be returned to that country and the country says yes, you can return, and the next day sends them out. "Return" in immigration legal usage in this country, and that is what we have to work with, does not mean return with the right to stay.

The word "admit" means return with the right to stay, but the Government has consistently refused to allow an amendment that would use the word "admit". I will be asking again that the words "the country would allow the passengers to return to that country" be struck out and replaced with the words "the country would admit the passengers to that country". That is enough to sink the whole clause. That is, without that amendment, the error of sending them back there only with the idea they can return for an hour or a day or a week is enough to sink the whole clause and the whole law.

I wish now to come to the Minister's additional motion which, along with my hon. friend, I accepted by unanimous consent for debate. I wish to point out that with this law for turning away ships, Canada has already become an international disgrace. Canada has the gall even now to condemn Thailand for pushing boats containing refugees away from its shores, the very thing that this law insists on doing. The fact that the Minister has the common sense to say "six months later, when no one is looking, let's just quietly tow it away", may get Canada out of a bad political hole but it does not fully correct the false signals sent to the world to say Canada is now joining Thailand in pushing refugees away from our shores, legally or physically pushing them away. The most I can think of doing to amend that clause is by replacing "six months" with "one month" so that we will be correcting it very soon after C-55 has been adopted and in force, if it is adopted and in force.

I now wish to come to the points on which not only Bill C-84 and Bill C-55 fall condemned, but that there must be corrective action taken if the Minister insists on putting these into law. The effect of these laws is not only to criminalize Canadians who help refugees come to Canada to seek refugee status, but as far as possible to prevent them from doing that and to have all refugees selected overseas. Therefore, the study I commissioned examined Canada's overseas refugee selection process as it relates to Central Americans applying to our overseas offices. It finds three very grave faults in that process.

One is that it favours certain countries. I am referring here to the self-exiled person class regulation in which a person from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is not required to show fear of persecution. The simple fact they come from those countries is considered adequate grounds for being considered a refugee. That is discriminatory. It is unjust. It is a denial of our

obligations to the UN which require that each refugee case be considered on its merits.

There is a similar problem emerging within the region of Central America in which one country, Nicaragua, with a much better human rights record than its neighbours El Salvador and Guatemala, nevertheless has a higher acceptance rate of refugees in Canada, perhaps because they are of a more professional class. We do not know the reasons but we know the fact that there is the appearance of discrimination in favour of Nicaraguan anti-Sandanista refugees as against refugees from the fascist Government of El Salvador and the extremely repressive Government of Guatemala. This again violates our obligations to the UN.

Second, our process fails because it puts immigration considerations ahead of refugee considerations. Refugee claimants in El Salvador and Guatemala are examined first in a prescreening process to see whether Canada thinks they would be useful immigrants. If they flunk that, if they do not have medical degrees or something we would like, then they are not even allowed to state their refugee claim. This is a violation of our obligations to the UN. The prescreening used, and the sequence of interview questions used, are clearly designed to keep out many bona fide refugees and favour those who have only the slightest refugee claim but who are otherwise more desirable immigrants.

• (1230)

The third point is that our security requirements can delay a person for as much as a year during which time it has happened that a refugee claimant is murdered by the people he was afraid would murder him. The security requirements result in risk of physical harm to the refugee claimant and very little benefit to Canada. The RCMP testified last August that during 1986 and to that point in 1987, of 11,000 undocumented aliens that they had examined, they found no evidence of security risk or danger to Canada.

I ask the Minister to clear up these points. If she is going to insist that all our refugees be selected overseas, at least let her ensure that the system is changed to become more honest, open, fair, and in keeping with our obligations to the United Nations. I wish to move the two amendments of which I spoke. The first amendment is to Section 91.1(1)(d) as amended by the Government. I move:

> That Section 91.1(1)(d) as amended by the Government be amended by deleting the words "the country would allow passengers to return to that country" and in insert therefor the words "the country would admit the passengers to that country".

The reason for that amendment is as I have mentioned. The word "admit" in our usage means that that country would allow the person to enter and stay as of right, not to be bounced out again on the next boat or the next plane.

My second amendment is to the Government's new clause. I move:

> That Clause 8 as amended by the Government be amended by striking out the word "six months" and inserting therefor the words "one month".

This is an attempt to reduce the scandal caused around the world by the fact that Canada has been proposing for a year now to do what it condemns countries of Southeast Asia for doing, that is, pushing the boats away. I know there will be arguments that they are going to look after the safety of the boats and so on, but the essential point is that unless my other amendment is accepted we will be pushing away real refugees who will not then have an assured chance of having their cases examined. Since Canada has pushed them away without hearing them, Canada has no reason to expect that another country will hear them. I would ask the House to adopt both of these amendments.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Chair would like to deal at this time with the amendment presented by the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi). It is in order, and will read as follows:

> That the motion be amended by deleting the word "may" in 91.1(1.1) and (1.2) and substituting the word "shall" therefor.

As to the motions presented by the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap), the amendment to Clause 8 is in order and can be put to the House at this time. However, the amendment to Clause 91.1 (1)(d) cannot be put to the House at this time. We must dispose of the motion of the Hon. Member for York West before we can deal with this one. Henceforth the amendment to Clause 8 proposed by the Hon. Member is now before the House.

There is a question and comment period following the Hon. Member's speech.

Mr. Keeper: Madam Speaker, I have a few questions I would like to ask my hon. colleague to elaborate on. The first takes us back to the genesis of this legislation. I use the word genesis advisedly because it seems to me that this legislation came about a long time ago. Last summer we were called back here in an emergency situation to deal with an urgent crisis which was facing the nation. We were called back under special Standing Orders in order to take quick action. Yet a year later we are dealing with that same legislation.

Would my colleague comment on the nature of this emergency? What kind of emergency was facing the nation which we were called back to deal with, when a full year later we are still dealing with the same legislation? Will my colleague comment on what he thinks was going on when we were called back in an emergency session a year ago and we are now still in the same session dealing with the same piece of legislation?

Mr. Heap: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for a very appropriate and timely question. I will make two points in response. The nature of the emergency, as presented, was that 174 dark-skinned people had landed on the East Coast of Canada claiming refugee status. Whether they will be found to be refugees under our laws we do not yet know. The Government suggested that there would be many boats of this sort

coming if we did not pass a law quickly to stop them. Eleven months later no more boats have arrived. There have been rumours of boats and rumours of wars, but no more boats have arrived. Therefore, it seems that the Government over-reacted.

Second, had the Government really been interested in simply increasing penalties for people like the Captain of the *Amelie*, it could have done so within weeks with majority consent of the Opposition and the Canadian public. This was made known to the Government by representatives of churches, bar associations, unions, all the refugee support groups, and immigrant groups including the Canadian Ethnocultural Council. They all said that if certain amendments were accepted which focused the penalties on those who tried to bring refugees in secretly and clandestinely by deception, we would pass the legislation quickly.

The Government did not want to limit the legislation that way. It wanted to criminalize and intimidate thousands of Canadians who have been helping refugees. That is why this law has been held up today and will be held up even after it has been proclaimed because it will not stand in the courts.

Mr. Keeper: Madam Speaker, I have another basic question about the legislation on refugees with which we are dealing. It has to do with how people who claim to the Canadian authorities to be refugees are treated. I am wondering whether my colleague, who is informed in this area, can tell us whether when people from East European countries, for example, apply for refugee status in Canada they are treated any differently than people who apply for refugee status from Chile or El Salvador?

• (1240)

In other words, is the Government pursuing a uniform refugee policy or is there a significant difference in the way people from Central America are treated? I am particularly interested in knowing how someone from Chile who is applying for refugee status would be treated. We know that a young lady from Chile who stayed in Montreal had suffered serious burns as a result of political persecution under General Pinochet in Chile. She is showing great courage by going back to that country.

Can people from Chile who apply for refugee status expect equal and fair treatment as those applying from eastern European countries?

Mr. Heap: Madam Speaker, the answer to my colleague's pertinent question is no. According to the regulations they get unequal treatment.

A person from Chile on the run from a bloody dictator may be rejected. Some of them are rejected by Canadians on the grounds alleged by Canadian Government representatives that they cannot prove satisfactorily that they have a well founded fear of persecution if they stay in Chile or return to Chile.

However, persons who come from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, U.S.S.R. or Yugoslavia, according to the government's self exiled person class regulations, are not examined on that point at all. It simply states that they will be considered if they are citizens, former citizens or former residents of a country listed in Schedule 1 and are outside of Canada and are not residing or sojourning in any of the countries listed in Schedules 1 or 2, including those countries I mentioned, and are unwilling or unable to return to their country of citizenship or former habitual residence. It does not say anything about a well founded fear of persecution. The regulation goes on to state that they will be considered if they have not become permanently resettled and are seeking resettlement in Canada. There is a double standard, and it works against refugees from most countries in the world.

Mr. Keeper: According to Government policy, as I am sure was true under past Liberal governments as well, a person from Chile who is applying for refugee status faces an extra obstacle before achieving refugee status in this country. They must establish a well founded fear of political prosecution, of death or other persecution in that country. Is that what my colleague is saying?

How could anyone doubt that someone from a country like Chile does not have a well founded fear? Anyone who visits Chile would have no doubt that the people in Chile live in terror. One only need walk the streets of Santiago to feel the fear and terror under which people live. It is the very essence of that political system.

How could a Canadian Government official ever doubt that a person who has been politically active in Chile would not have a well founded fear? Unless someone is a special assistant to General Pinochet, the very nature of the political system in Chile would provide a basis for someone to have a well founded fear.

Mr. Heap: I cannot say what is in the minds of Government officials in terms of doubt. I can say what the action was in one typical case. Chileans who were flying to Canada to claim refugee status stopped *en route* at Buenos Aires. A Canadian consular official went on board and before even talking to them said they were not refugees, just economic migrants. When a reputable Canadian lawyer, an expert in refugee affairs, was sent at private expense to Buenos Aires to examine them, he found a person who had been more than once imprisoned and tortured by the Chilean police for his trade union activities. Yet the Canadian official said he was not a refugee, just an economic migrant. She did not even listen to his story. That is the treatment often, but not always accorded to Chileans but not to people from Schedules 1 and 2 countries in eastern Europe.

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Madam Speaker, normally one is pleased to speak to a particular Bill. However, I think it is a disgrace that we are here, still dealing with this Bill, on the anniversary of the arrival of 147 Sikhs on Canadian shores. We were called back to the House of Commons on the pretext of a crisis in which we needed immediate laws to

handle this supposed untenable situation. We were presented with this Draconian legislation.

The fourth Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mrs. McDougall) appears to be more flexible. She obviously understands what needs to be done. I agree with her that we require proper laws in this land. We knew that in 1983 when we asked Rabbi Plaut to chair a committee that would give us an indication of how to deal with refugees who come here. We wanted to be a safe harbour to those in need and legitimately had the right to claim that status here. We wanted the kind of security measures and assurances to monitor and ensure that unworthy and unwanted people coming to this shore would not be given safe harbour. Yet neither problem has been answered adequately by a Government that does not seem to understand how to draft a Bill that reflects the Canadian attitude of openness toward strangers in need. Those who have no right to be in this land are not welcome.

The Minister is right in saying that we must send a message that undesirables are not welcome in Canada. Furthermore, those who confuse the issue by lying and stealing from those who would come here must be dealt with as well. Adequate punishments must be imposed.

The Draconian legislation introduced by the Government is before us once again on the anniversary of the arrival of the Sikhs. The Senate proposed some very intelligent and rational changes. It really was the Chamber of sober second thought. It was all Senators, not just Liberal Senators, who made recommendations. They strongly suggested there were errors made in this Bill both with respect to the methodology of turning back the boats and in the way it was written around the aiding and abetting of church groups and private citizens who, in a sense, were acting like good solid Canadians in lending the kind of help that I think the Minister intended in principle be acknowledged. However, the Bill unforgivably ignored the basic principles suggested by the Senate.

• (1250)

Let us look at how these things were ignored and how the Senate was rejected with respect to the compromises it put forward. Let me say in *entre parenthèses* that I come from a riding in which almost 40 per cent of its membership have come to Canada in the last 30 years. They have built the fabric of the Mount Royal riding into an absolutely exciting and dynamic multicultural, cosmopolitan part of the City of Montreal, of Canada and of Québec. I have talked to the Sikhs and to the Vietnamese boat people who have built up a wonderful centre in this riding.

If we had had this kind of narrow-minded mentality 20 years ago, we would not be enriched by those people and the kind of economy and personal initiative they have brought to this country, and that goes for the whole Caribbean Diaspora where there are problems, as you well know, Madam Speaker. It goes for the Tamils as well and I think the Minister should come to my riding and talk to these people. She would then correct the errors in this Bill. She would not turn back boats with these conditions and she would not charge as aiding and abetting with fines and imprisonment for people who have had some disagreement with Bill C-55.

The fundamental prescreening process is in some disagreement. The safe third country concept is an unacceptable concept because there is no real way of ensuring a safe third country. There is an inadequate non-universal appeal system which goes to the Federal Court, a court which does not have the kind of training or expertise that is required to examine a refugee claimant in order to determine their status in an intelligent and enlightened way. These are human beings. These are people who have families, who have children and whose lives are in danger. So there is a disagreement on the fundamental process.

These church groups, public advocacy groups, and fundamentally well-intentioned people are there to look at the individual cases to see if they can help them get the proper documentation. When the Senate wanted to protect those who acted in that way in a more open and upfront non-clandestine way, we say no. These are good solid Canadians of good will and we make them cheat. That is ridiculous. That is where we have to make some changes.

There are lawyers who want to help real refugees who are seeking the kinds of information a refugee needs. A refugee cannot stop and run back to his country because he needs his papers. He is fleeing a country which is no longer home to him. Anyone who has had to move from one city to another knows the trauma of dislocation and relocation, language, culture, environment, weather, the whole bit. These kindly and concerned lawyers try to enable a refugee to get their proper documentation but they will be harassed and subject to fines, and unnecessarily so. It is too bad that that was not changed.

I listened to the Minister as she talked about the refugees who were to be excluded from the refugee determination processing system and that she alone is responsible for that final decision. I think the Minister takes a terrible chance with those kinds of responsibilities. One should not disallow in that way for security purposes, but I know she has already said no to that amendment. It boggles my mind that she has said no to so many sound and intelligent amendments.

With respect to the deterrence and punishment procedure of people who are already on boats, my colleague, ho, I would suggest, has given a carefully listening ear to people who have experienced this refugee system. He has travelled and has heard from people who have experienced this particular trauma of dislocation. He has brought to our attention a very credible amendment which I would like to support very strongly. Under Section 91.1 the Minister may make a direction if she is satisfied that the vehicle can return to its port of embarkation without endangering the lives of its passengers. That is utterly ridiculous. Is she going to get frogmen out to take a look at the underside of the boat to see if it is safe? Is she going to investigate inside the boat?

There are four conditions here. If the vehicle is 12 to 24 miles outside of our country, it would have to be determined and then decided whether or not to send the passengers back to their country of origin, if they have refugee status, if they are nationals or if they are citizens of that country. The whole thing is just a mess of potash and I would suggest it be returned and looked at again. She should instead bring in the ship, arrest the captain, throw the book at him, throw the key away, and impound the ship. That is the kind of message we should be sending out to the world. We should be saying: "If you bring your boat in here, mister, you will end up in jail and you, the owner of the boat, say goodbye to your property". Believe me, they would not then be involved in this kind of illicit action such as bringing in illegitimate refugees, because we do not want those illegitimate refugees. We want productive, hard working, honourable people. Those are the kind of refugees who are welcome in this country.

I would like to speak about Section 91.1(1), where the Minister believes on reasonable grounds that a vehicle within the internal waters of Canada or the territorial sea of Canada is bringing any person into Canada in contravention of this Act or the regulation, the Minister may direct that the vehicle be escorted to the nearest port. Why "may"? It should read the Minister shall be obliged to. That is what Canadians want. It should read, after the boat has been escorted to the port of disembarkation and any such direction "shall" be enforced by such force as is reasonably necessary. In that way the search and the seizure could be done, the bona fides of the refugees involved could be established and the captain could be taken from the boat as well. I hope there will be serious consideration and support in this House for the amendments put forward by my colleague.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It being one o'clock p.m., I do now leave the chair until two o'clock p.m.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) does not appeal to or speak for rational Canadians when he says that Canadians are tired of the trade debate and just want to see the deal approved because they have made up their minds. Does he not realize that the latest polls show more Canadians oppose than support the deal?

The Minister for International Trade does not appeal to the pride and independence of Canadians when he says that the trade legislation cannot be changed by Parliament. Why should Canadians bother to elect Members of Parliament if they are to sit impotent and approve a Bill which overrides all other federal or provincial legislation that conflicts with the agreement?

The Minister for International Trade underestimates how much Canadians value water when he treats casually Illinois Governor Thompson's demand to triple the flow of water from Lake Michigan to the Midwest rivers.

When will the Minister for International Trade come to his senses?

* * *

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

RANGE FIRES CAUSED BY LOCOMOTIVE SPARKS

Mr. Geoff Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, ranchers in southwestern Saskatchewan are understandably upset over the numerous range fires caused by sparks from locomotives along the right of way of the Canadian Pacific Railway main line. These fires spread rapidly, causing considerable damage to the grassland. As well, the time and effort of countless numbers of local residents, neighbours, and volunteers are expended on the containment of these fires.

The ranchers question whether the spark arresters on the locomotives are properly maintained. They also ask why the CPR does not conduct more controlled burnings of the right of way in order to reduce the fire hazard. Finally, they ask why they should be fighting the CPR's fires thereby placing themselves at risk, without compensation.

Feelings in the southwest are running high. Some ranchers indicate they are prepared to burn the right of way themselves if the CPR will not do so.

In short, residents along the main line of the CPR resent the cavalier attitude of the railway. They ask that action be taken in order to maintain properly the right of way and the spark arresters on the locomotives.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

RETURN OF CARMEN QUINTANA TO CHILE

Ms. Pauline Jewett (New Westminster—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, this evening a young woman of uncommon courage

and grace is going home. Despite the obscene efforts of a wicked military regime to dismember her body and still her voice, Carmen Quintana is returning to Chile, determined, as always, to serve the cause of justice and democracy.

With the help and support of countless friends in Chile and Canada, caring burn doctors and nurses, she has defied medical odds, and General Pinochet. Tonight, she will do as she always vowed she would—return to her troubled homeland.

For the Chilean people she is living testimony that the human spirit endures and, ultimately, conquers the practitioners of terror. "I want to work with the Chilean people to bring back democracy", Carmen said yesterday as she bid us goodbye.

Albert Camus once wrote: "Those who love and are separated can live in suffering, but not in despair; they know love exists".

Carmen Quintana is returning to a land she loves. She is returning to a people she loves. She goes home with the love and admiration of all Canadians.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIVE PEOPLES

AGREEMENT BETWEEN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND JAMES BAY CREE

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, a 14 million dollar agreement was announced today by the Government of Canada and the James Bay Cree; this is a first step in the freeing up of negotiations on the implementation of the James Bay Convention with the Cree.

The agreement marks the end of a dispute revolving around four years' worth of adjustments to the amount of transfer payments to be made to the Cree for part of municipal service charges, that is the operating expenses of local and regional Cree governments, fire-fighting services, public health, roads and the maintenance of public facilities and buildings.

Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of the James Bay Cree in administering their own affairs constitute a remarkable success for the Cree and for all Canadians.

We should appreciate the work done by Big Chief Matthew Cooncome, as well as by the eight Chiefs from Cree villages, Judge Réjean Paul, federal negotiator Andrew Croll and Roderick Pachano, the Cree's negotiator. Mr. Pachano stated that the permanent relation between the Cree government and the Canadian government is based on respect for the spirit of the James Bay and Northern Québec Convention. In the absence of goodwill, it is hard to accomplish anything at all. Today's agreement marks the beginning of the reinstatement of trust.

* * *

• (1405)

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

QUEBEC'S EXPECTATIONS

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, we are a few weeks or a few days away from an election call and the Conservative government, after four years, still has not settled 12 priority issues important for Quebec: the Space Agency; the Banking Center; the development of the Port of Montreal; the improvements to the Old Port of Montreal; the contract for the construction of railway engines for Bombardier; the CN maintenance shops in southwest Montreal; the paper mill in Matane; a bridge on route 30 for the City of Valleyfield; a specific agriculture policy for Quebec; early retirement, and the Lauzon, Sorel and Montreal shipyards.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude with that. This is what we are wondering about at the present time: is the Government delaying its decisions in order to announce them during the election campaign in the hope that Quebecers will forget its incompetence and its neglect of them over the past four years? Or does it simply not have the courage to make decisions because there is disagreement within its caucus about the Space Agency?

* * *

[*English*]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

KOREAN WAR—AWARD OF SERVICE BADGES

Mr. Allan Pietz (Welland): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Hees) recently announced that Canadians who served in the Korean War are being awarded Korean Service Badges by Canada for the first time in 35 years.

On July 26 we will celebrate the thirty-fifth anniversary of the end of the Korean War. As we commemorate that day, we can be proud that it was this Government that at long last has seen fit to show Canada's appreciation for the dedication and sacrifice of Canadian servicemen who fought for freedom in that conflict.

Up until the recent announcement by the Minister, Korean War veterans were awarded British service medals and United Nations service medals only, and unlike veterans who served in the First and Second World Wars received no specific recognition from their own country.

S. O. 21

The Korean Service Badges recognize the contribution made by veterans who served with the Canadian Forces or associated support groups between June 27, 1950, and July 27, 1954. The Minister also announced that the immediate family of a deceased veteran may apply for the badge.

It is about time that these brave men and women received an official thank you from the people and Government of Canada, and I am very proud to be a member of the Government that has finally made this possible.

* * *

NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION

PROPOSED CANADIAN HALL OF FAME

Mr. Bill Tupper (Nepean—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to live in the nation's capital for nearly three decades. I describe this national capital as a jewel, even though every jewel needs a little polishing. This capital possesses great natural beauty. It is a safe and secure place in which to live, work, and raise a family. It has great schools, universities, research and cultural institutions.

The National Capital Commission recently prepared a discussion paper entitled "The Capital Orientation Plan". The NCC has a mandate to ensure that our capital serves as a meeting place, bringing Canadians together through the democratic process; communicating Canada to Canadians; and safeguarding and preserving those national treasures which are unique in their influence on all Canadians— in short, the mandate to turn our capital into a national symbol.

One of the Commission's principal proposals is to make known the major achievements of Canadians. This could be done by creating a Canadian Hall of Fame in the capital which would recognize both individual and collective achievements and contributions to the quality of Canadian life. I would like to encourage the National Capital Commission in achieving its goals.

* * *

• (1410)

LABOUR RELATIONS

TORONTO—LOCK-OUT AT CFTO-TV

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, as communications critic for the New Democratic Party, I am concerned about the lock-out by CFTO-TV in Toronto. It looks like the company is simply out to break the union and it is clearly bargaining in bad faith in order to do so.

I quote from someone who is not what I would consider a leftie, and that is Lorrie Goldstein of the Toronto *Sun*. He said:

> Personally, I don't like unions.
>
> Having said that, if CFTO-TV chief Doug Bassett was my boss, I'd probably be a union man.

I am concerned especially about their biased news reporting of their own strike. That is an abuse of the freedom of the press, abuse of the airwaves, and the CRTC should look into that. I am also concerned that cabinet Ministers have been crossing the picket lines in spite of the fact that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) says that he would never cross picket lines and cabinet Ministers are not supposed to do so.

This is a mean, vicious strike. The management of CFTO better realize that there are larger issues involved here and get a settlement of the lock-out strike.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

BEIRUT REFUGEE CAMPS—ARMED STRUGGLE FOR CONTROL

Mr. Roland de Corneille (Eglinton—Lawrence): Mr. Speaker, once again innocent men, women, and children in the Beirut refugee camps of Shatila and Bourj-el-Barajneh have been caught up in the crossfire of rival PLO militia groups who have been struggling for control.

Since the beginning of May approximately 170 people have been killed and over 600 wounded as a result of the fighting between the mainstream PLO Fatah forces of Yasser Arafat and those of his Syrian-sponsored rival, Col. Said Mussa's Fatah-Uprising faction. Witnesses say that "virtually every building in the Shatila camp has been wrecked or severely damaged". PLO officials state that 80 per cent of the Bourj-el-Barajneh camp has been destroyed by bombardments over the last 60 days.

On June 27, Mr. Arafat's group was forced to surrender the Shatila camp to Mr. Mussa's men after losing a three-month battle that killed over 90 people. While this brought the fighting in that camp to an end, a number of Fatah fighters requested and were granted safe passage by Libyan mediators to Mr. Arafat's bases near Sidon. There they will undoubtedly regroup to fight other battles and claim more innocent lives. By July 7 the Bourj-el-Barajneh camp had fallen to Mr. Mussa's forces, with 38 people being killed and 93 wounded since the battle for the camp intensified on July 4.

There has been no official Canadian government statement about this slaughter. It is unbelievably strange that such scant media attention has been given this brutal tragedy which has lasted several months. Canada should give consideration to what measures it can take to help innocent people escape the factional warfare of the PLO that inevitably leads to the death of their own refugees.

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

BENEFITS OF BILL C-72

Mr. André Plourde (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup): Mr. Speaker, the people of Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup are delighted with the adoption on third reading of Bill C-72, the Official Languages Bill.

I wanted to raise the subject today and express my unqualified appreciation of our democratic system, thanks to which the equality of French and English as official languages within our federal institutions has finally been recognized.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this Bill has corrected a situation that in this day and age was becoming intolerable. In fact, it took a Conservative Government and our Conservative Prime Minister, who has the courage of his convictions, to table and adopt the Official Languages Act, something the Liberal Government under Pierre Elliott Trudeau was afraid to do.

Mr. Speaker, the democratic process has dealt with certain individuals in this country who had a narrow and unbending attitude towards the French fact. Personally, I believe that our diversity and our respect for our differences will enhance our stature as a nation.

* * *

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

WESTERN DROUGHT—ASSISTANCE SOUGHT BY BRITISH COLUMBIA BEEF PRODUCERS

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, the South Kamloops Stockmen's Association recently informed the Minister of Agriculture for Canada (Mr. Wise) about the very critical situation its members are facing as a result of the prolonged, hot and dry weather. With herds representing thousands of head of cattle, their present water supplies are completely inadequate, and many ranchers are forced to haul water. Some have been hauling water since last fall and some ranchers presently have no water supply at all.

The situation looks especially bleak for this fall, and it means that there will likely be no water at all for this winter. The drought in the Thompson-Nicola region of British Columbia is at a crisis stage and these beef producers require immediate and special assistance.

I urge the Minister of Agriculture to take action immediately to provide the members of the South Kamloops Stockmen's Association with a subsidy to offset their recent drought related costs so that they will not be forced to sell off their herds.

These cattlemen form a crucial component of our regional economy and all efforts must be made to ensure their survival during these extremely dry months.

• (1415)

When we think of western agriculture, Mr. Speaker, often our thinking stops at the Rockies. I urge the Minister of Agriculture to remember all those struggling through the drought, including those ranchers in the interior valleys of British Columbia.

* * *

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SERVICE CHARGES—TREATMENT OF SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. Reginald Stackhouse (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business is seeking protection from unfair financial service charges on small businesses. It says that a measure of justice has already been accorded to the consumers of Canada, but much more is needed to be granted to small business people affected by financial institutions.

Particularly the Federation asks that financial institutions provide complete information on changes when they are to be made to service charges. It wants charge-back fees on NSF cheques eliminated. It calls for an annual monitoring of service charges as they apply to small businesses, and it seeks an appeal process to redress grievances.

The Government has already made a beginning in responding to these recommendations. I urge it to finish the job. The health of small business is vital to Canada's economy. We are aware that the key problem in this instance is the extreme imbalance of power between the financial institutions and small businesses. Here is an opportunity for Parliament and the Government to provide the equalizer.

* * *

RAILWAYS

DISBANDMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND RAILWAY—EFFECT ON NORTH SYDNEY, N.S.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, when the Government on June 20 announced the closure of the Newfoundland Railway it said that the town of North Sydney would not be affected. Yet on the same day the President of CN said that he was starting a new boat service from Halifax to St. John's. The very next day, CN sent a directive to all its outlets saying that as of June 25 all containers in eastern Newfoundland, east of Gander, would be shipped from Halifax to St. John's.

Atlantic Container Express just a few days later said that the closure of the Newfoundland Railway would mean that its business of shipping from Montreal to Corner Brook and St. John's would increase by 12 per cent to 15 per cent, which would have a devastating effect on the freight crossing from North Sydney to Port aux Basques and Argentia.

Now the workers in North Sydney are more alarmed than ever because the statistics, since the closure of the Newfoundland Railway, indicate that freight traffic from North Sydney to Newfoundland has declined by 70 per cent. This is despite the Government's statement that North Sydney would not be a affected.

When will the Government realize it is devastating freight shipments from North Sydney to Newfoundland?

* * *

PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS

ONTARIO—EFFECT OF PROVINCIAL POLICIES ON HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. John Oostrom (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, the Peterson Government has announced that 101 beds at Wellesly Hospital must remain closed in order to meet budgetary restraints. In fact the Peterson Government will soon force more bed closures in all hospitals across the province as a result of its overspending in other fields. What hypocrisy!

What happened to the 1987 election promise of $3 billion toward health care? The Peterson Government recently enacted one of the biggest tax grabs in Ontario history by raising taxes across the board, including substantial hikes in sales and personal income taxes. Yet the Peterson Government is ignoring health care, the most vital of all government services. It is apparent that the Government of Ontario places politics above the health of its citizens.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—WATER

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. Last night, our deputy chief trade negotiator, Ambassador Gordon Ritchie, declared for the first time that during the talks with the United States, Canadian experts from the Department of the Environment and experts on our negotiating team had drafted a special clause to exclude, to exempt our water from the FTA, and that the Canadian negotiating team had never insisted on getting this exemption.

Mr. Speaker, this raises some troubling questions. First of all, why have Conservative ministers systematically denied before the House that there had ever been any intention of excluding water? Why this misleading attitude? And second, since the trade legislation has paramountcy over Canada's water policy, why didn't Canada insist on obtaining this exclusion which was judged to be necessary by our experts from the Department of the Environment?

[*English*]

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, it seems very difficult for the Leader of the Opposition to understand that water was never on the table in the free trade negotiations.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1420)

Miss MacDonald: Quite frankly, the Leader of the Opposition may not want to understand that because, of course, his past references to water would lead us to believe that he indeed would have put it on the table.

Mr. McDermid: He would have given it away.

Miss MacDonald: There is no question about where this Government stands on the issue of large-scale diversions of water. We have said that there will be no large-scale diversion of water from this country. What is more, we have done something which the Liberal Party had never done in all its time in office. We have issued a water policy which expressly prohibits the exportation and the diversion of large-scale amounts of water.

I think it is about time that the Leader of the Opposition understood what this issue is all about, without trying to contrive some false approach which simply does not hold water.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I had known for a long time the Minister was Acting Prime Minister today, but I regret to say that she appears to have caught the contagious bombastic disease of her absent seat-mate. We might as well have been listening to the Minister for International Trade today. His philosophy when dealing with the House of Commons is simple.

Mr. Rodriguez: Deny, deny, deny.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): No, it is don't read the deal. That is number one. Don't debate the issues. That is number two. Try to bluff your way out of any falsehood you can. That is number three.

LENGTH OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Acting Prime Minister, while she is in

such a benign mood, on such a complex, serious and vital issue for Canada as this, why are Canadians being allowed less than one month to come to Ottawa to appear before the committee and to express their views on this crucial trade arrangement with the United States? Why do the residents of Vancouver Quadra, or of any other riding in Canada, have to travel hundreds or thousands of miles to come to Ottawa to get the chance to have their say on this Bill? Why is the Government afraid of the Canadian public?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, once again the Leader of the Opposition expresses his own fears. If there is one individual in one Party who is afraid of the Canadian public, he is sitting opposite in this House of Commons.

The free trade debate has gone on for a long period of time. It has been debated. It has been raised by hundreds of organizations and thousands of individuals across the country.

Obviously there will be presentations put to the parliamentary committee within the next month. I would think that the individual Members of Parliament who sit on that committee will give very proper attention to those who come before them. There will be full and adequate hearings, and the members of the committee will give proper consideration to the presentations that are made.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, the Acting Prime Minister has a unique opportunity. She is in charge today of the Government of Canada. She can leave the House immediately, go see the Governor General, and let's issue the writ. What about that?

Some Hon. Members: Go, go!

TERMS OF IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Acting Prime Minister has been briefed by the Hon. Member for Brampton—Georgetown. He is looking real tough there. He had better get back to his constituency and protect his behind.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): The Acting Prime Minister talked about fear. More than a month ago the Principal Secretary to the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Burney, in a panic, flew down to Washington because, on behalf of the Government of Canada, he was disturbed about what might be in the American legislation, particularly having to do with the tribunal and with the definition of subsidy.

• (1425)

My question is this. How can the parliamentary committee studying the Canadian legislation implementing the deal have any confidence that Canadian concerns expressed by the Prime Minister's Office about the American legislation have been addressed when that legislation has not yet been made public? What is the idea of the Government pushing our legislation through this House in such a hurry when we have not yet seen the American legislation? Why the obscene haste?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Two points with regard to the preamble, Mr. Speaker. One has to do with recent elections. The Lac-Saint-Jean result would not, I think, provide any great support or encouragement to the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss MacDonald: Second, because he raised the issue—

Mr. Riis: You bought that election.

Miss MacDonald: Now we are hearing from the NDP which managed 9 per cent of the vote in Lac-Saint-Jean.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Miss MacDonald: The Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition raised another point when he said that Mr. Burney went down to Washington in a panic. I want to assure him that I have never known Mr. Burney to do anything in a panic.

Finally, I want to say that we are proceeding with legislation in this House and in committee because this happens to be a sovereign Parliament. We decide the process and the way this Parliament will implement legislation in this country. We do not, like the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition seems to think, take direction from the people he listens to in Washington. Those are the ways in which the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition seems to think this Parliament should operate. We do not think that way because we know this is a sovereign Parliament.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I can only say to the Acting Prime Minister that if her assessment of the key to electoral success for the Tory Party in Lac-Saint-Jean was $164 million, it will cost the Canadian people $45 billion for it to win the general election.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Write the cheque, Mike.

Mr. Axworthy: It would take that much to win Rosedale alone.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Acting Prime Minister. We have seen a suppression of the rights of Parliament in its ability to provide access to Canadians to proper committee hearings and the ability to make amendments. In addition, the Canadian people are being put at a major disadvantage *vis-à-vis* the U.S.

The omnibus Trade Bill is now in front of Congress ready to be passed. Our senior trade negotiator, Mr. Ritchie, has acknowledged that Bill would totally undermine the trade

agreement. We have the Chairman of the Finance Committee saying that the U.S. Congress will introduce major new subsidy requirements for Canada as part of its implementing legislation. We now have two damaging pieces of trade legislation before the U.S. Congress, yet we are going to rush our Bill through without proper hearings.

Mr. Gormley: Do you have a question sometime this afternoon?

Mr. Axworthy: Why is the Government ready to suppress the rights of this Parliament and put Canadians at a major disadvantage *vis-à-vis* the U.S. and its trade legislation, rather than taking the prudent, responsible course and ensuring that the two pieces of legislation are at least brought forward at the same time so we can see where the advantages and disadvantages lie?

• (1430)

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I come back to the point I raised before. Obviously the Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry does not believe that this is a sovereign Parliament. We do. We feel that we should be taking the steps which we as a Government and as a legislature believe should be taken for this country.

There can always be some question as to how many Canadians are in favour of the free trade deal and how many are not. However, every survey which has been taken shows that more Canadians want to have the free trade agreement implemented than are opposed to it.

That happens to be the case with the Opposition. Once again they are backing a losing proposition. They want to tear up the free trade deal. Canadians want to see it implemented and we are doing that.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister is saying that the Government's decision is dictated by the polls, then I point out a very important poll which appeared last week which indicated that 65 per cent of Canadians want an election on this issue. We can only conclude that the Government is afraid to have one because it is afraid to put the deal in front of the Canadian people. That happens to be the case.

ENERGY—MANITOBA STUDY

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Energy of the Province of Manitoba released a study yesterday which pointed out that if the Canada-U.S. trade deal had been in effect during the last energy crisis, from 1979 to 1982, it would have cost Canadian consumers an additional $72.6 billion because we would not have been able to provide the support and protection to Canadian consumers which was available at that time.

Has the Government undertaken similar studies which would confirm these findings? Would it table those studies? Would it be able to tell us what the cost would be to Canadian consumers if they faced another energy crisis under the Canada-U.S. trade deal? Would it be another $72.6 billion?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I know the Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry likes to pose hypothetical questions to the House—"if it should be this", "if it should be that", and so on.

Quite frankly, with regard to energy deals we saw exactly what it cost the people of Canada in the early 1980s, particularly the people of western Canada, when the former Liberal Government implemented an energy package which did immense damage to this country economically.

We are dealing with the reality of the situation rather than with hypothetical issues. We knew that the national energy plan had to be turned around and we know that this one has to go ahead.

WATER RESOURCES—AMBASSADOR'S TESTIMONY

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister as well. On June 16 the Minister for International Trade said, "Water is not affected by the free trade agreement".

Last night in committee Ambassador Ritchie indicated that "there was technical work done" on the question of exempting water from this trade deal. In fact, he indicated that there was a "technical proposition" on the matter prepared, and confirmed "some official from another Department had indicated with great pride that he had some involvement . . . " in that work.

Given this, why has the Government consistently maintained that there was no connection between water and the trade deal when this preparatory work had been done according to the testimony of our ambassador?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I reiterate once again that water and the diversion of water was never on the table. I will repeat that for the Member. Water was never on the table. I hope he will understand that.

In fact, with regard to water policy we have introduced for the first time a water policy which states very clearly that there shall be no diversion of large scale water projects in this country.

I would also like to point out that Mr. Ritchie did say last night that there is nothing in the agreement which would constrain the Government in implementing its water policy. In other words, legislation dealing with water policy could flow from the statements and the policies that have already been introduced, but they are not part of the free trade agreement.

REQUEST FOR INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION ON WATER RESOURCES

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, the point, of course, is that that is precisely what Ambassador

Ritchie went on to say. He went on to say that there was nothing which would prevent action being taken to prevent such inter-basin water transfers as are now threatening the Great Lakes.

Given that there was nothing within the agreement which would prevent that, which is precisely what he said, would the Government, on an emergency basis, bring in legislation to prevent such water transfers which will damage people right across the Great Lakes basin?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I have two points to make. Last night Ambassador Ritchie said that water for export on a large scale was never considered to be part of the free trade agreement.

Second, I will be glad to send the Member a copy of this document dated November 5, 1987, which says, "Large-scale water diversions to the United States will not be considered by the Canadian Government under any circumstances according to the federal water policy tabled today by the Environment Minister".

I would ask the Member to read this so that he will know what the policy of the country and the Government is.

Mr. Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor but I think the Chair should observe that the last question was, at least in the opinion of the Chair, hypothetical. I know this is a very important matter and Ministers, of course, may answer if they wish. However, I would ask Hon. Members who are asking questions to remember the rule that hypothetical questions are, strictly speaking, out of order. I know the Hon. Member will be able to pose his question adequately.

REQUEST FOR INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION ON EMERGENCY BASIS

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the Acting Prime Minister that in the comments which she quoted from Ambassador Ritchie he went on to say that it may have been in error that they made that conclusion. Therefore, I ask the Minister—

Some Hon. Members: Come on, be honest.

Mr. Langdon: I quote from the transcript of the committee. If the Acting Prime Minister has the transcript, let her quote it back.

Given the fact that the Government can move to put legislation in place to protect the Great Lakes basin, will the Government, on an emergency basis, bring such legislation in at once?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, once again I will refer to the water policy which has been enunciated by the Government. I have read what it says. Legislation may indeed at some time flow from this policy, but this is the policy of the Canadian Government. The Minister stated, "Let me state categorically that the Canadian Government opposes the diversion of fresh water across our international borders".

That is the statement of the Minister, that is the policy of the Government. We have a tremendous concern about the water resources of this country, about water policy, and about environmental policy. It was for that reason that the Government of Canada this morning signed an agreement with the Province of British Columbia on the South Moresby Park.

• (1440)

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss MacDonald: That is an indication of the kind of concern that we continue to express.

WATER POLICY—REQUEST FOR INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. It flows from her last reply. It is almost one year since the federal water policy was announced and published. It is a policy that has no teeth until it is transformed into legislation. The Acting Prime Minister may be surprised, but it has no teeth until it is law. It is just a policy.

When will the Government introduce a Bill that will give teeth to the federal water policy that is explained in the document itself which is almost one year old? When will that happen?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I find it absolutely amazing that a Member who was a former Minister of the Environment, who never got around to introducing any kind of policy, should now be saying that we have not moved quickly enough. What was he doing all the time he was in the federal Cabinet? Did anyone ever listen to him? Did anyone ever pay attention? Obviously not, because there was no water policy announced.

This has been announced, and people who are concerned know what the policy of the federal Government is. We will see it moving forward as it should and as it has until now.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, it is definitely of secondary importance that I initiated this process of arriving at a federal water policy.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Caccia: It is astonishing to realize that the Acting Prime Minister does not even know that or does not want to recognize it. But that is not the question.

LEGISLATION—TIMING OF INTRODUCTION

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, if the Acting Prime Minister is serious about this matter she will have to recognize that this policy has no teeth unless it is

transformed into legislation. When will the Government introduce the legislation flowing from the federal water policy so that it will be in the Statutes of Canada, hopefully not to be overridden by Bill C-130 which will have overriding powers on any legislation, according to Article VIII of the agreement? When will the legislation be introduced?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has given some misleding information, probably because he has not read the agreement yet. Bill C-130 has an override only on legislation which pertains to the free trade agreement. The transfer of large bodies of water to the United States is outside the agreement. Therefore, Article VIII of the agreement does not pertain to it. The Hon. Member's preamble is totally wrong.

EFFECT OF AGREEMENT ON ENERGY COSTS

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. It was stated in an earlier question that the Manitoba Energy Department has issued a report, part of which states that the energy bill to Canadians between 1979 and 1982 would have been some $72.6 billion more had this particular agreement been in effect. Will the Government not finally admit to Canadians that this free trade agreement will mean higher energy costs for Canadians and lower energy costs for the Americans, especially in times of energy crisis?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Hon. Member was not at committee to hear the evidence that has been presented in the last couple of days on that very subject. Let us consider electricity exports for example.

Québec, Ontario, Manitoba, whoever sells their hydro, will sell it for the highest price they can receive. Nothing in the free trade agreement prevents that, and nothing in the free trade agreement states that people in Ontario, Québec or Manitoba must pay the same price the Americans are paying for electricity. As a matter of fact, today Ontario Hydro is selling electricity for three or four times more than what Ontario consumers are paying. I think he will find the same thing in Quebec.

The Hon. Member is away off base. He should come to committee because he will learn a lot.

MANAGEMENT OF ENERGY RESOURCES

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, if the Government would only allow the committee to travel—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. de Jong: If the Government would only allow the committee to start hearing some testimony about how this agreement infringes on the rights of western producing provinces in pricing and developing their energy resources, perhaps the Government would begin to learn what this agreement means to the rights of western Canada. How can the Government claim that it is supporting western producing provinces when it is stripping the West of its right to manage the energy resources?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, nothing in the free trade agreement prevents the provinces from managing their resources. According to the Constitution, they own the resources. There is nothing in the agreement that states they cannot control their resources. The provinces tell the explorers where they can drill and when. If they are lucky enough to find any oil or gas, the provinces tell them how much they can pump, when they can pump and so on. That has not changed under this agreement one iota.

Let me say something about the Hon. Member's preamble. He tells us about all the opposition in the West. Why are all the provincial Premiers supporting this—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Riis: Vander Zalm does not speak for British Columbia.

Mr. McDermid: Why is the support for the free trade agreement in the West so strong? Is the Hon. Member telling—

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Kootenay West.

Mr. de Jong: Call an election on it.

Mr. Riis: Vander Zalm does not speak for British Columbia.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An Hon. Member: Neither do you.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask Hon. Members, given the time, to co-operate with other Hon. Members who have been waiting to ask a question. The Hon. Member for Kootenay West.

* * *

CANADA PENSION PLAN

DISABILITY BENEFITS—DEFINITION OF "SUBSTANTIALLY GAINFUL OCCUPATION"

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Anyone who has ever applied for a Canada Pension Plan disability is familiar with the words "prolonged" and "severe".

But nobody seems to know, including the judges of the Appeal Board, just what is meant by the words "substantially gainful occupation".

The *Oxford* dictionary describes "substantial" as something of real importance or value, of considerable amount, well-to-do, and describes "gainful" as lucrative or remunerative.

Will the Minister have the wording defined to reflect its true meaning, or change the wording to reflect some of the Appeal Board decisions which would have us believe that licking stamps and addressing envelopes is substantially gainful employment?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has expressed the frustration many Members have experienced with the Canada Pension Plan. I have been concerned about it as well.

I must explain to him that those words lack some definition, but Hon. Members opposite will know that agreement with the provinces is needed for any changes to be brought about to the Canada Pension Plan. I have asked for a review of those words as well as for a recommendation as to how we might change them.

As the Hon. Member has mentioned, obviously there is concern about the application of those words on a case-by-case basis. The review has been undertaken and I hope some changes can be made. However, until they are brought about I am obligated to abide by the rulings of the Pension Appeal Board which, as the Hon. Member knows, is the final court of appeal. His point is valid and that is why the action was taken by this Government.

* * *

• (1450)

PUBLIC WORKS

SALE OF FALCONBRIDGE RADAR SITE IN SUDBURY

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Public works, or whoever pretends to be the Minister today. It concerns the sale of the Falconbridge radar site in Sudbury for $140,000 as part of the Government's mad rush to privatize anything. Given that this property includes no less than 97 houses valued at $1.5 million, a gymnasium, a theatre, garages, and an industrial park, with a total value by the Government's own appraisers of $5 million, why was the property sold for 3 per cent of its appraised value?

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. friend for the preciseness of his question. Under the circumstances, in the absence of the Minister, we will take it under notice and get back to the Member as soon as we can.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, let me be reminded never to hire the Minister of Public Works to act as a real estate agent for me in the future. The people of Canada would not want to hire him either.

[*Translation*]

SALE OF REAL ESTATE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): I would like to ask the Acting Minister of Public Works a supplementary question. Since the rent alone on the housing units brings in revenues of $250,000 a year, why did the Department sell these properties worth $5 million for $140,000? Why did it not keep these properties and rent homes to people who need them? Why did it give away this public asset?

[*English*]

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Well, Mr. Speaker, I simply have to say that I will take the matter under notice and get back to the Hon. Member as soon as we can.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

COMPUTER INFORMATION NETWORK CONTRACT—RCMP INVESTIGATION

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister and it concerns the fairness of the bidding process for a $150 million integrated information and communication system for the Department of External Affairs, which is one of the largest computer services contracts ever awarded in Canada.

Can the Minister explain why Systemhouse Limited of Ottawa and DMR Limited of Montreal, two of the largest and most experienced systems integration firms in Canada, have apparently been passed over for this contract, while the Government is negotiating to make Fenco Lavalin of Toronto the prime contractor despite its limited experience in systems integration as compared to the two competitors?

Can the Minister also explain why the RCMP Commercial Crime Division is investigating this matter? Is this a criminal matter or is it a bungled contract award?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Supply and Services explained yesterday, the evaluation of the bids has not been completed. The process is ongoing. So I do not think the Member should comment at this point about who or who may not be involved in the bidding process. It is an ongoing procedure.

I also would remind the Member that the Minister said yesterday that investigation, both by the Department of Supply and Services and the Privy Council Office, had concluded that everything that has been done is in compliance with the procedures under which government contracts are evaluated. Finally, I would inform the Member that an RCMP

investigation is being conducted because of a complaint raised by one of the bidders and not because of any internal process.

BIDDING PROCESS

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. The two companies which have apparently been passed over because final discussions with Fenco are now under way, just cannot believe that a contract whose most important element is systems integration should be given to a company which, however competent in other fields, has a very limited track record in the area of systems integration, particularly when this is a vital element in the future conduct of Canadian external affairs over the next 20 or 30 years.

The Minister has said that internal investigations have cleared the process and now the RCMP is looking into it, but can the Minister say what is going on? Was the bidding process fair, or has there been some kind of influence exercised to lead to a contract decision which seems to be so contrary to common sense?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, obviously the Member had written out his second question before he heard the answer to the first. I said to him when I replied the first time that the process is ongoing. There has been no award of a contract to date. There has been no decision taken. I would think that he should await the completion of that process before he makes statements about who or who does not have the contract.

* * *

DAY CARE

SITUATION IN METROPOLITAN TORONTO

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Metro Toronto has basically frozen the amounts to be given to subsidize day care spaces in that city. The reason is because the municipal Government, although willing to subsidize day care spaces, cannot do so unless the Ontario Government shares the cost, and the Ontario Government, along with other provinces, does not want to get caught spending money that may not be matched by Ottawa. In the meantime, the number of families awaiting day care subsidies has doubled, and in view of the lack of legislation provided to us by the Conservative Government in March, no one is quite sure what funds the federal Government will allocate.

In view of the hardships faced by parents across the country, can the Government provide us today with immediate assistance to day care users?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for the question. If she has patience for a day or two, she might have her answer.

[*Translation*]

DAY CARE CENTRES—ACCESSIBILITY FOR ALL CHILDREN—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to know that the Government is planning to give us an answer on day care. Since we will have an answer soon and we know all the difficulties that face parents and children as a result of the Conservative Government's decision to limit its participation in federal-provincial cost sharing for child care facilities, where before its participation was unlimited, can the Minister tell us whether the Conservative Government is ready to reconsider this aspect of the program within two days and give access to day care to all children instead of limiting it to those with money?

[*English*]

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member knows, the Government came in with a plan which was very reflective of a special committee on which the Hon. Member sat. It was a majority opinion of the committee, and we have been discussing various configurations with the provinces.

My first answer stands with respect to the second half of her question.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE OF ARGENTINA

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to draw to the attention of the House the presence in the gallery of the Honourable Ernesto Figueras, Minister of Agriculture of Argentina.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

IMMIGRATION

OVERSEAS REFUGEE STATUS STANDARDS

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. In light of the report I sent to the Minister yesterday concerning defects in Canada's process for overseas refugee selection, will the Minister assure this House that before proclaiming Bill C-55 and Bill C-84, which have the effect of restricting persons from coming to Canada to claim refugee status, she will bring Canada's overseas refugee status standards into line with the United Nations, for example, by eliminating discrimination on the basis of country of origin, whether it is eastern Europe, Chile, India, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, or wherever else?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is well aware that we do not discriminate against refugees by country of origin. According to this Government, a refugee is a refugee. It does not matter from which country they come, their source of origin, or whether it is a left wing regime or right wing regime, if someone is fleeing genuine persecution they are welcome in Canada.

EXAMINATION PROCESS

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I invite the Minister to study the regulation on self-exiled people which completely contradicts what she just said. I would ask her further whether before proclaiming Bill C-55 and Bill C-84 she will ensure that Canada's overseas refugee selection process is corrected so that our overseas officials will examine the refugee claimants about the grounds of their fear of persecution first, before examining them as to their economic suitability for immigration to Canada?

• (1500)

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, that is very much a part of our process now. The Government increased quite considerably the number of people we have brought from refugee camps in our overseas selection process. Private organizations have done the same thing.

We have also introduced a program called "Women at Risk" which ensures that women heads of households and women with particular problems can be brought out of the camps and to Canada. We intend to continue to focus on improving our standards for overseas selection.

At this point there is no discrimination. We intend to ensure that our policy continues to be fair and humane.

* * *

AIRPORTS

OTTAWA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—DIRECT FLIGHTS TO U.S.—PRECLEARANCE SERVICES

Mr. Barry Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. The National Capital Region is the fourth largest metropolitan area in Canada. It is trying to diversify its economic base and lessen its dependence on government. The newly redeveloped Ottawa International Airport is a key element to that diversification.

I would like to ask the Minister what plans his Department has to allow for the introduction of more direct flights to the USA, coupled with possible US customs preclearance, in order to allow for the National Capital Region—

Ms. Copps: What are the people of Hamilton supposed to do with their airport?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa—Carleton: —to attract more business development to this area.

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Carleton for his question.

Recently the United States indicated that it is reluctant to provide preclearance services at additional points in Canada. The people at Transport Canada are working with officers of the United States. However, we have our own reluctance because the United States would like to have some immunity, something with which I disagree. It has not been easy to find a way where we could have that agreement. However, we are always working on trying to find an answer to the problem which, by the way, is not any easier than trying to close the mouth of the Hon. Member for Hamilton East.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SITUATION IN HAITI—DEATH OF JOSEPH LAFONTANT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. André Ouellet (Papineau): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and has to do with the deteriorating situation in Haiti.

In the last few days, we learned that General Namphy had suspended the constitution. Today, we were sorry to learn that one of the great defenders of human rights, Joseph Lafontant, was assassinated.

I would like to know what the Canadian Government intends to do. Will it finally come down on the side of democracy or will it continue to support dictatorship?

Hon. Monique Landry (Minister for External Relations): Mr. Speaker, we were of course very affected by the assassination of Joseph Lafontant, whom I know the parliamentary delegation met during its trip to Haiti. We know how much this man is recognized for his stand on human rights.

I asked our ambassador to convey to the Haitian authorities our deep indignation at the death of this esteemed man and I also asked our ambassador to express how urgently we expect the Haitian Government to act to punish the guilty ones.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I must add how really puzzled we are by the present situation in Haiti, given that the authorities there undertook to respect human rights, freedom and democracy. We have serious questions, Mr. Speaker.

Point of Order—Mr. Scott (Hamilton--Wentworth)

PROPOSALS MADE TO GOVERNMENT BY QUÉBEC-HAITI SOLIDARITY COALITION

Hon. André Ouellet (Papineau): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the Minister. Haitians, as the Minister ought to know, want only one thing and that is a democratic country where they are free to exercise their fundamental rights.

The *Coalition de solidarité Québec-Haïti* has made some very specific proposals to the Government, asking it to transmit certain instructions to the staff of the Canadian embassy.

I would like to ask the Minister whether the Canadian Government has accepted these proposals and whether the Government will, in fact, immediately proceed to implement the proposals, as suggested by the *Coalition de solidarité Québec-Haïti.*

Hon. Monique Landry (Minister for External Relations): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of this letter which was, of course, sent to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who intends to reply as soon as possible.

Meanwhile, I can inform the Hon. Member that we have suspended bilateral aid planning and that we are taking a long, hard look at the continuity of bilateral aid.

We shall, of course, consider the Committee's recommendations in terms of respect for human rights, the application of democratic principles, and also the freedom that should exist in a country like Haiti.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry to have to say that that closes off Question Period. I know that the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt was hoping to catch the Speaker's eye. If he is here tomorrow I guarantee him that he will.

The Chair recognizes the Hon. Member for Hamilton—Wentworth on a point of order.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

ALLEGED ABUSE OF RULES DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Geoff Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a brief point of order which I believe affects directly all Members of this House and indirectly the vast viewing audience of these proceedings.

My point of order arises not out of one isolated incident this afternoon but from an accumulation of exchanges that I have witnessed during recent days and weeks. I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to the continuing flagrant abuse of parliamentary rules during Question Period, particularly the unholy length and argumentative nature of preambles and some answers—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth): —which limit Members on all sides the right to ask questions.

Let me state at the outset that through you, Mr. Speaker, the atmosphere in this House during Question Period has improved. By and large dirty words are out and during the recent past no Members have been thrown out for unparliamentary behaviour. That is a credit, I think, to all MPs, and most assuredly to you, Sir, as a very fine occupant of the chair.

That being said, what has deteriorated, and where improvement is needed, is with the conduct, dispatch and presentation of Question Period. Since this daily 45 minutes to one hour amounts to the most highly visible and newsworthy time of our parliamentary day, it is only natural that Hon. Members will use every opportunity to play to the Press Gallery and to the home-viewing audience. When Members ask a question they are not talking to the Government, they are talking to the national media. We all do it.

In the process we are forgetting that this is Question Period—not debate. My reading of the parliamentary rules, and in particular Beauchesne's, says that questions should be preceded by short, sharp preamble, and that questions should be seeking present or future government policy.

You and I know, Mr. Speaker, that there are some terse, telegraphic and pointed questioners in the House. I will just give the Chair three or four examples. I think of the Hon. Member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson) who always gets an answer whether she likes the answer or not. Her questions are always well briefed. I think of the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway) who regularly punches through his material with brevity. The Hon. Member for Cape Breton Highlands—Canso (Mr. O'Neil) is another who had an exchange yesterday with the Associate Minister of National Defence (Mr. Dick).

Ms. Copps: What is my grade, sir?

Mr. Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth): The Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell) is an expert questioner as well.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, this is an abuse. Come on. Sit down! This has to be a big farce.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): He is giving us all a report card.

Ms. Copps: And he gets an F.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is some agitation among some Hon. Members about this point of order, and there is a suggestion that it is an abuse of the rules. It is a point of order. It concerns conduct in this place. I do not know how the Speaker, because I may not altogether enjoy hearing this, can cut it off. I will hear other Hon. Members in a moment. I will not let it go on unduly long.

• (1510)

Mr. Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth): I know of too many cases, which I will not cite here, of lengthy preambles which are irrelevant and argumentative. These diatribes-cum-political statements are being smuggled in. Some Members are speaking for too long and other Members are suffering the penalty of the clock running out at the 45-minute mark. Moreover, these violations of rules are annoying to the public because once Your Honour rises to intervene, those watching hear only the barracking, name-calling, and general school-room hubbub which does nothing to enhance the dignity of this place.

I realize, Sir, that the lengthy partisan pitches put you as Speaker in a difficult position. A Minister will naturally move in and take on the argumentative nature of the preamble before he or she gets to the substance of the question, and that is only fair.

But we are also having constant repetition because when one opposition Party happens to pre-empt a second opposition Party on a question, then the question is asked not once, not twice, but five times or ten times to try to get different answers and to try to make the national news. When constantly repetitive questions are asked again we are in clear violation of the rules under Beauchesne's.

Ms. Copps: We never get any answers and we will continue to ask the questions.

Mr. Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth): If the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) will quieten down for a moment more, I can remember former Liberal Government appointed Speakers and I think particularly of the Hon. Lucien Lamoureux, and Speaker James Jerome, who were constantly admonishing Conservative and New Democratic opposition Members about repetitious questions which clearly are out of order, and detailed questions which should be placed on the Order Paper.

In conclusion, if we do not exactly need to overhaul Question Period, there are a couple of routes that we could take to restore some of the dignity and decorum of this place. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that one route we could take would be to refer Question Period concerns to the House Leaders of the three Parties, or second, and perhaps preferable, to the House Leadership of the colleagues who have enough on their plates these days, it might be advisable to set up an *ad hoc* committee of concerned colleagues on all sides of the House to compile our thoughts and suggestions on tightening up Question Period.

The goal would be to allow for better exchanges and more questions, thereby making life easier on Members and on our viewing audience. Clearly we need some mechanism to resurrect the true nature of Question Period and to make more effective this most high profile hour of any sitting day.

Point of Order—Mr. Scott (Hamilton--Wentworth)

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, with an unusual display of crocodile tears unheard of in this Parliament, if not in the history of Parliament, whether or not he realizes it, the Hon. Member has reflected unfairly on your conduct, Sir, of Question Period. The Hon. Member has made continued reference to what he calls the "rules". There are only two references in the rules, that is, the Standing Orders of the House with respect to Question Period. One Standing Order relates to when in the day Question Period takes place, and how long it should be, and it is 45 minutes, not one hour. Second, Standing Order 65(1)(a) states:

> Questions on matters of urgency may, at the time specified in Standing Order 19(4), be addressed orally to Ministers of the Crown, provided however that, if in the opinion of the Speaker a question is not urgent, he or she may direct that it be placed on the *Order Paper*.

This has always been interpreted to mean that the Speaker has the absolute discretion as to the type of questions and, for that matter, the answers, that may be allowed during Question Period. However, from time to time individual Speakers have announced guidelines as to how they would use the power given to them under the Standing Orders with respect to Question Period. These guidelines have been published in successive editions of Beauchesne's.

My hon. friend has failed to note that the most recent set of guidelines were those announced in this Parliament by your distinguished predecessor. Those guidelines were set down some time after this Parliament began, and some time after the practices which my hon. friend appears to be complaining of were established and very much in terms of precedents as to what were accepted, not only by yourself, but your predecessors in other Parliaments.

I want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that if my hon. friend is complaining about preambles, if my hon. friend is complaining about the content of questions, then in all fairness he should also talk about the answers. He should particularly talk about the length of answers and what often appears to be a deliberate effort, and I hope I am wrong in this, on the part of Ministers answering to talk out Question Period and to do the very thing my hon. friend complains of, that is, to prevent Hon. Members on both sides of the House from putting questions within the time limited by the rules for Question Period.

I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to this rather strange and unfortunate lack of balance in the point of order of my hon. friend. Everything my hon. friend complains of was done over and over again in previous Parliaments by members of his Party when they were in Opposition and therefore precedents were established in terms of preambles, in terms of length of questions, and in terms of content of questions which I do not think that my hon. friend can credibly complain of at this time because of what he and his colleagues did when they were in Opposition.

In conclusion, as far as I am concerned you have the judgment, Mr. Speaker, in the exercise of the authority given to you under our rules to deal with the matter of Question

Period fairly with respect to people on all sides of the House. If you want to give consideration to the point raised by my hon. friend, there is no way it can be done in an equitable way unless you pay particular attention to the length and content of the answers given by Ministers.

Question Period is one of the few checks and balances in our system, particularly when a Government has a majority. Question Period is particularly an instrument of opposition Members to hold to account the members of the Government. If members of the Opposition, through such points of order as this, are prevented from carrying out their duty on behalf of the Canadian people, then this entire Parliament suffers, and the entire parliamentary institutions are undermined.

I will concede that my hon. friend has raised this point of order today out of some sincere concern, but he has obviously forgotten the past and the precedents created by the past. He has obviously forgotten the role of answers with respect to Question Period, and today, perhaps most important of all, from the perspective of the Government House Leader (Mr. Lewis), with his point of order he is eating up time which the Government and other members of this House hoped to spend debating and making decisions on legislation.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to participate in this debate. While the points raised by my hon. colleague in his point of order reflect concerns that all of us share, raising it in this manner was inappropriate. It is a direct attack on the Chair and the work that the Chair is doing in terms of conducting the affairs of the House. However, the point the Hon. Member made was that the members of the Opposition have extremely long preambles. I would ask my hon. friend to do a content analysis of yesterday's *Hansard*. If he does, he will notice that time after time members in the Opposition asked questions of the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie). Some of these questions are three or four or five lines and then a half a page for the Minister for International Trade's reaction. Time and time again, it is short, concise and then a long, convoluted bafflegab from the Minister for International Trade.

• (1520)

It is very clear. It does not take any particular analysis to simply glance at *Hansard* and find that it is not the opposition Members' questions that are exceedingly lengthy, but the incredibly convoluted answers. Actually, they are not answers. I guess that is why it is called Question Period, because there are never any answers; there are only questions.

I would ask my hon. friend, before he is so critical of the Opposition, to take a look at what his own Ministers are doing in terms of using up valuable time during Question Period, to kill the clock. Yesterday's *Hansard* portrays that very clearly.

I also want to take this opportunity to remind the House that a year ago we in the New Democratic Party, during the routine Question Period, would average about seven questioners on a typical Question Period day. We are now often down to an average of four questioners.

An Hon. Member: Like today.

Mr. Riis: I am not saying that we are not guilty ourselves at times of perhaps a lengthy preamble. When the questions raised are long and the responses are doubly long and nobody is ever criticized or ever taken up for that fact, it encourages others to participate on longer questions and longer responses.

As my hon. colleague from New Westminster—Coquitlam indicated, the designated time for statements allows a Member to have up to 60 seconds to make a comment. That is the maximum. Perhaps we want to consider some time allotment so that the Member could use that time in terms of a concise question, with the idea that the response would be of an equal period and equally concise.

While I do not appreciate the point raised or the way my hon. friend has raised a point—because I do think it is a direct attack on the Chair—I think that his comments reflect a great number of concerns from Members on both sides of the House in terms of the interplay during Question Period, and the recognition that it has to be tightened up.

Mr. Speaker: I am going to exercise the prerogative of the Chair and close off this debate. First of all, I am going to close it off because, while I have listened to it as a point of order, as I think I am bound to do, if it is to be carried on, this is not the place in which to carry it on.

If there is complaint and concern on both sides of the House with respect to any matter of order in this Chamber, naturally the Chair must hear that concern, but having had the point made and having heard the reply, which I have heard from eloquent spokespersons of both the Official Opposition and the New Democratic Party, the debate ought to carry on in another place.

Now, may I just say this. There is nothing particularly easy for Hon. Members who are sometimes asking questions in this place, or Ministers who are replying.

I have said on other occasions that this is not a tea party. There are strong views held and those strong views of course will be replied to in a strong way. If a question has an argumentative turn to it, it is understandable that some argument will come back by way of reply. I invite all Hon. Members to repair to the Table Officers and take a look at the exact time of questions and answers, not just over the last couple of days but over an extensive period of time. I think that they will probably be well instructed to do so.

In any event, I have listened to the observations of the Hon. Member for Hamilton—Wentworth (Mr. Scott), the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray), the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis), and I would ask other Hon. Members to co-operate with the Chair. If they want to

continue this discussion further, there is, of course, another place to do so.

It may well be that the Chair, with the help of Members on both sides, can have more Members up. The Chair is concerned about that and it has ideas that may be helpful to both sides. If I am requested to share them with Members in a constructive way, I would be quite prepared to do so.

I might just say, in remarking on something that the Hon. Member for Windsor West said, that other Speakers have set out a long list of suggestions, guidelines and guides as to the proper conduct of Question Period. These guides are of course always helpful. Ultimately, this place operates on the basis of what it collectively is prepared to accept.

I am a servant of all of the Members here, and as soon as you wish me to conduct these affairs in a different way, where I feel that there is support for some change one way or the other on both sides of the House, I give you my complete assurance that I will certainly try to do that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I would point out one thing. I think it is important that we all understand that while at times exchanges are noisy and may be too lengthy in Question Period for some and despite the fact that there is very vigorous debate and exchange in this place, for the most part, over many, many months this has been a civil place where it has been possible for the Government and the Opposition to engage in discussion as to the conduct of business, without rancour, and with particular expedition in a great many places. Now, that says something for the general mood in this place. I say this as your Speaker. It also says a great deal for the co-operation which Hon. Members have given to their Speaker, for which I thank you.

The Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray).

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the intention of the Deputy Government House Leader to present a motion to the House with respect to the time of adjournment today. Can he indicate if he is ready to do so now or very soon?

Mr. Lewis: Immediately after the three o'clock vote.

Mr. Speaker: I take it from the whispered exchange that the Minister of State may speak later.

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Hon. Member for Windsor West satisfied at the moment?

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Yes.

• (1530)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADIAN MULTICULTURALISM ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Monday, July 11, consideration of the motion of Mr. Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean) that Bill C-93, an Act for the preservation and enhancement of multiculturalism in Canada, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division. Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

• (1540)

(Division No. 469)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Belsher
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boudria
Bourgault
Bradley
Brisco
Browes
Caccia
Champagne (Champlain)
Cochrane
Cooper
Copps
Cossitt
Côté
Crofton
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Daubney
de Corneille
de Jong
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Epp (Provencher)
Fennell
Finestone
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Frith
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Gray (Windsor West)
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Heap
Hicks
Hockin
Holtmann
Hopkins
Hudon
Jardine
Jepson
Jewett
Johnson (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Kaplan
Keeper
Kempling
Kindy
Ladouceur
Langdon
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacKay
MacLellan
Mailly
Manly
Marchi
Martin
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCurdy
McDermid
McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood)
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Mitchell
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson (Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Nowlan
Nunziata
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Orlikow
Ouellet
Penner
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Price
Prud'homme
Ravis
Reimer
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
St-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Skelly
Stackhouse

Tardif (Charlesbourg)
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Valcourt
Van De Walle
Vincent
Waddell
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)—130

NAYS

Members

nil/none

● (1550)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Lewis: I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker. There have been discussions among the Parties and I think you will find that if you were to call Bill C-84 immediately, a recorded division could be taken immediately without the necessity of ringing the bells.

I also wish to advise the House that, after that, in taking up the business of the House, if there are any other recorded divisions requested, those divisions will be deferred until 6 p.m. tomorrow.

Having made those points, I would advise the House that there have been discussions among the Parties with respect to business, and in view of the progress we are making I move: That this House adjourn at 6 p.m. this evening.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The House has heard the suggestion made by the Hon. Minister of State. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on Bill C-84, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976.

* * *

IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976

MEASURE TO AMEND—CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS

The House resumed consideration of the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-84, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976 and the Criminal code in consequence thereof; and the motions of Mrs. McDougall (p. 17445) and (p. 17445); Mr. Marchi (p. 17450); and Mr. Heap (p. 17453).

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Shall I dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Marchi), which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 470*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Caccia
Copps
de Corneille
de Jong
Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Finestone
Frith
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gray (Windsor West)
Heap
Hopkins
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
Langdon
MacLellan
Manly
Marchi
McCurdy
McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Nunziata
Orlikow
Ouellet
Penner
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell—39

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bourgault
Bradley
Brisco
Browes
Champagne (Champlain)
Coates
Cochrane
Cooper
Cossitt
Côté
Crofton
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Daubney
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp (Provencher)
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Holtmann
Hudon
Jardine
Jepson
Johnson (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Kempling
Kindy
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacKay
Mailly
Martin
Mayer
Mazankowski
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson (Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Nowlan
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Price
Ravis
Reimer
St-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Tardif (Charlesbourg)
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle

Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)
Wilson
(Etobicoke
Centre)—92

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Heap: On a point of order, Madam Speaker. I understand from the ruling this morning that an amendment that I introduced was not appropriately before the House at that time, but would be at this time, the previous amendment having been disposed of. If so, I ask leave to move the amendment now.

Mr. Gauthier: Madam Speaker, we would agree to the vote being taken at this time but that the previous vote would apply to this vote.

• (1600)

Mr. Heap: Madam Speaker, I would have no objection to the Hon. Member's suggestion after I have moved my motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is there unanimous consent for the Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap) to move his motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Heap: Madam Speaker, I move:

That Section 91.1(1)(d), as amended by the Government, be amended by deleting the words "the country would allow passengers to return to that country" and inserting therefor the words "the country would admit the passengers to that country".

Mr. Gauthier: Now that the amendment has been put I think you should seek unanimous consent to apply the same vote to the amendment as was taken on the amendment of the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi).

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I am sure the Hon. Member will allow me to put the question officially to the House. Is there unanimous consent that the previous vote be applied to this amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Heap), which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 471*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Benjamin
Blackburn
(Brant)
Boudria
Caccia
Copps
de Corneille
de Jong
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Finestone
Frith
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Heap
Hopkins
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
Langdon
MacLellan
Manly
Marchi
McCurdy
McDonald
(Broadview—
Greenwood)
Mitchell
Nunziata
Orlikow
Ouellet
Penner
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell—39

NAYS

Members

Belsher
Blackburn
(Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bourgault
Bradley
Brisco
Browes
Champagne
(Champlain)
Coates
Cochrane
Cooper
Cossitt
Côté
Crofton
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Darling
Daubney
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Holtmann
Hudon
Jardine
Jepson
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—
Conception)
Joncas
Kempling
Kindy
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacKay
Mailly
Martin
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Nowlan
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Price
Ravis
Reimer
St-Julien
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)
Wilson
(Etobicoke
Centre)—93

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. McCain: Madam Speaker, may my vote be recorded with the Government in the recording of the last division?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): As the Table Officers heard, the Hon. Member for Carleton—Charlotte (Mr. McCain) has asked that his vote be added to the last division.

The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Shall I dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Gauthier: Once again, Madam Speaker, I think you would find a unanimous disposition to apply the previous vote to this question, but in reverse. Some day we will win one.

Mr. Tobin: Madam Speaker, could my name be added to the count on this latest vote for which I would have been present, and to subsequent votes?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Table Officers have heard the request by the Hon. Member for Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin).

The House divided on the motion (Mrs. McDougall), which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 472*)

YEAS

Members

Belsher
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bourgault
Bradley
Brisco
Browes
Champagne (Champlain)
Coates
Cochrane
Cooper
Cossitt
Côté
Crofton
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Daubney
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp (Provencher)
Fennell
Fontaine
Fraleigh
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Graham
Greenaway
Gustafson
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Holtmann
Hudon
Jardine
Jepson
Johnson (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Kempling
Kindy
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacKay
Mailly
Martin
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson (Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Nowlan
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Price
Ravis
Reimer
St-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Stackhouse
Tardif (Charlesbourg)
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vincent
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)—93

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Caccia
Copps
de Corneille
de Jong
Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Finestone
Frith
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gray (Windsor West)
Heap
Hopkins
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
Langdon
MacLellan
Manly
Marchi
McCurdy
McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Nunziata
Orlikow
Ouellet
Penner
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Skelly
Tobin
Waddell—40

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion carried.

The next question is on the first amendment of the Hon. Member for Spadina. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): May I dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Dispense.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Heap) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 473*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand	Garneau	Mitchell
Axworthy	Gauthier	Nunziata
Baker	Gray	Orlikow
Benjamin	(Windsor West)	Ouellet
Blackburn	Heap	Penner
(Brant)	Hopkins	Prud'homme
Boudria	Jewett	Riis
Caccia	Kaplan	Robichaud
Copps	Keeper	Rodriguez
de Corneille	Langdon	Skelly
de Jong	MacLellan	Tobin
Epp	Manly	Waddell—40
(Thunder Bay—	Marchi	
Nipigon)	McCurdy	
Finestone	McDonald	
Frith	(Broadview—	
Gagliano	Greenwood)	

NAYS

Members

Belsher	Hnatyshyn	O'Neil
Blackburn	Hockin	Oostrom
(Jonquière)	Holtmann	Pennock
Blenkarn	Hudon	Peterson
Bourgault	Jardine	Pietz
Bradley	Jepson	Plourde
Brisco	Johnson	Price
Browes	(Bonavista—Trinity—	Ravis
Champagne	Conception)	Reimer
(Champlain)	Joncas	St-Julien
Coates	Kempling	Scott
Cochrane	Kindy	(Victoria—Haliburton)
Cooper	Ladouceur	Scott
Cossitt	Lanthier	(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Côté	Layton	Stackhouse
Crofton	Lewis	Tardif
Darling	MacDonald	(Charlesbourg)
Daubney	(Kingston and	Taylor
Domm	the Islands)	Thacker
Duplessis	MacDougall	Towers
Edwards	(Timiskaming)	Tupper
Ellis	MacKay	Turner
Epp	Mailly	(Ottawa—Carleton)
(Provencher)	Martin	Van De Walle
Fennell	Mayer	Vincent
Fontaine	Mazankowski	Wenman
Fraleigh	McCain	White
Friesen	McDermid	Wilson
Girard	McDougall	(Swift Current
Gormley	(St. Paul's)	—Maple Creek)
Gottselig	McLean	Wilson
Graham	Mitges	(Etobicoke
Greenaway	Moore	Centre)—91
Gustafson	Nicholson	
Halliday	(Niagara Falls)	
Hardey	Nickerson	
Harvey	Nowlan	
Hicks	Oberle	

● (1610)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the amendment lost.

The next question is on the motion of Mrs. McDougall, which reads:

Canadian International Trade Tribunal Act

That clause 8 of Bill C-84 be amended by striking out line 17 on page 9 and substituting the following:

"portation by sea.

4) If, during the second session of the thirty-third Parliament, Bill C-55 entitled *An Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976 and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof* is assented to, this section shall cease to be in force six months after the day on which that Act comes into force."

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL TRADE TRIBUNAL ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-110, an Act to establish the Canadian International Trade Tribunal and to amend or repeal other Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): There are 15 motions on the *Order Paper and Notices* offered in amendment to Bill C-110, an Act to establish the Canadian International Trade Tribunal and to amend or repeal other Acts in consequence thereof.

Motions Nos. 1 to 7 inclusive, 10, 11, 13 and 14, stand in the name of the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon).

Motions Nos. 8, 12 and 15 stand in the name of the Hon. Member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson).

[*Translation*]

The Chair has some hesitation about Motion No. 1 which adds to Clause 2 a definition of the term "domestic producers of goods". According to the definition, this term would cover any firm employing, or any trade union representing, workers producing the goods involved. If I understand the Bill correctly, the right to file a complaint directly with the International Trade Tribunal, on the grounds of injury as defined in the legislation, is granted to all Canadian producers.

Under Paragraph 26(1)(*b*), an inquiry by the International Trade Tribunal into a complaint may not be initiated unless the complaint is made by or on behalf of domestic producers who produce a major proportion of domestic production of the like or directly competitive goods. There is no provision for direct access to the International Trade Tribunal by a firm employing, or any trade union representing, workers producing the goods involved.

[*English*]

Furthermore, the Member is attempting to take the power away from the Governor in Council to make regulations with respect to defining the term "domestic producers" in Clause 40(b).

[*Translation*]

For the reasons just mentioned, I have concluded that this amendment is beyond the scope of the Bill as adopted on second reading in the House.

Furthermore, this is a substantive amendment of the interpretation clause of the Bill. I would refer the Hon. Member to citation 773 (10) of Beauchesne's, Fifth Edition, page 233, and I quote:

> (10) A substantive amendment may not be introduced by way of a modification to the interpretation clause of a bill. *Journals*, May 21, 1970, p. 835.

Consequently, the motion is ruled out of order.

[*English*]

I have concerns with regard to Motions Nos. 2, 3 and 4. These motions are related because the intent is to grant the International Trade Tribunal the power to initiate injury-related inquiries on its own. I understand that an identical motion as to Motion No. 3 was ruled out of order at the committee stage. In Clause 16, the powers, duties and functions of the International Trade Tribunal are stated. These powers are further elaborated in Clauses 18, 19 and 20 which provide for the kind of references of inquiries which the Governor in Council and the Minister of Finance may authorize the International Trade Tribunal to undertake.

[*Translation*]

According to the Chair, it would be beyond the scope of the Bill as adopted on second reading by the House to give the International Trade Tribunal the power to conduct inquiries as a matter of course. The motion is therefore ruled out of order.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 10 are in order but they will be grouped for debate. A vote on Motion No. 5 will also apply to Motions Nos. 6, 7 and 10.

[*Translation*]

Motions Nos. 8 and 9 which are also in order will be grouped for debate. A vote on Motion No. 8 will dispose of Motion No. 9.

[*English*]

Motion No. 11 is in order and it will be debated and voted on separately.

[*Translation*]

Motions Nos. 12 and 13 concerning reports following inquiries by the International Trade Tribunal will be grouped for debate, and a vote on Motion No. 12 will dispose of Motion No. 13.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 14 and 15 are in order but will be debated and voted on separately.

[*Translation*]

The House will now proceed to consideration of the first group, being Motions Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 10.

[*English*]

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (**Essex—Windsor** moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-110 be amended in Clause 22 by striking out lines 18 to 24 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"22. In Sections 23 to 30 'complaint' means a written complaint filed with the Tribunal under subsection 23(1), and, for the purposes of those sections, a complaint is properly documented if it contains the information required by section 23 together with such other information as the Tribunal may reasonably require pursuant to Section 24."

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-110 be amended in clause 23 by striking out lines 25 to 35 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"23.(1) Any domestic producer of goods that are like or directly and competitive with goods being imported into Canada, or any person or association acting on behalf of any such domestic producer, may file a written complaint with the Tribunal alleging that the imported goods are being or are about to be imported at such prices, in such quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten to cause serious or other injury to domestic production of like or directly competitive goods."

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 7.

—That Bill C-110 be amended in Clause 26 by striking out lines 13 to 22 at page 9 and substituting the following therefor:

"(a) that the information provided by the complainant and any other information examined by the Tribunal disclose a reasonable indication that the goods that are the subject of the complaint are or are about to be imported at such prices, in such quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten to cause serious or other injury to domestic production of like or directly competitive goods."—

[*English*]

Motion No. 10

Bill C-110 be amended in clause 27 by striking out lines 33 to 42 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"27.(1) The Tribunal shall, in an inquiry into a complaint, determine whether, having regard to any regulation made pursuant to paragraph 40(a), the goods that are the subject of the complaint are being or are about to be imported at such prices, in such quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten to cause serious or other injury to domestic production of like or directly competitive goods."

He said: Madam Speaker, I thank you for your ruling with respect to this Bill. As Members of the House will recall, the Bill attempts to put together the three trade tribunals which presently exist in this country: The Textile and Clothing Board, the Tariff Board, and the Special Import Tribunal. In doing so there are some serious powers which at the moment are presently held by the textile and clothing board, including powers to put recommendations to the Minister, to initiate inquiries, and I must say myself that I am disappointed the Government has chosen to reduce the independence and capacity of this new institution to act at arm's length from the Government as compared with the textile and clothing board from the past.

• (1620)

Perhaps more important for the specific industries to which I refer, these industries themselves are treated quite differently under the international regime which exists under GATT. Textiles and clothing have been, since 1962, the subject of special consideration under, first, the long-term cotton arrangement and subsequently under the multifibre arrangement. Yet we in this Bill have a treatment of these industries which represents completely the same kind of very tough and strict definition of injury which is to apply to all industries across the country, despite the fact, as I say, that there is a difference recognized at the international level and a difference applied there.

It is for this reason that I have moved these amendments. They have some relationship to some other amendments about which I will be talking later. However, with respect to the various motions, if I can go through them in order, Motion No. 5 is an attempt to loosen up and perhaps clarify also for companies the information which they have to provide to this new Canadian international trade tribunal in order to have a hearing in front of that tribunal. An industry is asked to provide certain information and the information for this complaint, as in the present Clause 22, left it very much to the tribunal to decide if it is satisfied that it has been presented with the material required by Clause 22.

My amendment to the motion suggests that it is not up to the tribunal to make this decision but simply that if the details which are outlined in Clause 23 are in fact provided to the tribunal, then the complaint must be heard. In short, it opens up access to the tribunal itself so that our industries across the country, which are affected by import pressure, can put their complaints before this tribunal successfully.

With respect to Motion No. 6, what we are attempting to do is to set forth a somewhat looser definition of what constitutes import pressure or import damage. The key point in comparing the two clauses, the existing Clause 23 and the suggested amendment, is that we have to take account, in analysing what import damage is, not just of the quantities and the conditions which might cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers, but the prices at which these imports are coming into the country. If these prices are, for instance, such as to themselves constitute a threat which could cost us thousands of jobs, even if there has been no change in the quantities or in the basic competitive conditions which exist within the industry, the difference which is constituted by such prices is something which should be taken into account by the tribunal.

I should indicate that a number of these amendments have been directly influenced by the testimony put before our trade tribunal hearings on Bill C-110 by the various witnesses who made presentations from industry, from the existing textile and clothing board chairperson and from certain testimony written and provided by trade unions.

With respect to Motion No. 7, the suggestion here refers to Clause 26. Again there is an attempt to introduce into Clause 26 this same notion of prices as an important consideration in considering the potential impact of imports coming into the country. I think, if I may say so, that to ignore the price at which imports are coming into the country is really a serious gap in this present Bill.

With respect to the other motion which is grouped here, which is Motion No. 10, precisely the same point is being made with respect to Clause 27. Clause No. 27 in this case also leaves out the question of price.

• (1630)

As economists would want to point out, price and the potential undercutting of price which exists with respect to those items which are produced here in Canada are important considerations. One really cannot determine what is supposed to be determined by each of these clauses, which is the potential to cause or threaten to cause serious or other injury to domestic production of like or directly competitive goods.

If I can conclude, Madam Speaker, these are minor amendments but ones which I believe will improve significantly this Bill with respect to the benefits which Canadian industry may expect to receive from the Bill in the future.

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Madam Speaker, I would like to respond to my hon. friend's proposed amendments to this Bill. I commend him for the close interest he has taken in this piece of legislation. I have to disagree with him when he says that these are minor amendments. In fact, they add up to a major attack on the whole concept of the GATT. His Party has often suggested that the GATT be appealed to in the place of, for example, the free trade agreement. In this particular set of amendments, and in others which I think he will propose later, he is attacking in essence fundamental standards behind the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. I want to address myself to those amendments in order to make this clear to the House.

I would also like to say that there may be a misunderstanding in his close study of the Bill in terms of the wider context in which this Bill is placed. He began his comments—and this may be the source of his troubles—with reference to some of the powers that the present Textile and Clothing Board has, in particular its authority to self-initiate an inquiry about injury. I remind the Hon. Member that the Textile and Clothing Board has only used this authority in the past to self-initiate an inquiry about injury in the context of reviews of existing textile and clothing import quotas to determine whether or not they should be continued or varied. One would have to be pretty conversant with the board to know that. But that in fact has been the history.

Inquiries into new product areas, something which may be at the heart of the Hon. Member's concern, which can be initiated at the request of industry or the Minister, are different. The provisions of this Bill, Bill C-110, will continue to let industry petition the tribunal for inquiries into new product areas or to let the Government request an inquiry.

That is not being blocked. There is no power that the Textile and Clothing Board has today that would not be available with regard to new product areas under Bill C-110 for the new trade tribunal that we are establishing.

I think the Hon. Member is concerned about where the restraints come from to prevent us from having a flood of imports, textiles and so on into Canada. That is part of the broader context, too, that I want to point out to him. These broader restraints imposed on textile and clothing imports into Canada come from the negotiation of bilateral agreements with exporting countries under the multi-fibre arrangement. This arrangement, known as the MFA, which is a derogation from the GATT in that it provides for border actions on the basis of bilateral agreements rather than on a global basis against imports from all sources, is still in place. I made that point in committee. However, I do not know whether or not the Hon. Member was there that day. Nothing will change that. The MFA only requires evidence that textile and clothing imports are causing what is called market disruption. No compensation is required to be paid when these arrangements are worked out.

In comparison, a safeguard action, which is what we are talking about this afternoon, is totally different. So that whole process, the non-safeguard part of the textile and clothing arrangement, those bilateral agreements under the MFA, remain. It is business as usual for them.

During the past 10 years, and more particularly since 1981, the Government has used bilateral restraint agreements to protect the textile and clothing industry. These restraint agreements permitted under the multi-fibre arrangement are very flexible and much less costly than taking safeguard actions. That is not the way to deal with this matter. The way to go is to work on those bilateral restraint agreements if flexibility is wanted.

It is important for me also to tell the House that External Affairs officials are responsible for the bilateral negotiations and deals with industry problems. They deal with these problems as requests arise. It is a very flexible system. The industry is well aware of the process in that area. I gather the industry said that during the committee hearings that were held on the morning of May 19. This is a broad context to deal with all of these amendments which have been suggested.

Let me deal precisely with the motions. I gather Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4, if I heard the Speaker properly, are out of order. I will speak now to Motions Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 10, which I believe are to be debated at this time.

Motion No. 5 deals with Clause 22. The basis of the Hon. Member's amendment would seriously weaken the requirement that a complaint be documented properly. As a matter of fact, if one starts to attack the concept of proper documentation, one can find the whole evidence of safeguard actions tumbling down.

I understand the desire that the Hon. Member has expressed to avoid imposing an undue information requirement on producers petitioning the new tribunal. However, for the tribunal to undertake an inquiry and to examine for serious injury it is absolutely indispensable that the tribunal be satisfied that the documentation it has before it is adequate at the outset and thus later avoid no injury findings because of inadequate initial information.

Because of the lower standard in the proposed amendment, the complaint may be deemed to be properly documented, even if the tribunal is not able to satisfy itself that the complaint contains the necessary information. This is a very awkward posture for the tribunal to be put into. However, once a complaint is accepted as properly documented the tribunal has only 30 days to decide whether or not to initiate a safeguard inquiry. In such cases the tribunal may not be able to initiate an investigation because the complaint may not have disclosed an acceptable indication of increased imports causing serious injury. Because of the documentation problem this amendment is flawed.

With respect to Motion No. 6, in essence, it would put Canada *ultra vires* with respect to our obligations to the GATT. The changes embodied in this proposed amendment to Clause 23 and the corresponding change to Clause 26 would put Canada *ultra vires* with respect to its GATT obligations for Article 19, safeguard actions. These are obligations for everybody and not just for Canada under the GATT. The Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon) is proposing that there be a right of direct access in the case of a threat of increased imports, whereas GATT requires an increase in imports, not a threat, not a dark cloud, but actual empirical proof that there is an increase in imports.

• (1640)

Aside from the amendment being inconsistent with GATT, opening up the system in this manner would have a very chilling effect on trade. If this process were used in this manner, we would cause reverberations with our trading partners. Similarly, allowing for direct access where only injury rather than serious injury has occurred would also be inconsistent with the GATT safeguard provisions. Injury is not consistent with GATT; serious injury is consistent with GATT.

The amendment of the Hon. Member makes its case on injury rather than on serious injury. The Hon. Member may be attempting to alter the basic purpose of the legislation to allow the tribunal to undertake direct access inquiries for non-safeguard purposes. That may be what the Hon. Member's attempt is. However, the legislation is not designed for non-safeguard purposes. It is there for the whole safeguard process. That amendment is a serious mistake.

I now want to speak to Motion No. 7 which speaks to Clause 26. It is the same problem, and I already spelled out my concerns with this motion when I addressed the amendment proposed to Clause 23 in Motion No. 6. GATT does not permit

Article 19 safeguard action on the basis of a threat of imports, or on the basis of any other type of injury funding other than "serious injury". Therefore, there has to be serious injury to put this process in place under Article 19 of GATT. My argument for Motion No. 7 is the same as my argument for Motion No. 6.

Finally, Motion No. 10 speaks to Clause 27. The amendment proposed in Motion No. 10 to Clause 27 would radically change the concept of the legislation in its entirety. This clause was discussed at great length in committee. The committee endorsed the concept that increased imports must be the principal cause of serious injury. The amendment set out in Motion No. 10 eliminates this concept, and at the same time introduces the notion of other injury. This is contrary to Article 19 of the GATT provisions which only provide for safeguard injury in the case of serious injury. The revised language also contains the concept of threat of imports which, as I have already stated, is not permitted under GATT.

I commend the Hon. Member for following this Bill carefully, but for those reasons the amendments are not minor. They are quite major mistakes, and I say that the House must not support those amendments.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon) has already had the floor on this grouping. I would need unanimous consent to recognize the Hon. Member.

Mr. Langdon: I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker. If I am not mistaken, it is my understanding that at report stage it is possible to speak a number of times, within the constraints of time; is that not correct?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): That would apply to Committee of the Whole. At report stage normally an Hon. Member can speak for 10 minutes on each of the groupings, unless there is unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): There is not unanimous consent so I cannot recognize the Hon. Member at this time.

Is the House ready for the question on the first grouping? The first question is on Motion No. 5. I should remind Hon. Members that the vote on Motion No. 5 will also apply to Motions Nos. 6, 7, and 10.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motions negatived.

Motions Nos. 5, 6, 7, and 10 negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The next grouping is for Motions Nos. 8 and 9.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Madam Speaker, I think that if you ask for unanimous consent you will find that the House is disposed to allow the Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau) to introduce the motion of the Member for Trinity (Ms. Nicholson).

[*English*]

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor) moved:

Motion No. 9.

That Bill C-110 be amended in Clause 26 by adding immediately after line 27 at page 9 the following:

"(c) that what constitutes total domestic production under subparagraph (b) excludes the production of those domestic producers who are related to any exporter or importer of the like or directly competitive goods or are themselves importers of such products; and".

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? On debate the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Garneau (for Ms. Nicholson (Trinity)) moved:

Motion No. 8.

—That Bill C-110 be amended in Clause 26 by striking out lines 24 and 25 at page 9 and substituting the following therefor:

"behalf of any domestic producer".

Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few words on Motion No. 8. Essentially, the Bill proposes to allow groups of domestic producers who are responsible for or represent an important part or the major proportion of a given production to file a complaint with the Tribunal asking it to conduct an inquiry to determine whether or not they have been the victims of an injustice.

The amendment I am moving on behalf of my colleague the Member for Trinity (Ms. Nicholson) is to the effect that a producer who feels that certain circumstances have caused him injury could himself file a complaint with the Tribunal to ask it to conduct an inquiry to determine whether or not Canadian

industry has been adversely affected by massive quantities of imported goods that might suddenly flow into the country at a certain point.

Madam Speaker, when the Legislative Committee debated the Bill we broadened the clause somewhat, because the original text of the Bill used the following expression, in English: "a major proportion of domestic production". "A part or a proportion of more than 50 per cent" . . . and an amendment was made to modify the clause somewhat, and to say "an important part".

But there are several types of industries in Canada where large producers may represent 55, 60, or 65 per cent of production, and very often those major producers are controlled by national interests or, quite frequently, by non-resident shareholders. And for all sorts of reasons related to international ramifications, those large producers might object to complaints being filed with the Tribunal to ask that Tribunal to conduct an inquiry on the import of unreasonable quantities of goods or the sale of goods at unjustifiably low prices.

The result would be that domestic producers, or the smaller ones at least, would find it impossible to file their complaints with the Tribunal to ask it to investigate massive imports affecting them.

The Government claims that this would be an excessive simplification and might increase the complaints. In any case, small producers or producers representing 5, 6 or 7 per cent of a given production are often represented by associations that could make representations on their behalf to the Tribunal and file a complaint asking that an inquiry be conducted into the massive imports of goods being sold at overly competitive prices in the light of production costs in Canada.

It is nice to think that things might happen that way, but here again, there are several types of production where the number of producers is so small that the associations, even though they represent everyone, may have different objectives and perspectives, especially if one producer is totally dominant for a given product.

Thus, the purpose of the amendment is to make the inquiry process accessible to a domestic producer who feels that he has really been wronged. Pursuant to the clauses that precede clause 26, he would have to provide sufficient information to show that an inquiry is justified, but the amendment would allow a producer to file a complaint and initiate the process on his own.

The need is obvious if one looks at what has been done in other countries; I believe that in some recent cases in the United States, concerning potash particularly, the major producers were not the ones to file the complaint that was judged to be in order and that triggered the whole inquiry process which led to the result you are familiar with.

If American producers are protected in that way, I don't see why we on the Canadian side could not offer the same possibility to a producer who feels that the survival of his business is threatened, as well as the jobs he offers to a certain number of Canadians; he should be able to benefit from the advantages of complaining to the Tribunal which could analyze the exaggerated increase in imports which might have occurred.

• (1650)

[*English*]

Mr. Langdon: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, on your ruling with respect to the grouping of these two motions together for debate, while I have no objections to that it does raise for me a very serious problem. I do not support, and my Party would not support, Motion No. 8, while of course I have moved and my Party would support Motion No. 9. So I would ask if, for purposes of voting, these two could be divided, even if you would wish to carry on the debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I think I can certainly ask for two separate votes on these two motions.

Mr. Hockin: Madam Speaker, I would certainly agree to splitting these two votes. The Hon. Member does not support Motion No. 8. I would like to speak to Motion No. 8 before we go to the Hon. Member's comments on Motion No. 9.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Would the Hon. Member allow the Minister to—

Mr. Langdon: Since we are debating the two motions together and then voting separately, it might make sense for the Hon. Minister to respond to both motions.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It will allow the Chair to make life easier for every Member this afternoon.

Mr. Hockin: Madam Speaker, I would be happy to respond, after hearing the Hon. Member's comments, on Motion No. 9.

Mr. Langdon: Madam Speaker, these models of politeness are what the House should be all about.

I would like to say why I think the motion by my colleague, the Hon. Member from Trinity (Miss Nicholson), moved by the Hon. Member from Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau), is not something that makes sense. With many of our industries in this country, as all Members of this House know, we have vast numbers of extremely small producers. This is certainly the case with respect to the auto parts industry, which is prevalent in my constituency. It is certainly the case with respect to the clothing industry. I think it does make sense to insist that there be some proportion of the industry which has to bring a complaint. I have some concern about the existing level which has been established. It represents a compromise on the Government's part which it took in committee, and I am therefore pleased to live with that compromise.

With respect, however, to my motion, in attempting to assess the proportion of the industry which brings its complaint

before the tribunal, it is important that domestic production include or be considered to be production, leaving aside those firms which are, as my amendment suggests, related to exporters or importers of the like or directly competitive goods, or are themselves importers of such products.

We could certainly see a situation in this country where the great bulk of domestic producers were related to importers and would therefore have no interest in bringing a complaint before the tribunal. So, to leave out of the analysis what constitutes a major proportion of the domestic production of this particular good, it seems to me absolutely critical that we exclude those firms which are themselves associated with importers. Otherwise, we will be in a situation where true domestic producers are not going to be able to go before this tribunal to ask for safeguard or for other action.

• (1700)

I want to make a point with respect to this entire section which deals with complaints by domestic producers. This section does not, through any definition or statement in the Bill itself, limit itself to safeguard actions. It may well have been the Minister's intention that it should have been limited to safeguard actions. If that is the case, there is a major mistake in drafting because there is no indication whatever within the Bill that that is the point. This is very important, Madam Speaker. At the present time domestic producers in the textile and clothing industry have the right to go to the Textile and Clothing Board and to take to that board complaints which are non-safeguard action complaints. If the Minister intends to apply this safeguard action test, that will, in fact, take away from our domestic textile and clothing firms the right to be able to take complaints, as they have always done in the past to the Textile and Clothing Board, to this new international trade tribunal.

If that is the case, Madam Speaker, then the textile and clothing producers will not just have lost the right to see the Textile and Clothing Board initiate inquiries, they will not just have seen the Textile and Clothing Board lose the right to make recommendations, but they themselves will have lost the right to be able to take anything before this new international trade tribunal except those matters which are related to safeguard actions. Of course, safeguard actions are themselves only one sub-set of the kinds of activities which, as a result of injury, textile and clothing firms might wish to carry forward to this trade tribunal.

I recognize that these are technical issues which are difficult to deal with especially at this stage of the session, but I hope very much that the Minister will recognize, for the textile and clothing producers particularly, that this right to take their complaints to the new international trade tribunal is an important right which they have always had with respect to the Textile and Clothing Board. If we wipe it out, it will be an unfortunate and sad result for the textile and clothing manufacturers and workers of this country.

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Madam Speaker, let me speak to these two motions. The first one was originally in the name of the Hon. Member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson) and is now moved by the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau). The second one is in the name of the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon).

The first one astonished me. The second I think is unnecessary. I know it is unnecessary but I think the best way to summarize my complaint is that it is redundant and not needed to accomplish the purpose to which the Hon. Member is speaking.

Let me speak to the first motion. In terms of a single producer having trouble with imports and wanting inquiries to be conducted, to argue that no inquiry could ever be conducted, of course, will not necessarily be the case at all. The new tribunal will be able to do general economic inquiries, conduct tariff-related inquiries and injury inquiries. It will have the responsibility for all injury inquiries, as the House knows.

In addition, the Government will be able to direct the tribunal to inquire into the injurious impact of imports which are not dumped or subsidized. The Government currently has the authority to request such inquiries under the Special Import Measures Act and in the case of textile and clothing products, under the Textile and Clothing Board Act.

The key problem with Motion No. 8 is that one sole producer could trigger what the Hon. Member is asking for. That is as protectionist a device as I have ever heard in this House from a Party which purports to believe in liberalized trade around the world. Just one producer, Madam Speaker. GATT, decades ago, threw out that standard as being nothing more than a standard of harassment, and is this the Liberal Party's position on this trade tribunal? I find that astonishing and I am very surprised—I have great respect for the Hon. Member for Trinity—that she would bring that motion forward.

This amendment would allow direct access to the tribunal by a single producer. I know why the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor does not support it, because it is so dangerously protectionist that it would hurt our reputation as supporters for liberalized trade around the world. For a Party to propose this amendment that says it does not believe in the free trade agreement with the United States but does believe in GATT and liberalized free trade, I find, is inconceivable and I will remind Liberal Members of it in the future.

Members who participated in the committee know that there was extensive discussion about what proportion of the industry should be represented in a petition. That was a serious question and we had a good discussion. I think everybody learned from it. The Government agreed to what it believed was a consensus on the concept. Instead of saying "a majority of producers" we agreed that "a major proportion of producers" should be able to have direct access to the tribunal, and the Bill before the House has been so amended.

I must ask the House, in the name of GATT as well as in the name of liberalized trade around the world, to defeat that proposed amendment. I think I am supported by members of the New Democratic Party on that.

Motion No. 9 is only about safeguard actions. I hasten to tell my hon. friend that that is what this Bill is about and that is what this particular clause is about.

Mr. Langdon: It doesn't say so.

Mr. Hockin: Therefore, I am making that clear in my remarks now. The Hon. Member says it does not say so. The whole Bill is about this kind of safeguarding inquiries, and that is what it is meant to be.

The amendment set out is intended to exclude from the definition of industry those producers who are related to importers or exporters of the goods in question. I know what is behind this question. We had a good example from Windsor with the auto parts industry and so on. I also asked these questions during my work on this Bill.

Motion No. 14 proposes a related amendment to Clause 40 which would eliminate the authority of the Government to make regulations defining what is domestic production. The legislation deals with the definition of industry and related definitions through regulations because the definitions cannot be put into a piece of legislation. We would have to put that in regulations because we are negotiating it with GATT now. The draft regulations—and this is why I feel the Hon. Member's motion is unnecessary—will be put through the accepted regulatory process, including pre-publication, and will contain a detailed definition covering the concept which is included in the amendment of the Hon. Member from Essex—Windsor. That is why I called the motion unnecessary.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

• (1710)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The question is on Motion No. 8 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion negatived.

Motion No. 8 negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The next question is on Motion No. 9.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the motion negatived.

Motion No. 9 negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The next motion before the House is Motion No. 11.

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor) moved:

Motion No. 11.

That Bill C-110 be amended in Clause 27 by striking out lines 43 to 49 at page 11 and 1 to 4 at page 12 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) In determining the question of injury under subsection (1), the Tribunal shall consider

(a) all relevant economic factors and indices having a bearing on the state of the industry, including actual or potential decline in output, sales, market share, profits, productivity, return on investments, utilization of capacity, production, employment, wages and volume of other imports; and

(b) Canada's obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and, in the case of textiles and apparel, under the Arrangement Regarding International Trade in Textiles."

He said: Madam Speaker, there are two key points which are made in this motion which I think should be taken seriously by the Government and adopted in this legislation. The first is that the question of injury itself to a domestic producer here within Canada should not be some kind of narrow, restricted formula but, instead, should take into account, as I suggest, all relevant economic factors and indices having a bearing on the state of the industry, including actual or potential decline in output, sales, market share, profits, productivity, return on investments, utilization of capacity, production, employment, wages and volume of other imports.

This would give us a framework within which it would be possible for the new International Trade Tribunal to deal with some of the pressures and threats which we will face in the future. It would not be a protectionist framework in itself. Rather, it would require the tribunal, in analysing what it is undertaking, to assess very broadly the state of the industry and the impact that imports are having on it and, in considerable detail, to analyse the points which bear on the state of that industry itself. It seems to me that the narrow formulations of the past have not in fact given to our industries a sufficient safeguard against sudden thrusts from low-wage countries which undercut the jobs of Canadians and affect their families and communities.

Second, the amendment recognizes what the Bill does not recognize. The Bill has made a serious mistake in not recognizing that, for most industries, GATT and the GATT regime is what constitutes the framework within which there are certain obligations. There are also certain other goods which are outside GATT obligations, as, for instance, those goods which we used in our retaliation against the United States on the shakes and shingles case.

Most important, there is a class of very important goods in Canada which is not subject to GATT obligations but is, instead, a subject of the Arrangement Regarding International Trade in Textiles. In Canada, over 100,000 employees work in the clothing industry. I would venture to guess that close to 90,000 employees are working in the textile industry. These industries are located in small communities.

The potential impact on those firms is very serious. That is why we have seen at the international level the establishment of a completely separate regime with respect to textiles. It is why, in the trade tribunal and the clause which deals with domestic complaints, we should also recognize that some of those complaints may be brought by the textile and clothing industries, complaints which should be analysed with consideration, not to our obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, but instead with respect to our obligations under the Arrangement Regarding International Trade in Textiles.

If this amendment is accepted, we will see before us a much better Bill, a Bill which, first, does consider all economic factors which are important for an industry, and also recognizes the significant distinction which exists in the case of trade between those obligations we have under GATT and those obligations which affect the textile industry producers, workers, communities and people.

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Madam Speaker, the amendment to Clause 27 in Motion No. 11 would, quite frankly, further twist the intent of the legislation. This was the import of what the Hon. Member was doing with the two previous motions as well. There would not be a requirement any longer that increased imports be the principal cause of serious injury. However, that is what this whole Bill is about.

Increased imports is the principal cause of serious injury. With any lower test than that, the system would degenerate into one used for nothing more than harassment, and Canada could quickly be called to explain itself by our major trading partners. It is a chauvinistic kind of approach.

We are members of GATT and this totally undercuts GATT. The Hon. Member opposite is proposing that the injury criteria be embodied in the legislation. The injury criteria are similar to those used in dumping and countervail inquiries and are incorporated in the rules of the Canadian Import Tribunal. Because injury criteria are not exhaustive and never can be, and are subject to constant multilateral negotiations, it is the Government's intention to include them in the rules of the tribunal.

• (1720)

I do not think I need say more. Those are the fundamental reasons why this amendment is not acceptable.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The question is on Motion No. 11 (Mr. Langdon).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11) the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next group of motions is Motion No. 12 and Motion No. 13.

Motion No. 12 is in the name of Miss Nicholson (Trinity). Do I have unanimous consent for the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau) to move the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Garneau (for Miss Nicholson (Trinity) moved:

Motion No. 12.

That Bill C-110 be amended in Clause 29 by adding immediately after line 18 at page 13 the following:

"(2) Where, as a result of an inquiry, the Tribunal determines that the goods that are the subject matter of the inquiry are being imported in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers of like or directly competitive goods, the tribunal shall make a written report to the Minister setting out the results of the inquiry and containing a recommendation as to whether, in its opinion, special measures of protection should be implemented.

(3) The report of the Tribunal made pursuant to subsection (2) shall specify the recommended scope and duration of the special measures and shall be published in the *Canada Gazette*."

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor) moved:

Motion No. 13.

That Bill C-110 be amended in Clause 29

(a) by adding immediately after line 18 at page 13 the following:

"(2) The Tribunal's report shall set out

(a) whether the goods that are the subject matter of the complaint are being imported at such prices, in such quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten to cause serious or other injury to domestic production of like or directly competitive goods;

(b) in cases where the Tribunal determines that the goods that are the subject of the complaint are causing or threatening to cause serious injury to the domestic production of like or directly competitive goods, a recommendation as to such special measures of protection, if any, that in the opinion of the Tribunal appear necessary or prudent to remedy or prevent such injury;

(c) in cases where the Tribunal determines that the injury to domestic production is other than serious, a recommendation as to the removal of any applicable preferential tariff or concession granted by Canada in respect of the goods or the country of export that is not an obligation of Canada under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade;

(d) nothing in this Act shall be taken as limiting any provision or power under the Special Import Measures Act."

(b) by adding immediately after line 11 at page 14 the following:

"(6) In making recommendations under this section the Tribunal shall consider Canada's obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade."

Mr. Garneau: Madam Speaker, Motion No. 10 deals with the reporting powers of the tribunal. As the Bill presently stands, the new tribunal will not have the right to make recommendations to the Government for action in light of a finding of serious injury. Members of Parliament suggested during the course of the meeting of the legislative committee that the tribunal should have the right to make recommendations. However, to give the tribunal an automatic power to make recommendations would, the Minister stated, be tantamount to an abdication of the Government's policy-making responsibilities.

This is a strange fear. Even if the tribunal makes a recommendation, the Government will still have the power to reject or act upon it. Recommendations are essential. At least they provide some guidance to officials and the Government. One questions why the Government is opposed to even hearing a recommendation on an injury finding from an expert body like the proposed tribunal. The amendment would ensure that recommendations are reported by the tribunal and published in *The Canada Gazette*.

Mr. Langdon: Madam Speaker, with respect to Motion No. 13, I want to point out to the Minister that, contrary to his constant refrain that we are trying to escape from our GATT obligations, we make quite clear in Motion No. 13 that we wish to add something to the Bill which will in turn make it quite clear that in making recommendations under this section, the tribunal shall consider Canada's obligations under GATT. We are making it quite clear that we are, have been and will continue to be a committed member of GATT.

The point that the Minister continues to miss is that these domestic complaints are not simply complaints brought under GATT. They will be brought by textile and clothing producers who are not subject to GATT, except for the special set of considerations established by GATT under its textile regime. These are separate and distinct from the obligations Canada has under GATT.

We have recommended that the tribunal, in making recommendations, shall consider Canada's obligations under GATT. We make it absolutely clear, but there are other parts of what will be undertaken by this tribunal which the Minister and his Department will recognize. Certainly some witnesses who testified before us in committee recognized them. The textile and clothing producers came before us, and the clothing workers communicated with us in writing, and indicated that they expect that, just as with the Textile and Clothing Board which is being amalgamated into this new tribunal, they will continue to have the right to bring forward complaints as domestic producers which will not fall under our GATT obligations but instead under our obligations under the various multi-fibre arrangements which have affected textiles, as I said, for 26 years.

As I pointed out to the Minister, there are a number of goods which he knows are not covered by GATT. Yet producers of those goods will also have the right to bring complaints before this tribunal. In those cases where they are not covered by GATT, surely the Minister is not saying he is going to impose GATT obligations on them? Surely he is not saying the same thing with respect to textiles and clothing? Despite the fact that they are not covered by GATT, he will, through this Bill, cover them under GATT. I think it is sheer nonsense for the Minister to put that into effect.

I would point out to him again that we are not talking about a single board, a special board which existed in the past, the Canadian Import Tribunal. We are talking about three tribunals, one of which, the Textile and Clothing Board, permitted domestic complaints from textile and clothing producers. Surely they will continue to have that right in the future. In doing so, it is simply inconceivable that they will be bound by GATT obligations when no other country forces its textile and clothing producers to be bound by GATT obligations. Surely the Minister is not trying to put our textile and clothing industries in much tighter strait-jackets than American, British, French and Italian textile producers. That does not make sense.

• (1730)

Mr. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Madam Speaker, I hasten to respond to the Hon. Member on Motion No. 13. I think I have good news for him if he will listen carefully. The amendment set out in Motion No. 13 amplifies the provisions on the issue of recommendations and whether or not the tribunal should be making recommendations. The amendment goes further and requires the tribunal, in case of non-serious injury, to recommend the removal of preferential tariff concessions which are not obligations of Canada under the GATT.

We know that this amendment is targeting the general preferential tariff regime which Canada has in place. That is the concern of the Hon. Member. In the Government's view this provision is entirely unnecessary. The good news is that that Government now has a standing general reference to the Tariff Board on the GPT which will be given to the new CITT. This regime has operated satisfactorily in the past and there is no reason why it should not operate satisfactorily in the future.

The advantage of this is that if offers flexibility, given the future MTN negotiations and, more important, is less offensive to developing countries than would be a legislated obligation to remove the GPT. I would not want to have to go with our developing country friends with that legislative obligation. It should be part of a more flexible MTN negotiation. I ask the House again to reject these amendments.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The question is on Motion No. 12. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare Motion No. 12 negatived.

Motion No. 12 negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The vote on Motion No. 12 applies to Motion No. 13.

Motion No. 13 negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The next motion before the House is Motion No. 14.

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor) moved:

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-110 be amended in Clause 40 by striking out lines 43 to 45 at page 16 and 1 and 2 at page 17.

He said: Madam Speaker, I am mostly provoked to speak briefly because of the last intervention of the Minister which, so far as I could see, had absolutely nothing to do with the section which was being analysed. Section 29, which was being analysed with Motion No. 13, simply suggested the various ways of defining the nature of the report which the tribunal would itself put forward. It had absolutely nothing to do with developing country partners of Canada, with the GPT, or with anything else.

Mr. Hockin: The implication of what you were saying.

Mr. Langdon: Well, if the implication of what I was saying was that, then that simply proves that the section which the Minister has claimed all along dealt only with safeguards deals with much more than safeguards, which I do not think follows logically from the positions he has taken previously.

In any event, the motion to which I am speaking now is Motion No. 14 which deals with Clause 40 and attempts to take out the power of the Governor in Council to make recommendations with respect to domestic producer and domestic production and, therefore, is a companion piece to a motion which was ruled out of order earlier. I would assume, therefore, that if this motion were in fact carried, the original motion which I wished to move, Motion No. 1, which defined domestic producers of goods as "any firm employing, or any trade union representing, workers producing the goods involved", would conceivably be in order.

I will speak very briefly to that principle which I think the House should take seriously since our neighbour to the south, the United States, is among a number of countries which permit trade unions to carry complaints to their various trade tribunals in order to ensure that the trade unions can ensure that their workers benefit from the improved protection of either safeguard action or action for textile and clothing workers under the regime which applies to them.

I think that we as a Parliament are about 20 years behind the times in recognizing the important, positive role which trade unions can play in our economy. One of the studies which I undertook as an economist before my election to the House examined the restructuring of the textile industry in the Netherlands and found that the trade union movement had in fact played a major constructive role in helping to restructure that industry so that much more in the way of Third World imports could come into the country and, at the same time, workers were able to transfer successfully to other jobs at higher wages and were able to restructure their own firms in

such a way as to make them viable in the new context which they faced.

For some reason we in this country seem to believe that the trade union movement should be treated as some kind of pariah to be left out of major economic decision-making except in cases of propaganda value such as the national economic conference of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) some years ago.

• (1740)

I hope that we can carry Motion No. 14 so that it will then be possible to look once more at the advisability of permitting debate on Motion No. 1.

Mr. Lewis: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been discussions among the Parties. I think you will find agreement to the following proposition: That the House complete report stage debate on Bill C-110, with all motions being put and any recorded divisions that are requested deferred until 6 p.m. tomorrow evening; that the House then proceed to all stages of Bill S-17; that the House would not see the clock at 6 p.m. in order to allow for all stages of Bill S-17 to be completed today, and that during that time there would be no quorum calls and,naturally, no further business called.

Mr. Gauthier: Madam Speaker, I want to confirm that indeed there have been negotiations with the Deputy Government House Leader. The Official Opposition, in its usual co-operative mood, will tell him again that we are achieving a lot of work in the House even though we are in the middle of July.

Mr. de Jong: Madam Speaker, I want to confirm that negotiations have taken place. I believe it was my suggestion to one of his Members that the House proceed in this way so that Bill S-17 can be dealt with in all stages today. We are happy to see the type of co-operation being exhibited here. Hopefully the Government will take note of how co-operative we have been to pass legislation.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Being a servant of the House and in a co-operative mood as well, the Chair will stay as long as is necessary. The Hon. Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Hockin) has the floor.

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Madam Speaker, in a spirit of brevity and co-operation, I will make a brief comment on the Hon. Member's motion. His amendment would remove the authority of the Government to make regulations defining domestic production. When I addressed Motion No. 9, I gave the reasons why this power must be retained by the Government and why the amendment should be rejected. I call upon the House to reject this amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The question is on Motion No. 14 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion, the nays have it.

I declare the motion negatived.

Motion No. 14 negatived.

Mr. Raymond Garneau (Laval-des-Rapides) (for Miss Nicholson) moved:

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-110 be amended in Clause 59 by adding immediately after line 21 at page 27, the following:

"(5) A person appointed to hold office as a member of a former authority shall be entitled to be given or paid by Her Majesty in right of Canada such compensation, damages or indemnity for ceasing to hold office under this Act or for the abolition of that office by this Act as may be agreed by such person or such amount as may be determined by the Federal Court under paragraph 17(3)(a) of the Federal Court Act, and, for the purpose of that paragraph, Her Majesty shall be deemed to have agreed in writing to pay the amount so determined."

He said: Madam Speaker, since three tribunals will be abolished, this motion deals with compensating board members who will not be hired to sit on the new tribunal. This Bill originally contained a clause explicitly stating that former members had no right to compensation. This clause was removed.

However, changes to the Tariff Board Act, the Textile and Clothing Board Act and the Special Import Measures Act have the effect on the coming law of depriving the former board members of any rights to compensation or damages for breach of contract. Therefore, the purpose of this amendment is to add the subclause that explicitly grants former board members the right to compensation.

The Canadian Bar Association made representations to the committee and stated that the discharge of former members without compensation was arbitrary, fundamentally unfair, and contrary to the Charter. Many of these former authorities are distinguished citizens who have interrupted or indeed have ended their careers in order to add their expertise and experience to these boards.

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Madam Speaker, we support this amendment. It seems unfortunate that the pushing and shoving in the legislative committee which succeeded in persuading the Government to drop its prohibition of any such compensation should not have ultimately led to a more open and generous spirit and the incorporation of a clause that committed the Government to make such compensation available in the future.

When people serve their country, as has been the case with those on these three tribunals, it is very important that they not simply be shoved out the door without some promise of compensation in the future.

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Madam Speaker, I think it would be absolutely exceptional to have a compensation obligation written into a statute. As as general rule, compensation issues are handled without statutory requirement. It was agreed in the committee to remove clause 39(5), to remove any potential conflict of interest situation. I see no reason for this proposed amendment which, in essence, would prejudge the nature and scope of any court action on the matter. I ask the House to defeat this amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The question is on Motion No. 15 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion, the nays have it.

I declare the motion negatived.

Motion No. 15 negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Normally at this time the House would proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at the report stage of the Bill now before the House. However, pursuant to the agreement reached earlier this day, the recorded divisions on the proposed motions will stand deferred until 6 p.m., Wednesday, July 13, 1988.

• (1750)

[*Translation*]

ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE CONTINUATION OF THE MONTREAL TRUST COMPAGNY OF CANADA

MEASURE TO ENSURE CONTINUATION UNDER THE LAWS OF THE PROVINCE OF QUÉBEC

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Mr. Lanthier moved that Bill S-17, an Act to authorize the Montreal Trust Company of Canada to be continued as a corporation under the laws of the Province of Quebec, be read the second time and, by unanimous consent, referred to Committee of the Whole. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and, by unanimous consent, the House went into committee thereon, Mrs. Champagne in the chair.

On Clause 1—authorization

Mr. Garneau: Madam Speaker, to expedite debate, I did not intend to speak at the second reading stage of this Bill. However, after some conversations with the Minister, during which I had a few questions for him about financial institutions, I had the impression he would agree to respond to some of these questions which are related, though indirectly, to the Bill before the House. The Bill before the House today constitutes a request by a private company for a change in jurisdiction, that is, to have part of its operations, which were under federal jurisdiction, transferred to that section of the same group that was under the provincial jurisdiction of Quebec, and which in fact represented the majority of the assets of Montreal Trust.

After my conversations with the Minister and after reading the comments made by the President of Montreal Trust, Mr. Gratton, before the other honourable Chamber of this Parliament which examined the Bill in committee and heard witnesses, I was generally satisfied with what was said by the President of Montreal Trust, and I have no real problem with the Bill itself and its wording, so that as far as I was concerned, once the Minister answered some of my questions, clause-by-clause consideration could be done very quickly.

Madam Speaker, without being a cause for concern, and I am sure there are reasons, one does wonder why this is the third company that, for practical reasons, has expressed the desire to be transferred from a federal to a provincial charter. We had *Les Coopérants* in December 1987, *l'Alliance Industrielle* a little earlier, and today, there are also rumours about *La Sauvegarde* and of course we have Montreal Trust.

When we look at how our financial institutions are evolving, we can say there have been various developments. First of all, we had a Green Paper, I think in April 1985, tabled by the former Minister responsible for financial institutions, which was examined by the Standing Committee on Finance

and Economic Affairs, under the distinguished chairmanship of the Hon. Member for Mississauga—South (Mr. Blencarn). This Committee did a considerable amount of work. It heard witnesses and reported to the House on developments in our financial institutions and on their ties outside the financial sector, with commercial and industrial sectors. The report also touched on issues such as the ownership of these institutions. Who may own or own shares in a bank or trust company or insurance company, and what percentage of the total share capital?

How many shares are in foreign hands? What are we supposed to do about issues such as selling insurance, and so forth? Quite a few quesitons were raised, especially in the subsequent document, the Blue Paper which was tabled, if I am not mistaken, in 1986. We had a report by the Commons Committee and the Senate Committee. We had a number of documents published by the Economic Council of Canada. All this goes back to 1985 and 1986.

The Minister tabled a Bill on financial institutions, which dealt with the restructuring of the role of the inspector of insurance companies, trust companies and banks, consolidating all these responsibilities under the same person. The Minister also tabled a Bill on certain conflicts of interest. Basically, however, there are a number of points that have yet to be dealt with, and which to a certain extent may lead financial institutions to consider a change to a federal or a provincial charter. I would like to ask the Minister whether the Government intends to table its Bill on ownership very shortly. We were informed some time ago that the Government felt that non-financial businesses should not be major shareholders in new financial firms. I am thinking of industrial and commercial groups that acquire a controlling interest in financial institutions or vice versa. I would like to ask the Minister whether the Government has reached a final decision in this respect. Will it be possible, in future, for financial institutions to be owned by commercial groups? I understand it was always agreed there would be a grandfather clause for existing groups.

Could the Minister inform the House what the Government's policy will be in this respect and when we can expect the appropiate legislation to be tabled?

[*English*]

Mr. Hockin: Madam Chairman, this particular set of questions does not relate directly to Bill S-17, but I will be happy to help the Hon. Member with his questions. As he knows, in December the Government released a draft Trust and Loans Companies Act which is really a boiler-plate or new model of legislation for insurance companies, banks, the Canadian Co-operative Credit Society, as well as trust and loans companies.

The reason we had the legislation released in draft form was to ensure that we had very intense consultations with the industry, not on hypothetical things but on the practicalities of the Bill. As a result of the consultations which have been very widespread with the provinces and industries, we have put ourselves into a position whereby we can hasten the process of putting in place a new regime when the Bill comes into the House.

Frankly, this is the most important legislation ever in the history of Canada for restructuring our financial institutions and our financial system. Sweeping changes for the industry are proposed in it. I placed a great deal of importance on consultation. Because of the strategic importance of the financial institution industry in the country, we have to get it right and rather than present a Bill that was flawed and that had not had the benefit of proper consultation. We put forward a draft piece of legislation and encouraged consultation. During the period of talking to both industry and the provinces, numerous representations and many helpful suggestions were made upon which I am now acting.

As I noted in my press release on June 15, 1988, one of the constant themes throughout the consultations with both industry and the provinces was that the Government's over-all financial sector policy goals were applauded and supported, but it was felt that it could be accomplished with a lesser degree of reliance on the policy in that draft trust and loan legislation of separation of financial and commercial enterprises. It relied very heavily on that separation.

I am now investigating, as I said in that press release, whether any modifications in ownership policies should be made and whether the changes would require a strengthening of prudential rules. If we move back somewhat in our reliance upon the separation between commercial and financial links, then we should ask the question whether more prudential requirements are needed in the over-all legislation.

• (1800)

That is what we are examining now. We have virtually completed that examination. I expect to be in a position shortly to announce any changes. I remain committed to the notion and the commitment of moving the legislation ahead as quickly as possible while ensuring that the policy serves consumers and the industry well.

Introduction of the trust and loan legislation will be followed by changes to the Bank Act. After that the new insurance companies Bill and the Canadian Co-operative Credit Associations Bill will follow. That is a huge set of legislative changes. They will follow quickly because the thinking will have been done and the principles will have been revealed in the first Bill that is brought before the House.

We are resolved to move quickly. The new legislation will look different from the draft legislation because it will have less reliance on commercial financial links.

Mr. Garneau: I am all for consultation. I agree that it is very important, particularly in this very sensitive field of activity. Nevertheless, this consultation process has been ongoing since 1984, if not before that time. The Government was sworn in in September of 1984. We have had the Green

Paper from the former Minister. There has been the report from the House of Commons and the report from the Senate. There has also been the report of the Economic Council of Canada. There have been long, long discussions.

When the Minister says that it is not linked with the actual piece of legislation that we are studying, I agree that it is not linked; but it could be linked. When there are a great many financial institutions federally chartered and they cannot see and know exactly in what context they will develop in the future, then they will look for other ways and means to achieve their goals.

Thus there is a link with the *raison d'être* of this Bill. However, no chief executive officer would tell that to anyone. Certainly, ownership is a very important situation. I am not very pleased with the answer that we should wait and see, or that we may have an answer in legislation that will be tabled soon. We have been told that for the last two or three years. We even studied one piece of legislation. Under pressure from the Finance Committee and members of the Opposition—in fact from everybody—the Minister stripped the Bill and introduced a new one. If I recall correctly it was entitled Bill C-56. We are now being told that the measures will come as early as possible.

A great many people are talking about elections. You may have heard about it, or perhaps read about it in the papers, Madam Speaker. If we have an election this fall, as a great many people suggest, it will take at least another six months for the new Minister from a new Party to organize another piece of legislation and have it adopted. In the meantime the financial world will be in a difficult situation.

I am asking the Minister to be more precise, if not with respect to the timing of the legislation then at least will he tell the financial institutions, as well as the Members of this House, when the legislation will be tabled. Will it be before the election? Will commercial and financial links be acceptable in the new legislation?

Mr. Hockin: I am very pleased to answer those questions. Since I do not know when the election will be called, I cannot make a prediction on whether or not the legislation will be before the election or after. Is that not logical? If I knew when the election would be called, I could answer the Hon. Member's question.

Mr. Layton: Give us a hint.

Mr. Hockin: Elections aside, the legislation itself will be tabled very soon. The Hon. Member will not have to wait very long at all.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Garneau: Madam Speaker, in the same context, the legislation will have to settle a certain number of questions. Among others, I was reading articles in the papers published following the annual meeting of Montreal Trustco, such as the one published in *The Globe and Mail*, and another written by

Montreal Trust Company of Canada

François Shalom and published in *The Gazette* last March 17, which said that the president had held a press conference and that Mr. Gratton said the following:

[*English*]

> This company, which has a federal charter, is eager to get into insurance, as a distributor of home insurance against fire and theft as well as car insurance.
>
> But Gratton said Montreal Trust does not want to penetrate the life insurance market.
>
> If the government does not scrap its regulations on trusts, Montreal Trust could be restructured to fall within provincial jurisdiction, he said, which has fewer restrictions.

[*Translation*]

Similar comments were reported in *The Globe and Mail*. I would like to ask the Minister this: will future legislation allow trust companies to penetrate the insurance field? I would also like to know what will happen in the area of automobile leasing. There has been intensive lobbying, and the member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) and my colleague from Regina East will certainly remember all of the testimony we heard at our Committee in 1986. Even though the Bill we have before us is not directly related to those issues it has ramifications that might affect other financial institutions.

[*English*]

Mr. Hockin: I am very anxious to respond to those two questions. As far as Mr. Gratton's comments are concerned, I think that the Hon. Member has read the testimony which was given before the Senate committee. In Mr. Gratton's own press release and comments he has made it clear that even if the federal rules were the very same as the provincial rules, he would still be moving his charter provincially. The content of our Blue Paper has in no way been part of his thinking in this respect. It was a business decision. It was based on Quebec being the home of that institution for a long time. When the two companies were amalgamated it made sense for them to find one home, and Quebec seemed to be the natural place.

As for possibilities for Montreal Trust, or any trust company in the future, I suggest that the Hon. Member read my Blue Paper. In it I made it very clear that this is a magnificent new opportunity to have—

[*Translation*]

a removal of barriers among the various financial institutions.

[*English*]

As a result of that, and following on the Blue Paper, we can have trust companies buying an insurance company, a property and casualty insurance company or a life insurance company. We can have a bank buying an insurance company or a trust company. This opening up of ownership is provided for in the Blue Paper. In no way was it mooted in my press release of June 15 that that would be changed.

The second question has to do with a more technical aspect concerning the leasing of cars. I would be very interested to know the Hon. Member's position with respect to that. My view, and I have stated it publicly a number of times recently,

as well as when I brought the draft trust and loan Bill forward, is that I do not believe that banks should be allowed to lease cars.

Mr. Garneau: I am not sure if I understood the Minister well. As long as I am in the Opposition I will ask the questions. If he wants to change sides, then I may answer his questions. I am prepared to do that if his boss calls an election. Nevertheless, on many occasions I have been public on that issue.

• (1810)

I am not sure if the Minister understood my question. I am asking if the trust company will be able to sell insurance in its branches. That is what my question was. Mr. Gratton said in his press conference on March 17, 1988 that he wanted to sell car insurance and home insurance.

The other part of my question dealt with the other financial activity, and in French we say "*le crédit bail*". I would like to receive an answer from the Minister on those two points.

Mr. Hockin: I think the Hon. Member knows that my position is clear that the retailing of insurance in bank and trust company branches under federal jurisdiction will not be allowed. I have made that clear on a number of occasions, and I have reiterated that since my press release on June 15.

Mr. Garneau: What will the Minister do if provinces make it possible to retail insurance under provincial charter, be it Ontario, Quebec, or any other province? Is the Minister going to defend the transfer of federal charter to provincial charter in the future, or will he change his mind? How will the federal chartered financial institutions be able to compete with provincial chartered institutions in the field of insurance and other financial activities that some of the companies are asking for?

Mr. Hockin: I am very interested that the Hon. Member put on the record that he would like federal financial institutions, banks, and trust companies to retail insurance in the branches. That is his position.

Some Hon. Members: Shame.

An Hon. Member: That's not going to sell in western Canada.

Mrs. Finestone: That's not what he said.

Mr. Garneau: That is not what I said. If the Minister wants to debate that, he should bring in a piece of legislation. That is what I am asking for. That is what the Hon. Member for Mississauga South has been asking for for many months.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: The Hon. Member and the Minister have entered into debate. The Chair is quite willing to allow them to debate, but one person at a time will make it a lot easier. The Hon. Minister had the floor.

Mr. Hockin: I look forward to the debate on this question, Madam Chairman.

The fact is that the provinces will have to make their own determination on this question. They will make their own determination as they see fit. We have made our determination.

Mr. de Jong: That is exactly the point that disturbs me. I have no problem with Bill S-17. In reviewing the testimony made before the Senate committee we see that it is a move by Montreal Trust that is based on sound business reasons. The fact remains that $4 billion worth of assets presently under federal jurisdiction will be moved to provincial jurisdiction. Out of this we will get a trust company with some $8 billion in assets.

What disturbs me is that policy is being made on the run. The Government has promised some action. Certainly it has been obvious from the types of failures of various trust companies we have seen in the 1980s that co-ordinated action was necessary. Basic agreements with the provinces were needed, in order that there was some sense of security in this country by depositors about where the financial institutions were going. I am afraid that there is still not a coherent set of policies nor a coherent set of federal-provincial agreements in order that depositors will know what is happening with our financial institutions.

The Minister stated that he is opposed to financial institutions such as trust companies selling insurance, and so are we. What the provinces are going to do nobody knows. We have moved $4 billion in assets with Bill S-17 from under federal jurisdiction to provincial jurisdiction that at some stage might allow—

An Hon. Member: Will allow.

Mr. de Jong: The Chairman of the Finance Committee is more certain and he states "will allow" the selling of insurance in branch offices.

Mr. Hockin: It might.

Mr. de Jong: And that might change. There is confusion. What we are doing today is making policy on the run. As John Lennon said, "Life is what happens to you while you are busy making other plans". The Government is busy making other plans, but life is going on, another $4 billion of assets are being moved over to a provincial jurisdiction, and we have no idea where that will lead to.

We have co-operated by allowing Bill S-17 to pass today in all stages in an easy manner. I wish to tell the Government that this is the last time. We will not allow other pieces of legislation like this one to go through as smoothly, without having the promised legislation from the Government and without having a coherent policy in this country. As we move to financial deregulation, having 10 or 11 different policies

with the federal Government not knowing quite where to go is not responsible government.

Mr. Hockin: I am not too sure whether there is a question in all of that, but I am very anxious to reply. First, I do not think a federal Government has ever presented a more coherent or more comprehensive new set of principles for financial institutional reform than has this Government. The Blue Paper, the draft trust and loans legislation, is a blueprint the Hon. Member and the provinces can read if they want to know where the principals are going, and the provinces can also read. We would also like to do some fine tuning to maximize harmonization with the provinces.

I am very proud of the principles that we have laid down: to remove the barriers as much as possible among financial institutions, to allow capital to move, to allow ownership across the pillars, and to allow a great deal of one stop shopping. I am very proud of the new supervisory organization and procedures that have been put in place since Bill C-56 and Bill C-42. The reconstitution of the CDIC is all in place now and is off and running. Quite frankly the financial institutions in this country know where they stand. They never knew where they stood before. We want to maximize harmonization with the provinces. That is why we took a couple of extra months to do it, and I am very proud that we have.

Mr. Taylor: I could not follow the thinking of the Hon. Member of the New Democratic Party, because the Hon. Minister had made it abundantly clear that insurance would not be sold by banks and trust companies, and properly so. Let the banks carry out their financial matters, and let the insurance companies carry out theirs. The Minister has been absolutely definite on that throughout the years. There is nothing wishy-washy about it. I commend the Minister on it, and I hope that he sticks to that policy, because it is a sound policy.

Since this comes under the Trust Companies Act, will there be any adverse effect at all on people in other provinces who have deposited money in the Montreal Trust Company?

Mr. Hockin: I am very happy to respond to my hon. friend, and it is a responsible question. We have no reason to believe that in any way there would be any negative effect on depositors. As a matter of fact, they might find that life is clarified. Now there is an amalgamated institution that they are dealing with, and some of the overhead costs that were involved in running two institutions will be gone. Therefore they will probably have a slightly stronger institution that they are part of because they do not have to operate in two different jurisdictions. Depositors should feel confident, not the opposite.

Mr. de Jong: The government Member took issue on the point I was attempting to make, that provincial Governments can have their own regulations dealing with trusts which might allow the sale of insurance. What we have done here is move $4 billion worth of assets under federal control to provincial control. What the Province of Québec will do in terms of its regulations we do not know. I am not certain what influence this Government will have on it.

• (1820)

I want to ask the Minister about another point. I think it is fair to say that Québec has a pretty stringent and competent regulatory agency. We have not heard of too many financial institutions going under in Québec because of negligence in their regulatory agencies. Certainly we have seen this in other provinces.

Would the Government have facilitated this Bill had the request been, for example, to have it incorporated in Alberta or in Saskatchewan? In other words, what is your opinion of the Alberta regulatory agency?

Mr. Hockin: Madam Chairman, I think it is a first rule of Parliament that one does not ask hypothetical questions, let alone answer them. In fact, that question is not really appropriate. We have a situation in front of us with a good jurisdiction, which can do more than an adequate job with depositors' funds, and that is our concern.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Garneau: Madam Speaker, I would like to come back to the question that was raised by the Member for Bow River concerning depositors. I agree with the Minister when he says that this should in no way affect the quality of the financial institution, all the more so since a financial institution that is under provincial jurisdiction still has the obligation of reporting to each of the provinces from which it obtains a licence to operate. Because a company that is registered or incorporated under the laws of Ontario, Quebec, or Alberta, and wants to do business in another province, must obtain a licence to operate in that field of provincial jurisdiction and present quite lengthy reports to each of those provincial jurisdictions. This does not in any way, I think, affect the quality of deposits, it may even improve it, because transfers are now allowed, and the consolidated assets will be greater and will protect all depositors.

I would like to raise another point. I do not think the Minister answered me. Of coure I understand the need for a little electoral bombast, the urge to say that one will protect banks and insurance salesmen. I understand that. I can appreciate the Minister's objections and comments, and I agree that the distribution of insurance by specialized agents is a valid service for consumers, and that to a certain extent, if all of these agents were private businesses, it might affect that service. I have no quarrel with the Minister's objective, but by not acting and by not solving the problem, as my colleague for Regina East just said, we will see businesses moving to the jurisdiction of Ontario or Québec or other Provinces where those activities are permitted. Then the Minister will swell his chest and say: we have prevented the sale of insurance in our federal institutions, in banks, but finally this will be done

everywhere else under other jurisdictions and the situation the Minister hoped for will not even last as long as the election.

But I would like to go back to the financing of fleets of automobiles, to car leasing. Does the Minister intend to allow federally chartered financial institutions to take part in such activities, because it is important to them to know what the Minister thinks and what he intends to do. If we want to avoid having to study other Bills on these issues eventually, Bill S-18, S-20, it would be desirable that the Minister indicate the Government's intention on this issue of automobile leasing. He answered earlier on insurance, but I do not think that he answered the question on automobile leasing.

[*English*]

Mr. Hockin: I thought clarity came through brevity, Madam Chairman. I said that in no way would I support the leasing of cars through banks. I do not know how I can be more clear on that subject. We have in Canada close to 5,000 independent car dealers and hundreds of employees in each institution. They make very important contributions to their communities, and I do not want to see them disappear from the landscape. I want to see them stronger, not weaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lanthier: Madam Speaker, as a Quebecer and a Montrealer, I wish to thank our Government as well as the Opposition parties for their exemplary cooperation in presenting this Bill.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: I thank the Hon. Member for his remarks.

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It being six o'clock, according to the agreement reached earlier today, this House stands adjourned until two o'clock tomorrow afternoon, pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 6.27 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, July 13, 1988

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

WILDLIFE

ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY FUND

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, in June of last year the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) pledged $1 million to the Endangered Species Recovery Fund, a joint project with the World Wildlife Fund to protect endangered species in Canada.

In May of this year the Minister told the Standing Committee on Environment and Forestry that he thought the money could be found in this year's Estimates.

In June of this year departmental officials told our committee that in fact the funds were not in this year's Estimates, but that Treasury Board was considering the request. Today, 13 months after the Minister announced the Endangered Species Recovery Fund, the money is still not available.

Monte Hummel, Canadian President of the World Wildlife Fund, says: "The stalling couldn't have come at a worse time. This year 26 more species were added by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada". The Minister of the Environment should do his duty and deliver now the funds he promised a year ago. This an an urgent matter.

* * *

• (1405)

PUBLIC SERVICE

POLITICAL RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES

Mr. Bill Tupper (Nepean—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-273, an Act respecting the political rights of public employees, was reported to the House on June 21, 1988, by the legislative committee which dealt with it. Bill C-273 is good legislation. It proposes a twofold classification whereby the political rights of most public employees will be greatly enhanced while the political rights of those who have policy responsibilities will remain restricted.

Bill C-273 has an appeal process for both the employer and employee, and maintains the principle of the impartiality of the Public Service. The process by which politically restricted employees will be distinguished from politically unrestricted employees is simple. Moreover, there is an all-Party agreement to encourage passage of the Bill at third reading.

Bill C-273 will harmonize the long-standing requests of public service staff associations with the requirements of our Charter of Rights. I would like to encourage this House to make the passage of Bill C-273 a priority. I would further ask that if any Members of this House have concerns about the Bill, they raise them with myself or the sponsor of the Bill, the Hon. Member for Ottawa West (Mr. Daubney), or their House Leader.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF NUCLEAR PROPELLED SUBMARINES

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, the appearance yesterday of the Committee for a Sovereign and Effective Naval Defence, as it calls itself, to promote the purchase by the Conservative Government of nuclear powered submarines is a recognition of decline in public support the purchase. This alliance of business leaders and defence experts wants to marshal support for a program that is strategically dubious, fiscally irresponsible, environmentally unsound, and politically misguided.

Patrolling under the ice of the Arctic Archipelago is not a defence priority. Canada's Ambassador to the United States recently assured Americans that these submarines will not assert Canada's sovereignty. It is surely a waste of taxpayers' money to put Canadian submarines into the U.S. Navy's forward maritime strategy. Canada can hardly maintain its peace loving reputation with nuclear powered submarines. The decommissioning of nuclear powered submarines also adds to our nuclear waste disposal problems.

The oddest aspect of this new committee is the presence of former Liberal Defence Minister, Jean-Jacques Blais. Surely, Mr. Blais, we can encourage shipbuilding in Canada without building nuclear powered submarines. It is time for the Conservative Government to forget about the purchase of

nuclear powered submarines. Our big boys don't need these big toys.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

VULCAN, ALTA.—INVESTIGATION OF SAY STINK BUGS

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, the farmers in the county of Vulcan in Alberta have been subjected to drought, frost, hail, grasshoppers, and so on. Now they face another attack. This time it is from the Say Stink Bug, a green colored sap feeding insect that feeds upon the developing kernels in the wheat head. The crops in 60 sections of good farm land have already been completely destroyed and it is estimated that there are billions of young bugs rapidly approaching adult stage when they will swarm and fly to other crops.

The farmers affected by this infestation have spent $100,000 in spraying their fields and they need help. No time can be lost or hundreds of other farms will be affected. I urge the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. McKnight) to co-operate with the Government of Alberta to stop this infestation and to provide compensation to the farmers who have so far been fighting the battle alone.

The Say Stink Bug must be stopped.

* * *

• (1410)

[*Translation*]

THE ELDERLY

GOVERNMENT'S PERFORMANCE

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montréal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, we are a few weeks or perhaps a few days away from an election call and I hope it comes as quickly as possible so that we can get rid of this Conservative Government.

But as these 4 years draw to a close, it is important that we look at this Government's record on an issue of particular concern to me, the lot of senior citizens. We note that elderly people have been neglected and ignored by this Government and its Conservative Members. We remember that the Government turned its back on senior citizens of 60 to 64 years of age and chose to discriminate against them as far as spousal allowances were concerned. We remember the de-indexation of old age security pensions. We know that the government promised and continues to promise an early retirement program. That program does not exist.

Mr. Speaker, senior citizens and Mrs. Solange Denis remember that this Prime Minister deceived them during the previous electoral campaign. Not one single senior citizen in Canada will want to vote Conservative in the next election.

* * *

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

THE FAMILY OF THE YEAR

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, at the 89th provincial Convention of the Knights of Columbus of Quebec, an eminent and respected Quebecer, Mr. Marcel Gignac, introduced the family of the year in Quebec, the Masseau family of Fort-Coulonge, to the thousands of persons who had gathered for the occasion.

The family's story is simple: Léonette and Sylvio Masseau are two Catholics who were joined in holy matrimony on August 4th, 1962 and had two children, Jacques and Angèle. All four were involved in numerous activities in Fort-Coulonge.

The couple had finished raising their two children and were at last free to travel as much as they liked when a dreadful catastrophe struck a young family from the same small area. A young couple returning from a business trip was involved in a terrible car crash. Neither spouse survived the tragedy. Their sudden and unexpected death orphaned five little girls from 8 months to 11 years of age.

When Léonette and Sylvio Masseau heard the sad news, they agreed that they both wanted to prevent the five aggrieved little sisters from being separated: Chantelle, Sharon, Léanne, Christine and Kimberly. They wanted to give them a home, love, and the headstart needed to make something of themselves.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all the Knights of Columbus of Quebec and their families, I want to congratulate the Masseau family of Fort-Coulonge for this distinction.

* * *

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

MASTER AGREEMENT BARGAINING PROCESS

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a letter sent to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) dated July 6, signed by Iris Craig, the President of the Professional Institute of the Public Service. In the letter she points out that bargaining for a new master agreement has been under way with the Treasury Board for 11 months without a single government salary offer. She also points out that meaningful discussions on job

classification, career development, and employment prospects are absent in discussions with Treasury Board officials. She also stated that the present Treasury Board Minister after many calls and written requests by the union has said she is either "too busy" or "too tired" to meet with the union.

The President of PIPS has been forced to ask the Prime Minister publicly to intervene because of what she calls complete frustration.

When the responsible Cabinet Minister is "too busy" or "too tired" to meet with the groups she has responsibility for in bargaining, I believe she is also too tired to hold her job in Cabinet.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

OTTAWA—BUS TRANSPORT DURING RUSH HOURS

Mr. W. R. Bud Jardine (Northumberland—Miramichi): Mr. Speaker, the Ontario provincial Environment Minister advised that he would consider introducing emergency powers to deal with future pollution crises, including restricting the use of vehicles, because of the extremely high ozone pollution level last week in Toronto.

I raise this as a national concern because as Canadians from coast to coast visit their national showcase—our capital—the City of Ottawa should consider the example of the capital city of Turkey, Ankara, which, in an effort to reduce vehicle pollution, provides free bus transportation during the morning and evening rush hours. Ottawa appears to have reversed this approach by doubling its fares during the same period.

I believe that the capital city could show real leadership and concern for the health of Canadians by following the Turkish example.

* * *

• (1415)

PARLIAMENT

TRIBUTE TO RETIRED LIBRARY EMPLOYEE

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of all Members of Parliament on all sides of the House to pay tribute to Peggy Moxon, a 20-year veteran employee of the House of Commons, who retired several weeks ago. She was an employee in the Confederation Branch of the Library of Parliament.

As Members on all sides can attribute, she was unfailingly courteous, helpful, gave a great deal of advice, and did a great deal of research on behalf of all Members and served this House, and therefore through the House the people of Canada, well. She has left the employment of the Parliament of Canada but I know that all Members would want to join me and indeed, Sir, join you, in congratulating her upon her retirement, wishing her the very best in the years ahead, and giving her our sincere thanks for a job well done.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF NUCLEAR POWERED SUBMARINES

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, "each nuclear powered submarine can do the work of three destroyers or three conventionally propelled submarines . . . They can be completed on time and within the Government's $8 billion budget."

This ringing endorsement of the Conservative Government's naval procurement policy comes from none other than the Hon. J. J. Blais, former Liberal Minister of National Defence.

It is refreshing to see that at least one Liberal is capable of seeing the obvious, and we wish him every success in his battle to see that common sense prevails over the mindless opposition of his former colleagues in the Liberal Party.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

NISHNAWBE-ASKI NATION HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. John Parry (Kenora—Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, the Nishnawbe-Aski Nation of northern Ontario has expressed concern over the way in which its submissions to the Medical Services Branch of the Department of National Health and Welfare for health programs are being treated. Its submission of this year of $875,000 has been approved only in the amount of $240,000. No new programs have been authorized, and all existing programs have been flat-lined.

However, when it comes to Medical Services Branch approving contracts from other health care providers it seems that a different regime prevails.

The Nishnawbe-Aski people state that they are incensed that there have been no consultations with the people who actually consume the health care services provided, that there has been no serious attempt to address the concerns and needs raised by this First Nation organization, and finally that large increases are going to other contractor organizations while submissions from the First Nations themselves are treated in this very stringent fashion.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—WATER RESOURCES LEGISLATION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Deputy Prime Minister, and welcome him back to the House from his trip down under.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Axworthy: I take it that we will not see him appearing in any beer ads in the near future as a result of his experience!

Yesterday the Acting Deputy Prime Minister, after two or three weeks of stonewalling by her colleagues concerning the serious problem of water exports to the United States, finally admitted that there is a serious and grave problem facing this country, and suggested that the Government may introduce legislation, but was totally vague on the specifics as to when, where, or how.

The problem with the answer of the Acting Prime Minister is that it missed the point. We are concerned about the major loophole created as a result of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement which no legislation can properly fill.

In making a commitment now to bring in legislation, will the Government be bringing in that legislation before final determination or judgment is made on the Canada-U.S. trade agreement in order that we can determine its effectiveness or its application to that agreement, and whether in fact it is able to close that loophole?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Hon. Member's kind remarks on my return from Australia and New Zealand. Quite a topic of discussion while I was down there was whatever happened to the Liberal Party—

Ms. Copps: Issue the writ and you will find out.

Mr. Mazankowski: —that they find it so difficult in accepting a position on free trade. Whatever happened to that great Liberal Party that once supported free trade? I said that perhaps they would have to come up here and see for themselves and maybe they could talk some sense into them.

• (1420)

The Minister of Communications in her role as Acting Prime Minister yesterday admitted nothing of the sort. There is no loophole. The policy is clearly stated that the free trade agreement provides for no large-scale export of water or no diversion of water.

The policy of the Government with respect to water is very clearly stated as outlined in the November declaration. As a matter of fact, if the Hon. Member took the time to read the document he would find at page 24 that legislation was in the process of being drafted to implement such policy, which is consistent with the way in which we have followed up on things such as transportation, tax reform, copyright, film and video, and all important issues that face Canadians.

REQUEST THAT AGREEMENT BE AMENDED

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I hope the Deputy Prime Minister responding to those thoughtful inquiries by Australians about the future of the Liberal Party told them that we will become the next Government of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Axworthy: I must have said something that interested members of the Government, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy Prime Minister has said that we should read the agreement. I want to quote to him the comments made by the Deputy Minister of the Environment who last night agreed that natural water is included within the tariff classification as part of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. That was a senior official of the Department of the Environment. She went on to say that her own departmental officials had been advising trade officials on the possibility of having an exclusion written into the agreement.

Mr. McDermid: She did not say that.

Mr. Axworthy: When you have that kind of examination in the process by officials, a clear admission that it is part of the agreement, doesn't the Government realize that any unilateral action by the Government itself is not enough, it is too late—you have already signed an agreement—and the only way to get out of it is to amend the agreement to provide an exclusion to protect Canadian waters against the kind of vulnerability that the Minister's own negotiators and colleagues put us into?

Why will the Government not come down to the real solution to the problem, that is, to exclude water from the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I hate to disappoint the Hon. Member but his suggestion that the Liberals may form the next Government was certainly not a view shared optimistically by the people down under. They see it a little differently.

In so far as the Member's legitimate question is concerned, I can only rely on the evidence of Mr. Ritchie when he appeared before the committee which is currently studying the Bill. He said:

> that negotiators from both countries agreed that flowing water was not covered by the agreement, so there was no need to write in an exemption.

That has been very clear and has been clearly stated by all parties.

He also indicated:

—there is no precedent for flowing river or lake water to be considered as a commodity covered by any international trade agreements.

He went on further to say that to suggest that flowing water is covered, through diversions or even large-scale pipelines, "took a Canadian exercise in creativity".

It is perfectly consistent with what has been said in the House by the Minister for International Trade and the Minister of Communications. The policy clearly stands, and the suggestion that the free trade agreement provides for the large-scale export or diversion of water is simply not true.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, just to complete the report on the Minister's trip to Australia, I would suggest to him that it is not important what the people down under think, it is what the Canadian people think, and all opinion polls show that they are prepared to have an election and elect Liberals. That is what they show.

Miss MacDonald: They showed that in Lac-Saint-Jean too.

Mr. Axworthy: The Deputy Prime Minister referred to Mr. Ritchie. Mr. Ritchie in a statement before the committee clearly acknowledged that the right of amending the Act is still there, contrary to the kind of assertions made by the Minister for International Trade. Mr. Ritchie said that we still have the right to amend the Bill.

What we are seeking is clearly a correction to a mistake made by the Minister's colleagues when they negotiated this agreement, signing an agreement that opens up Canadian water to access by the United States both by Clause 409 and by the tariff classification which clearly includes it and makes it part of tradeable goods and services.

• (1425)

I want to ask the Minister the question I think all Canadians are asking. Why is the Government stonewalling? Why has it refused to take the simple, proper, easy way out, and simply say that it wants to amend the legislation to make sure that Canadian water will not be sold at the expense of Canada?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, of course we have had evidence from the Canadian people as to what they think about us. Just look at the result of the Lac-Saint-Jean by-election to get a pretty good reading of it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: There is no mistake, there is no loophole. The statements that have been made by the Minister for International Trade and by the Minister of Communications are clear and categorical. The only legislative body in Canada that is proposing or is interested in the export of water is the Government of Ontario which brought in legislation on June 29 that would set up an approval process and a pricing mechanism for water transfers out of the province.

What is the Liberal policy? Do the Liberals have one policy in the Province of Ontario and another policy here? Do they have a different policy every day? Why doesn't someone stand up and clarify it? Or is it the policy that was enunciated by the now Leader of the Liberal Party in his book back in 1968?

* * *

[*Translation*]

DAY CARE

INCREASE OF SPACES IN DAY CARE CENTRES—MINISTER'S POSITION

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put my question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

The Minister's announcement this morning about day care is an insult to Canadian families that have problems with child care in Canada. It is a mirage and a smokescreen that the Government is putting forward to Canadian families.

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Mrs. Pépin: In February, the Minister said that he would increase the number of day care spaces by only 15 per cent over the next seven years, when we know that there is now a shortage of 1.4 million spaces in Canada. That is a fact.

This morning, the Minister led parents to believe that they would have more day care spaces, but we know that this morning's announcement will not result in a single space more than what he said in February.

So how can the Minister justify such a falsehood and have parents believe that there will be more child care spaces, when not a single additional space will be created?

[*English*]

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased, on behalf of the Government, to be able to announce today an additional $1 billion for spaces.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Epp (Provencher): I was also pleased that, as part of that program, there was an inclusion for spaces for day care on reserves for Canada's native people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Epp (Provencher): I think it was also important that in our consultation with the provinces we always said we wanted quality day care spaces, and in our discussions we also looked

at additional subsidies and increases that day care workers needed.

I take it from the Hon. Member's comments that the increase that is proposed in some provinces for child care workers, and Statistics Canada has recently said the wage averages $8,900 per year per worker, is something she does not support. It is those types of increases that will obviously be benefiting in the delivery of the 200,000 target, plus the increase in quality and salaries which were also needed, and which, under the proposal she puts forward, would not be achieved.

CHILD CARE STANDARDS

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, will the Government of Canada ensure that all provinces meet reasonable objectives and standards so that comparable and equitable child care will be available to all families in Canada?

• (1430)

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in the preamble to her first question the Hon. Member said there was a need for 1.4 million daycare spaces. That is not correct. She keeps repeating those figures but she knows that the committee did not verify that.

I am saying to the Hon. Member and all Canadians that the federal Government made a commitment back in 1984 to give leadership on child care. It is a program of $6.4 billion over seven years, a boost of 200,000 spaces, and an opportunity to increase the quality of child care and the wages of those who work in the field, as well as helping native people. I am pleased we have shown that leadership. It is regrettable that the Opposition does not recognize it.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—WATER RESOURCES LEGISLATION

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister who, I see, has returned in his customary good humour from Australia.

Yesterday the Acting Prime Minister said in the strongest possible terms that there was a need for legislation to see to it that large quantities of fresh water were not diverted to the United States. Given that, will the Deputy Prime Minister confirm it is the intention of his Government to bring forward such legislation on an urgent basis as quickly as possible?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in response to an earlier question, there is a federal water policy which was developed by this Government and announced in November. It naturally follows that the legislation and regulations required to implement that policy will be followed up. I am advised that the legislative process is in a well advanced stage. As is customary and consistent with what we have done on numerous issues in the past, be it transportation, child care, broadcasting, film and video, or tax reform, we have announced a policy and followed it up with legislation. Such is the same in this particular case.

TERMS OF TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, Section 8 of the trade Bill indicates that Bill will override any legislation, any Act of the Parliament of Canada.

Miss MacDonald: You know better.

Mr. Langdon: How does the Deputy Prime Minister intend to get around that fact and actually see to it that there is full and secure protection of the fresh water of Canadians for the future?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the Hon. Member was not in the House yesterday for Question Period because the Hon. Member for Davenport asked an identical question, and I am going to give an identical answer.

First, the preamble to the Hon. Member's question was wrong. Section 8 of the free trade agreement does not cover all legislation in Canada. It covers legislation pertaining to the free trade agreement. Because large-scale water exports are outside the free trade agreement, Section 8 does not pertain. So the Hon. Member is absolutely wrong.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, can the Deputy Prime Minister tell me why, if this trade deal has no connection with water, the trade negotiator's office formally initiated discussions with the Department of the Environment on precisely that subject, export of water to the U.S. and how to get an exemption? That was admitted last night in testimony in committee.

Why is the Government not prepared to face this country directly and admit there is a connection between the trade deal and water exports, and that there must be protection in the trade deal to prevent those exports from going forward?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, as is his habit, the Hon. Member is being very selective in talking about the testimony given in committee. Unlike the Hon. Member, I have attended every minute of the sittings of the committee and heard exactly what has gone on there.

The Hon. Member knows full well that what he has related to the House is not factual. In fact, formal discussions did not go on between the trade negotiation office and the Ministry of the Environment There was discussion in the lower ranks of

the Ministry but it never reached the negotiating table. Both Clayton Yeutter, and Mr. Ritchie on our side, said it is outside the agreement. When both negotiators say that, why can the Hon. Member not accept it?

* * *

ENERGY

HIBERNIA OILFIELD DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. It concerns the reports both in national newspapers and on national television regarding the proposed start-up of the Hibernia project. It has been reported there will be $2 billion in federal government financial support, and a shameful agreement by the—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: —Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to forgo all royalties. Members of the Conservative Party may find it funny that Newfoundlanders would be required to give up royalties on Hibernia oil as a precondition to this project, but Newfoundlanders do not find it funny.

Mr. McDermid: Have you seen the agreement?

Mr. Tobin: They find it very similar to what happened on Churchill Falls and they do not want it repeated.

Miss MacDonald: That was a Liberal Government.

Mr. Tobin: Can the Deputy Prime Minister give Members of this House and, through them, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador the assurance today that the Province of Newfoundland will not be required to forgo royalties on the production of Hibernia oil as a precondition to a start-up of that project?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I find it rather strange that the Hon. Member would be condemning an agreement which he has not seen and which has not yet been ratified. I can tell him that the discussions have been going on between the federal Government and the Government of Newfoundland as well as members of the sponsoring consortium who are interested in advancing the Hibernia project. It is a major project, one that is important to Newfoundland and Canada. I hope the tone of his question would not signify his opposition to the development of this important resource for the people of Canada, and in particular the people of Newfoundland.

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE ON PAYMENT OF ROYALTIES

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Lest there be any doubt about it let me tell the Deputy Prime Minister, and I am sure I speak for many Newfoundlanders when I say this, that if developing the project arises out of desperate measures employed by political Parties in desperate trouble in Newfoundland, that is forgoing royalties to the province in order to get this project going, then we do not want it.

This is an important project and can be beneficial. I ask the Deputy Prime Minister again can he give this House and, through this House, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, an assurance that that province, the poorest in the country, will not be required to forgo royalties on Hibernia oil in any way, shape or form, as a precondition to the start-up of this project?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland are both interested in developing this very important resource, as I indicated earlier, for the security of energy supply and for the tremendous spin-off benefits that will accrue. The negotiations have been taking place in very close consultation with the Government of Newfoundland, and I say to the Hon. Member that any agreement that will be reached will be reached on the basis of complete concurrence with the Government of Newfoundland.

Mr. Tobin: Will they forgo royalties?

• (1440)

Mr. Mazankowski: Will they forgo royalties? Mr. Speaker, it was this Government which brought forth the Atlantic Accord which recognized that resources belong to the province. It will be fully consistent with that, something the former Liberal Government denied the province. That is an important element.

* * *

CHILD CARE

GOVERNMENT PROGRAM—REQUEST FOR REDRAFTING

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, if he is in the House. I see him rapidly running to his seat. I must say I do not blame him for hiding behind the curtains.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Miss MacDonald: That is totally uncalled for.

Mr. Boudria: Were you having a cigarette behind the curtains?

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member will put her question.

Ms. Mitchell: The Minister's announcement today confirms our predictions and the predictions of many others that this policy to spend $2.3 billion on tax measures rather than using it for quality child care services was ill-conceived, ignored the real need for working parents in this country, and is a misuse of child care dollars.

Will the Minister now listen to child care experts? Will he go back to the drawing board and redraft an adequate plan which guarantees affordable access to child care for the many thousands, if not millions, of children across the country whose parents are working? They desperately need this.

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated to the House already, it is an adequate plan. The Member's points must be analysed. She and her Party believe that stay-at-home parents, who make that choice, should get no benefit from a child care package. The Government believes that they should get some benefits from a child care package.

Additionally, the NDP is against parents who have decided not to access the formal child care system but have made the personal choice to access a system which they feel is valid for them. In order that they are able to have the same deductions for child care expenses, the $2.3 billion package has been put in place.

Obviously NDP Members are against it. They want everything driven by government and do not want parents to have a choice.

Ms. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Minister has asked any mothers who are homemakers whether $200 a year is giving them a choice. I hardly think so.

REQUEST THAT MINISTER MEET PROVINCIAL COUNTERPARTS

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, the Minister has pretty well admitted that the additional $1 billion for child care only corrects the Government's miscalculations. This is a badly conceived plan altogether. It provides for only a very small percentage of the badly needed spaces.

Since the Minister has not yet tabled legislation will he agree to meet with provincial and territorial Ministers, take a new look at this plan, and draft a plan which meets the real child care needs of kids and working parents across the country?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I have consulted with the provinces as recently as this morning. This is a good plan. In terms of the extra $1 billion she should remember that when the provincial and federal Governments looked at the cost per space they saw a need to raise both the subsidies per space for families as well as the abominably low salaries of people working in day care, the average being, as I said, about $8,900.

Those were the kinds of calculations we made with regard to the $1 billion. I hope the Member will support at least that if nothing else.

* * *

CANADA POST CORPORATION

SYDNEY, N.S., MAIN POST OFFICE

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. I have here an internal document from Canada Post which—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Epp (Provencher): Did they deliver it?

Mr. Gagliano: Don't laugh, it's a serious matter.

Mr. Gauthier: The Tories are all laughing.

Mr. MacLellan: Mr. Speaker, I want it noted that the Conservatives find what I am going to say very funny.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: No, we'll be the judge of that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member.

Mr. MacLellan: Mr. Speaker, the document states that Canada Post is going to be closing the main post office in Sydney, Nova Scotia.

Some Hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Boudria: Hardly a laughing matter.

Mr. MacLellan: A post office which serves 22,000 people is going to be replaced by a privatized counter-type service. It is an outrage that the Government would act so arbitrarily and without any consultation with the community.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister use his authority to tell Canada Post to abandon all plans to close the Sydney post office?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Lise Bourgault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in 1981, it was the Liberal Government at the time that, with the consent of all three parties in this House, wanted to create a Crown corporation to avoid political interference.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the post office to which the Hon. Member is referring has not been closed. It has been transferred to the private sector, and service has been increased. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that when residents are asked their

opinion in the months to come, they will express their complete satisfaction with the new service being offered by Canada Post.

[*English*]

CONSTRUCTION OF REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION CENTRE

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, the Government said last month that it would not be closing these post offices.

Ms. Copps: Right on!

Some Hon. Members: Right off!

Mr. Boudria: We'll see how funny it is when you're turfed out of office for closing post offices.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member is not getting very much help from his colleagues.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I am referring to colleagues on both sides of the House. Would the Hon. Member please put his question.

Mr. MacLellan: Once again, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the Conservatives find this so funny.

Public Works has confirmed that this post office has to be moved by February of 1989 and that a new distribution centre will be in place by then.

My question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. If it is not that all the post offices in Cape Breton are going to be privatized, why would a distribution centre for the region be built?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Lise Bourgault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, once again, I wonder why Opposition Members insist on having the Government intervene in housekeeping decisions by Canada Post.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure residents of The Sydneys and the Hon. Member's riding that contrary to what he just said, we are not closing the post office. That is just not true.

Canada Post has transferred the service to the private sector which will offer residents a better service and longer hours, and I repeat that residents will find everything to their complete satisfaction.

I hope that the Hon. Member, in the months to come, will come back to the House to revise his statement.

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—NATIONAL ENERGY PROGRAM

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I want to return to the trade deal. Most people in my new riding of Port Moody—Coquitlam—

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

• (1450)

Mr. Speaker: The wish is further to the thought. Would the Hon. Member please put his question.

Mr. Waddell: We Scots are optimistic, Mr. Speaker.

Most people in this suburban area near Vancouver drive their cars to work. Therefore, they need secure supplies of oil at reasonable prices. I want to direct a question on their behalf to the Deputy Prime Minister. Does this trade deal with the United States mean that never again can the federal Government enact a National Energy Program—

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Waddell: —that would mean lower than market prices for gasoline at the time of an energy crisis? In other words, could the federal Government enact legislation after this deal that would hold Canadian gasoline prices lower than American prices?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Hon. Member was not at committee last night because the Deputy Minister of Energy gave a very fine explanation of the energy situation within the free trade agreement.

By the way, your riding does not come into being until tomorrow, so you are a day early.

An Hon. Member: Do not give it to him yet.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary could finish his answer.

Mr. McDermid: As the Deputy Minister explained last night, the short answer was yes, it was difficult, but yes it could be done.

PRICE OF GASOLINE

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, this in direct contradiction to what the previous Minister for International Trade said, that there could be no more national energy programs.

Mr. McDermid: That was not the question.

Miss MacDonald: That was not the question.

Mr. Waddell: I will rephrase my question. Can there ever again be a National Energy Program which, while criticized, saved billions of dollars for Canadian motorists? Forget the oil company line. At the time of an energy crisis will the federal Government be able to enact a national energy program which would accomplish the same as the previous energy program, which was to have a different made-in-Canada price for Canadian consumers?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I would hope not. I hope we never have to put up with a National Energy Program like that.

The Hon. Member stands up and talks about saving money for the drivers of this country. He does not talk about the unemployment insurance costs for all those people in the West who were put out of work by the National Energy Program, or the people who lost homes and businesses. He does not talk about that loss.

WATER RESOURCES LEGISLATION

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. As recently as 1985 the Prime Minister of Canada stated in an interview with *Fortune* magazine, when asked about water exports from Canada: "Why not, if it is economically desirable?" Yesterday the Minister of Communications indicated outside the House that a piece of legislation on the federal water policy would be forthcoming. Today the Deputy Prime Minister indicated that the legislation is in a well advanced stage. Given these facts, will the Deputy Prime Minister indicate when this legislation will be introduced in the House?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there is certainly nothing new in what has been said today and what was said yesterday. It was contained in the water policy statement of November, 1987, at page 24. I would ask the Hon. Member to consider reading it.

The fact is that the legislative and regulatory measures that are required to implement the federal water policy are in an advanced stage. I will certainly check with the Minister of the Environment as soon as he returns to see what particular time it may be introduced. Work is proceeding, consistent with what we have done on many other important issues, be it child care, tax reform, broadcast policy, film and video, or transportation. All of these things have been done in the same consistent manner.

Mr. Caccia: We may have to wait some time, judging from the record of attendance of the Minister of the Environment.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member is a very experienced Member and has made a great contribution to this place. He knows that that is not an appropriate observation. Will the Hon. Member please put his question.

TIMING OF LEGISLATION'S INTRODUCTION

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. Considering the importance of the matter and considering that the preparation of the legislation is in a well advanced stage as he says, and considering the deadline of January, 1989, when will this legislation be introduced in the House? It is a very reasonable question.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, we have always considered this water policy and the accompanying legislation as being very important. We have been working at it. It is amazing to me that just in the last week or so it has attracted the attention of the opposition Parties. It has always been a priority of this Government and will continue to be a priority.

I will take the Hon. Member's representation and make his views known, to see whether we can expedite the process. I give him that assurance.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

ALBERTA—SAY STINK BUG INFESTATION

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Hon. Minister of State for Grains and Oilseeds. The Say Stink Bug is threatening the crops of hundreds of farmers in Alberta and the bugs have already completely destroyed the wheat crops on some 60 sections of land. Millions of these green bugs will reach maturity within days and swarm to other areas.

Will the Minister co-operate with the Government of Alberta, take immediate steps to stop this infestation, and assist the farmers who have already spent about $100,000 trying to stop these bugs?

Hon. Charles Mayer (Minister of State (Grains and Oilseeds)): Mr. Speaker, this is a serious problem for the farmers affected. The federal Department of Agriculture is aware of the problem and has been working through the research station at Lethbridge with the Province of Alberta. It is my understanding that some spraying has already been carried out.

We are prepared to spray again if there is a reinfestation. Fortunately, this is a rather rare occurrence. I am told that the last infestation goes back to the early 1950's. The bugs thrive on weeds, which have done particularly well this year.

We are aware of the problem and have been co-operating with the province in doing some spraying. We will certainly monitor the situation, and are prepared to spray again if the situation warrants it.

* * *

HOUSING

USE OF TORONTO RAILWAY LANDS

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. It concerns the decision of the Toronto City Council to approve a major housing plan which will provide thousands of new units, particularly very badly needed affordable housing units in Toronto. The Minister will know that co-operation from the federal Government is required for the land. Will the federal Government co-operate, particularly to ensure that the railway lands needed for this new housing project will be made available at reasonable, or, better still, at no cost, to help solve the Toronto housing crisis?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I must apologize to the Hon. Member. I am not fully briefed on this particular issue. However, I will certainly look into it and get back to the Hon. Member as soon as I possibly can.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, will the Deputy Prime Minister agree with the principle that since the railway lands were either given or highly subsidized it would be very reasonable for a return to be given to the people by making them available at a very low, reasonable cost or, better still, simply give them back to the people, to help solve the Toronto housing crisis?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I will take the Hon. Member's statement as a representation, and when we consider the matter I will get back to her as soon as I can.

* * *

• (1500)

FISHERIES

CHUM SALMON CATCH—SAANICH TRIBAL FISHERIES COUNCIL PROPOSAL

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane—Superior): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and I have given him notice of it. It concerns a proposal from the Saanich Tribal Fisheries Council of southeast Vancouver Island to harvest the excess Chum salmon returning to the Goldstream River system. As the Minister knows, this particular fish is not generally regarded as being a sports fish.

Last year the Department rejected that proposal and as a result the stock overspawned and the five Indian bands of the council lost about $2 million and 45 jobs.

The Department has judged the proposal to be technically feasible and sound. Is the Minister personally aware of the proposal? Has he taken an interest in it? And has a decision been made, or is it about to be made?

Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for the courtesy he has shown by giving me notice of this question. I am certainly aware of the proposal which poses a very difficult policy question for the Department and for myself.

As the Hon. Member knows, wild stocks of salmon which are not the product of our hatchery but of natural runs, are known as a common property resource. We generally manage the quotas of the commercial fishing fleet to ensure there is no surplus, or a very small surplus of this stock. We have for a long time adhered to the policy that wild stocks of salmon are a common property resource, not to be privatized or turned to the benefit of any group, native or non-native, for commercial gain.

The native communities, of course, have their traditional food fishing rights, and this proposal would violate this long-standing policy. I have it under consideration. The concept has been before my Pacific Area Regional Council for the last several months and I will be making a decision in the next few weeks on this proposal.

REQUEST FOR EARLY DECISION

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane—Superior): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for that answer. The proposal will create jobs and provide economic development for the bands. It will prevent the wastage of fish which is now happening because of overspawning, and there is a treaty right involved.

Will the Minister carefully consider using the authority of his office and the Fisheries Act, especially Sections 4 and 7, and get behind this proposal from the Saanich Tribal Fisheries Council? And can he tell the House he will make every effort possible to render a favourable decision before the end of this month?

Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member has pointed out, there may well be a treaty right and long established policy giving native bands and communities first access to returning stocks for food fish requirements, but there is also a long-standing principle that all user groups should have equal opportunity to harvest this common property resource, so that the jobs and economic gains about which the Hon. Member speaks, to the Saanich Tribal Fisheries Council, could well be at the expense of other sectors of the commercial fishery. Good management should

dictate that we give all sectors an opportunity to harvest this surplus resource.

* * *

CANADA POST CORPORATION

POSTAL FRANCHISE OUTLETS

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister responsible for the Post Office. The Government has been saying that it is improving service and increasing the number of outlets with its franchising program at the Post Office. The confidential planning document we have indicates that what is happening in Sydney and Yorkton is quite the opposite. It indicates Canada Post is going to relocate a downsized corporate outlet in a secondary market area and establish a franchise in the business core, which is the area in which it gains the most money.

Will the Government now admit that what it is doing is gutting the Post Office, destroying the post offices which exist, in order to establish franchises, that it is in no way increasing service but is simply replacing one post office with another so it has contracts to hand out to its friends?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Lise Bourgault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member realizes that the charge he is making is entirely frivolous and that he has not checked his facts. Once again, I can assure Hon. Members that the Canada Post Corporation, contrary to what is claimed by the New Democratic Party, ensures that service and access to service is enhanced. Today, most people work, and customer demand has changed, and Canada Post has adjusted to this change. I can assure the Hon. Member that Canada Post is taking good care of customer service.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: A short supplemental—very short.

PLANNING DOCUMENTS—REQUEST FOR DISCLOSURE

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, these post offices that are being closed are post offices which have revenues seven and ten times the salary costs of maintaining them. It should be possible to improve service at these post offices without closing them down in order to open a post office in a drugstore. Will the Minister make public the planning documents of Canada Post so that Canadians can make a decision about what the Government is doing about service at the Post Office?

Mrs. Lise Bourgault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, parliamentarians made a decision in 1981 when they decided unanimously in the House to transfer the service to a Crown Corporation. Again, they are not closing the Post Office, they are expanding the service.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last question. The Hon. Member for Ottawa West (Mr. Daubney).

* * *

HEALTH

AIDS—PROTECTION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. David Daubney (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Given the fact that thousands of federal government employees working in laboratories and health care facilities and elsewhere in the Government have understandable concerns about AIDS in the workplace, would the Minister advise the House if his Department is doing anything to inform employees of the federal Government how to protect themselves from AIDS while at work?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, with respect to federal employees and AIDS in the workplace, I remind the Hon. Member and the House that quite some time ago kits were provided, for example, for our employees who work abroad, especially plasma kits, for postings in countries where health facilities might not be up to the standards we expect in Canada.

Second, I should tell the Hon. Member and all Members of the House that a video has been completed with respect to protection in the workplace. It is directed to federal employees. I believe it is going to be aired tomorrow in both official languages. I can get the information to the House. I believe it is helpful and instructive to our federal employees so they can protect themselves and yet render the services the Hon. Member mentioned.

* * *

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE TO TRAVEL—SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members will know that I heard an important argument two days ago with respect to the use of motions of instruction relating to Bills. I undertook to Hon. Members to do everything I could to return as quickly as possible with a ruling. The ruling is now complete.

The Chair has considered the procedural arguments raised on the admissibility of the motion of instruction moved by the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon). Since the

motion concerns the legislative committee on Bill C-130, which is, of course, the committee studying the Canada—U.S. Trade Agreement and whose deliberations have already begun, I wanted to proceed expeditiously in rendering this decision. I just want to say to Hon. Members and to the public that this is a technical ruling, but it is of importance and I ask all Hon. Members to bear with me.

In his point of order, the Hon. Minister of State argued that this type of motion should not be moved under the rubric "Motions"—which is one of the items we go through each day under Routine Proceedings—but should rather be taken up as an item of Private Members' Business. In reply, the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) and the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray), presented arguments for allowing it to be moved under the heading of "Motions". After listening to the points made by all Parties, I wish to proceed as follows.

As most Hon. Members know, after second reading, a Bill is normally sent to a legislative committee for detailed consideration, as it was in this case. It is this stage when the Bill has been referred to committee that motions of instructions are to be moved. A motion of instruction is nothing more than a motion passed by this House sending a message to a committee that is already in place empowering it to do something and, in some cases, if one wants to go back through the history, perhaps to instruct it. I say for the record that this motion moved by the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor was a motion to empower the committee to travel both in Canada and abroad, if the committee so decided to do.

• (1510)

It is at this stage, when the Bill has been referred to committee, that motions of instruction are to be moved. The purpose of such an instruction is to empower a committee to do something which it could not otherwise do. In this case, the committee studying the trade agreement does not have on its own, nor does any other committee, the automatic right to travel. It would have to seek that right or else the House could, on the motion of the Hon. Member, or on the motion of the Government, or on the motion of any other Hon. Member for that matter, empower the committee to decide whether it wanted to travel or not—but at least empower it to do so.

What the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor has done is he has tried to move under "Motions" during Routine Proceedings to have this House consider sending to the committee an instruction empowering it to travel if it so wishes. I think I see the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor nodding. I think I have put the situation as clearly as I can.

Practically all existing Canadian precedents dealing with motions of instruction relating to Bills took place in a period when the practices and procedures of the House were quite different from those used today. During this period Bills were referred to Committee of the Whole, that is to say a committee of the whole House. The Speaker goes out of the chair and the Deputy Speaker takes the table. The entire House sits here in this Chamber as if it were in committee. That is what Committee of the Whole means.

As I said, during this period Bills were referred to Committee of the Whole following second reading after the adoption of a motion: "That the Speaker do now leave the chair". This procedure is no longer applicable. Consequently, our rules on motions of instruction to committees studying Bills need to be reviewed in a new context.

Citation 759(1) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition reads in part:

> The time for moving an Instruction is immediately after the committal of the bill, or, subsequently, as an independent motion. The Instruction should not be given while the bill is still in the possession of the House, but rather after it has come into the possession of the committee.

While the above citation is accurate, it leaves a considerable number of questions unanswered. An examination of precedents and citations in Beauchesne's Third Edition and Bourinot's Fourth Edition reveals that under previous practice a motion of instruction could be moved after second reading under one of three different conditions. The first is immediately after second reading, without notice or debate, but prior to the Speaker leaving the chair. The second is as an amendment to the motion "That the Speaker do now leave the chair". The third is at some point following second reading as an independent motion, after notice.

In the first situation the Speaker accepted the motion without notice immediately after second reading because it was a privileged motion intrinsic to the progress of the Bill to committee stage. If this approach is taken, and logically it can only be taken in instances where a referral has been made to Committee of the Whole, the motion is not debatable or amendable according to Standing Order 56(2). This is in keeping with precedents found on March 19, 1948, at page 269 of *Journals*, and on July 30, 1956, at page 942 of *Journals*.

In the present case, the opportunity to move a motion of instruction at that particular time has not been available since Bill C-130 has been referred to a legislative committee.

[*Translation*]

The second approach, that of moving a motion of instruction as an amendment to the motion that the Speaker do now leave the Chair no longer applies because Standing Order 78 now provides for the Speaker to leave the Chair without question put.

[*English*]

The third option, that of proposing an independent motion with notice, is in keeping with the authorities cited, and at least one known precedent which occurred on March 26, 1888, found at page 136 of *Journals*.

[*Translation*]

The Hon. Minister of State (Mr. Lewis) argued that this particular motion should be moved more properly under Private Members' Business. The dilemma that the Chair faces

is that the precedents to which I have just referred date back to a period when the *Notice Paper* was much different from the one used today. In addition, new procedures have been introduced and this complicates the situation still further.

If Members wish to pursue this avenue and move a motion of instruction under Private Members' Business, this option is of course open to them.

[*English*]

The Chair would certainly have no objection to this approach. However, the Chair, and I suspect most Hon. Members, might share the practical concerns about this approach raised by the Hon. Members for Kamloops—Shuswap and Windsor West namely, that the likelihood of such a motion debated, let alone voted upon, is now quite remote, because of the new rules governing Private Members' Business.

[*Translation*]

The Chair, however, fails to see why the Hon. Member for Essex Windsor (Mr. Langdon) could not propose his motion under the rubric "Motions". The Hon. Member for Windson West (Mr. Gray), cited Standing Order 56(1)(p). This Standing Order lists as debatable items usually raised under Routine Proceedings "motions . . . [concerning] the management of [House] business [and] the arrangement of its proceedings."

[*English*]

The rubric "Motions" usually encompasses matters related to the management of the business of the House and its committees, but it is not the exclusive purview of the Government, despite the Government's unquestioned prerogative to determine the agenda of business before the House. For example, an individual Member's motion for concurrence in a committee report is properly moved under this rubric. Similarly, the Chair judges that, if a Member wishes to give notice of a motion of instruction to a committee on a Bill, it can be filed under "Motions" on the Notice Paper. Once called, the motion is debatable and amendable pursuant to Standing Order 56(1) and, if the motion has not come to a vote by the end of the day, as in the analogous case of concurrence in a report, the motion is transferred to Government Orders where debate will resume only at the pleasure of the Government.

Before our rules pertaining to the referral of Bills to Committee of the Whole were changed, any Member could move a motion of instruction to a committee on a Bill. Were the Chair to rule today that this can now only be done under Private Members' Business, then this would in fact mean that only the Government, under Government Notices of Motion, could move instructions to committees studying legislation in a timely and effective manner.

Another important point in the discussion, and one on which the Chair sought clarification from Hon. Members, was whether the proposed motion of instruction is permissive or mandatory.

Generally speaking, a permissive instruction confers on a committee the authority to do something it otherwise would have no power to do. Citation 761 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition lists some examples, among them, the permission to travel, to consolidate Bills or to divide a Bill.

According to Citation 757 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, if such a motion is adopted, it is then left to the committee to decide whether or not it will exercise this power. As Citation 409 of Beauchesne's Third Edition explains:

> An instruction which is generally made when a Bill is committed is not mandatory, and it is therefore customary to state explicity in the motion that the Committee "have power" to make the provision acquired. The intention is to give a Committee power to do a certain thing if they think proper, not to command them to do it. The committee is not bound to obey the instruction.

Precedents relating to Bills have been examined and all of these respected this permissive approach.

● (1520)

In the case before us, the Chair has closely examined the text of the motion proposed by the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor and has concluded that it rests squarely within the definition of a permissive instruction.

Finally, at the risk of venturing into highly technical matters, the Chair would like to point out to Hon. Members, although no reference was made to it when the matter was argued, the last sentence of Citation 759(1) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition states: "If the Bill has been partly considered in committee, it is not competent to propose an Instruction".

The Chair wishes to avoid possible confusion on this point and I would ask the House to bear with me as I briefly explain its intent to Hon. Members. In early House practice, as I discussed earlier, there were specific procedures for moving motions of instruction to a Committee of the Whole considering a Bill.

Citation 412 of Beauchesne's Third Edition states:

> All instructions must be moved on the first occasion when the order for the Committee [of the Whole] on a Bill has been read. If the Bill has been partly considered in Committee at a previous sitting, it is not competent to propose an instruction when the order is read for the House "again in Committee," as the rules require that the Speaker leave the Chair (without putting the question) as soon as that order has been taken up.

The same explanation occurs on page 517 of Bourinot's Fourth Edition. Simply put, the passage means only that when the House entered Committee of the Whole for a second or subsequent time, it did so automatically without a motion for the Speaker to leave the chair. A motion of instruction without notice could not be put at that time because this was not immediately after second reading. Further, an amendment to the question "That the Speaker do now leave the chair" could not be put because the Speaker automatically left the chair without the question being put. The only viable option would be for a Member to propose an independent motion of instruction with notice to be taken up under "Motions". Although this is not expressly stated in Citation 412 of

Beauchesne's Third Edition, it is in keeping with Citations 409 to 411 of the same volume.

However, the idea that a motion of instruction could be moved with notice after a committee commenced its deliberations is not addressed in Beauchesne's Fifth Edition where, instead, the early practice appears to have been transmogrified into a categorical injunction against committees being given an instruction after they began their deliberations on a Bill. If Members think that this is difficult to follow, wait until the end.

The Chair raises this issue only as a cautionary measure to clarify the concept before the House.

In summary, the Chair, after carefully examining and analysing the relevant precedents and authorities, rules that the motion proposed by the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor is in order and may be moved under the rubric "Motions" and that until the House chooses to clarify its rules relating to instructions, the Chair will continue to accept such motions, after due notice, on condition that they are directed only at committees reviewing legislation. I hope that that is clearly understood. That does not go to standing committees.

The Chair again wishes to thank all Hon. Members for their valuable contributions to this discussion, and I thank all Hon. Members for patiently hearing me through a complex procedural matter which is made more complex because there have been changes throughout the history of our rules which make it somewhat difficult to completely understand what some of the citations mean. I have tried to meet that problem. I am sorry that I could not come into the House earlier, but with the help of the Table Officers I have brought this ruling back as soon as I could.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the thoughtful commentary that preceded the ruling and it assisted us in understanding these particular points. I seek two points of clarification, Mr. Speaker. First, in relation to you commented that this would apply to motions that referred to legislation being studied by committees, and then you made the point that that usually refers to a legislative committee, but on occasion there has been a decision to send a piece of legislation to a standing committee if it requires a particular amount of expertise. Therefore, presumably under those conditions one would understand your ruling to include a standing committee if it is dealing with a piece of legislation.

Second, you indicated that there are two types of instructions, permissive instructions and mandatory instructions. Are we to assume that your ruling would refer to both permissive and mandatory motions giving permissive and mandatory instructions?

Mr. Speaker: I can assist the Hon. Member. First, as Hon. Members know, under the new procedure most Bills now go to a legislative committee. This is in fact the situation that we have in front of us. However, there are a number of standing committees that cover various aspects of government activity, sometimes a single Department, and sometimes several Departments. Those standing committees are empowered now to do many things on their own.

As the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap has pointed out, it is absolutely correct that sometimes rather than send a Bill to a legislative committee after second reading, in some instances it has been the practice to send the Bill to the standing committee. Before we changed the rules all Bills went to standing committees, unless a special committee was struck.

As is being used in this present instance, a motion cannot be used to send instructions to a standing committee unless that standing committee has received a Bill after second reading, and in that case it would be acting in the capacity of a legislative committee. I can assure the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap that if a Bill was sent to a standing committee after second reading to be dealt with in the same way as it would be dealt with before a legislative committee, then what I have ruled in order today would be applicable. I hope that that is helpful.

The second question is on the distinction between mandatory motions and permissive motions. Without going into a lot of detail, if one goes back into history, the reality is that those motions have been for a long time permissive not mandatory. Until I receive some instruction from the House or until I can be persuaded that it would be appropriate to allow the effect of this ruling to include a mandatory motion, this ruling says that these motions must be permissive. That is in keeping with many years of practice. At least at the moment I can find no tradition or practice which contradicts that.

What I have ordered is that a motion as put by the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor can be moved after notice on motions by any Member of the House, that that motion must be permissive in nature, and that it must of course go to a legislative committee that is studying the Bill in question after second reading. It could also go to a standing committee if that standing committee had received a Bill after second reading and is acting as a legislative committee.

I hope this has been helpful to the Hon. Member.

Mr. Riis: This has been extremely helpful to us all in terms of understanding what has become perhaps a new initiative as of late. I am certainly accepting your ruling, but would request that you consider Citation 756 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition which states:

> An Instruction is a motion empowering a committee to do something which it could not otherwise do . . .

On that point, I think your ruling is perfectly clear and one that we all would agree with. However, it then goes on to say,

> . . . or to direct it to do something which it might otherwise not do. It directs the order and course of the committee's proceedings . . .

And so on and so forth. While your decision obviously clarifies the point in terms of the permissive instruction in the case that is before us, it seems to me to leave a part of it still

somewhat unclear, in that Citation 736 indicates that an instruction *per se* can include the direction to do something which a committee might otherwise not do. I emphasize the term "to direct". That seems to me to move it beyond the permissive realm.

• (1530)

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, perhaps you would be good enough to hear me on this point, because this was the one I was going to raise. Your ruling is very thoughtful and helpful as it is, and it will certainly do much to advance the growing importance of the committee system before our House of Commons. However, I would very respectfully suggest to you, since the motion by the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon), which led to the point of order on which you have ruled, is clearly only a permissive motion and not a mandatory motion, that you would be willing to limit your ruling today within the four corners of the motion which has given rise to it, and leave open the opportunity for us to argue the course of action which the House can follow if a motion is presented to give a mandatory instruction to a committee. I make the suggestion with the utmost respect. Your comments on the entire question have been most helpful, but I do submit that the only issue before you is with respect to a permissive motion rather than a mandatory motion.

Mr. Speaker: I have the point of both the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap and the Hon. Member for Windsor West Certainly, at the moment, my ruling applies to the motion of the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor. Since omniscience is seldom given to any of us here on earth and certainly not to Speakers, it might be that at some other occasion I might be persuaded by the procedural knowledge of Hon. Members, who I know would want to assist me, that another view might be taken of a mandatory motion. Naturally, what I am saying here today would not preclude an Hon. Member from rising and arguing that at some other point, at some other time.

At the moment, at least, it is my view that that argument would not prevail. It does not mean for one minute that I would not hear it. I am indicating pretty clearly, I think, at least at the moment, that until I can be persuaded otherwise—despite the citation in Beauchesne's that the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap has quoted—if that is put into context and into history, at least I feel today that the appropriate inference to be drawn is that the proper practice is permissive motions only. If Hon. Members wanted to raise that matter at another time, I would most certainly hear them.

If I could be persuaded that I have misinterpreted the tangled history of this particular matter, then of course I would act accordingly. The Hon. Minister of State (Mr. Lewis).

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Chair for its ruling and clarification of the instruction motion. I want to indicate on behalf of the Government that I think the ruling makes good sense in terms of today's existing practices and Standing Orders. I am sure we can understand the opposition Members' interest in pursuing matters in this way, and I want to indicate that we will consider each case and each motion moved on its merits and act accordingly.

Mr. Axworthy: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I apologize. I had to step out of the Chamber for a few short moments to attend to a piece of business, but I was wondering if the Speaker, in providing a ruling about the permissive nature of a motion, would indicate whether that still incorporates or encompasses a certain judgment from the House that is in effect advice to the committee.

Aside from just providing authorization, it also incorporates a certain will or set of advice to the committee to act upon, as a result of that motion being presented which, I think, in terms of the role of the committee *vis-à-vis* the entire Chamber, it is a very important distinction to make. It certainly has great relevance in this case, where there was major dispute in the committee about the advisability of travelling and whether in fact if there was a motion in the House, to express the will of the House in this case, it might affect the judgment or decision of the committee within the realm or parameters of that permission.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) is very persuasive. However, I think it is important that this ruling be taken in the context in which it has been argued and given. It is not for the Chair to go beyond what is clearly the practice and the precedents. That is, it is quite clear in our practice that whatever effect a permissive motion given to a committee may have on the committee, it is for the committee to decide what it is to do with it.

As the Hon. Member will have noticed in listening to my reasons as I read them, I have made it very clear that the committee does not have to necessarily act. What went on in that committee is not for the Chair to speculate upon. I am trying as much as possible to meet the appropriate concerns of the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor and other Hon. Members who have raised this matter, to ensure that all Hon. Members, as can the Government, can move a permissive motion.

If the motion was, for example, passed on some occasion by the House and sent to the committee, what effect that might have on the committee is not for the Speaker to say. It certainly is open to the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry to perhaps approach individual members of the committee—as is of course the right of any Member—and say; "Look, in view of this, don't you think you should do something?" That is not something upon which the Chair can speculate. I know that the Hon. Member would understand that.

What moral weight may be given to a permissive motion is something for the committee itself, and other Hon. Members

who may be in conversation with committee members, to measure. It is not for the Chair to say.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong this discussion. Again, I appreciate and accept the guidance that you have given us as a result of your decision. I am encouraged by the words you used, that you would at some appropriate time entertain further debate and discussion on this matter in terms of the difference between a permissive and a mandatory instruction.

I simply ask Members to cast their minds back to not long ago when another important committee was meeting on the Constitution in 1982. As a result of that special order, the House of Commons decided that televised hearings would be appropriate for such an important committee. We then passed such an order, and a very clear requirement was passed along for the committee to carry out.

• (1540)

If the day ever came when the House of Commons through a mandatory motion providing mandatory instruction to a committee were to decide in its wisdom for a particular course of action for the committee to take, it would be in our interests to pursue that so that the House of Commons could send a very clear and definitive instruction to the appropriate committee to follow a particular course of action.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing us to carry on this discussion if the event ever arose in the future.

Mr. Speaker: I want to assure the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap that I do not think it would ever be appropriate for a Speaker to say that he or she would not hear argument on a procedural matter. After all, because we have had arguments on procedural matters over centuries, that is why we have the body of procedural law that we do have.

I have to say to the Hon. Member also that I would have to deal with it when a case arose. I am also indicating to Hon. Members that at least for today I am of the view that the practice, the tradition and the history indicates that these matters are permissive. If I can be persuaded to the contrary, of course I would change my position. But that is for another day, not today.

In the meantime, I hope this has been helpful because as the Hon. Minister of State has said—and I am appreciative to the Hon. Minister for his generous reaction because I think it is important, we all think it is important— that private Members not be placed in a position where they are more limited in their ability to take part in the dealings of this House than they might otherwise be. What has happened as a consequence of this argument I think has clarified the matter.

The second question is still there, and I understand perfectly well why some Hon. Members may want to pursue it further at another time, and if they do, then of course I will hear them.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to nine petitions numbered as follows: 332-4832, 332-4834, 332-4840 to 332-4843 inclusive, 332-4845, 332-4860 and 332-4866.

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

* * *

[*English*]

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE TO TRAVEL

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the motion that I put on the Order Paper on July 6:

> That the legislative committee on Bill C-130 be empowered to adjourn from place to place in Canada and the United States for the purpose of hearing witnesses on the proposed trade agreement with the United States.

Mr. Speaker: Just so that all Hon. Members and everybody else who is watching or listening understand where we are, this is the motion upon which there has been procedural debate and upon which I have just ruled.

This motion is now in order. I will put it to the House.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, there is a stage at which issues confronting us as parliamentarians become something more than just the issues themselves. When we face, for instance, debate on questions of water exports to the United States, with respect to new trade tribunals or with respect to the trade Bill, Bill C-130, that is one level of debate, one level of concern.

There is a second level of concern which we in this House must at all times be conscious of and responsible to, namely, the responsibility which we have as Members of the House of Commons to respect, to reflect and to practise the commitments to democratic debate and democratic consideration, especially of major issues which confront our country and which would profoundly change our country. That is why I have moved this motion.

It a motion to set, as the Speaker himself put it, some moral weight on the committee which is considering this Bill and which has rejected the possibility of going across the country to hear Canadians from coast to coast; to hear Canadians in their small towns and in their small cities speak out in favour or against provisions in the trade Bill. The Minister of State (Mr. Lewis), the Deputy House Leader, when he made a speech on Bill C-130 said that the Government spoke for big Canada. It spoke for the big Canada which is, as I see it, the Canada made up of national elites, of powerful corporations and of dominant groups which have run this country for years and years throughout our history. Now this group of dominant individuals, of dominant corporations, of dominant cities, wants to take us and weave us into the United States. That is what Bill C-130 is all about.

Despite the tremendous significance of that move, the betrayal of hundreds of years of settlement, of development, of building and of history which has gone into making this country, this Government wants, nevertheless, on behalf of big Canada to proceed.

It is possible for this Government with its massive majority, despite the fact it has no mandate from the people from the past election, to force that kind of project through the House, though we shall see how far it goes beyond that.

What is completely unacceptable because it is undemocratic, unresponsive, insensitive and because it does not listen to the people of Canada is to take this action on behalf of big Canada. It does not permit small Canada, the small towns, the small cities, the groups which have fought for social justice against those large corporations and dominant elites, to have the chance, through hearings across the country, to put their point of view forward with respect of this betrayal of hundreds of years of history.

• (1550)

In taking that decision, the committee which is looking at Bill C-130 has in fact betrayed our democratic traditions, and I regret this very deeply. I do not say this simply as a reflection of my own thinking on this. I reflect instead the hundreds of telegrams and letters which have poured into my office and into the committee indicating that right across Canada, a broad cross-section of people want a chance to speak. They want a chance to be heard and they want that chance through cross-country hearings on the part of the committee.

There have been telegrams from groups like the National Federation of Nurses, the National Council of Playwrights, the Canadian Teachers Federation, the Saskatchewan Pro-Canada Network, the Little Mountain District Public Housing Tenants Association, the Toronto Workers Health and Safety Legal Clinic, the Diocese of Victoria of Social Justice Commission in Victoria, B.C., Oxfam Canada, the Association of Canadian Publishers, the United Church of Canada, the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, the Executive Secretary of the United Church in Winnipeg, the Jesuit Centre, the Health Coalition of Cape Breton—

[*Translation*]

The Quebec coalition opposed to free trade, groups that have said it is necessary for democracy and for the future of our country that there be hearings across the country so that the people of Canada can be heard.

[*English*]

There have been groups like the Catholic Family Services Bureau in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, the Conference Program staff of the United Church in Saskatchewan, the B.C. and Yukon Women's Centre Association, Co-op Atlantic, the Northwest Territories Federation of Labour—

[*Translation*]

. . . spokespersons for *la Solidarité populaire du Québec* . . .

[*English*]

—the Archdiocese of Regina and its Social Action Committee, the Federation of Women Teachers Associations of Canada, the Toronto Theatre Alliance—

[*Translation*]

Groups like CIAFT from Montreal have said that throughout this country, where French and English are spoken, are groups that want to make presentations and that it is not possible unless the Committee decides to travel and visit cities in all provinces of this country.

[*English*]

There have been groups like Lawyers Against the Trade Agreement from Edmonton, Alberta, so I speak on behalf of these groups but not just on behalf of these groups. I speak on behalf of thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions of Canadians who do not accept this trade deal and believe by an overwhelming majority that it is essential that an election take place before this trade deal is put into effect.

This is a permissive motion but it is a permissive motion which I hope will take the moral weight of this democratic House of Commons to the committee which is looking at Bill C-130 by sending it a very simple message which says that the committee must listen to the people of Canada and it must cross this country so that the people of Canada can speak to it. It must see to it that there is fairness practised in the consideration of this Bill.

There is before this country a profound choice. It is a choice as to whether this country will continue independently as it has for the past 121 years, an event just recently celebrated here on Parliament Hill, or whether it will take steps which will weave it into a continental relationship dependent on the United States, a relationship which makes Canada no more than a colony of that country. That is the profound choice which is before us.

Some people in this House are on one side of that choice and other people are on the other. Some people in Canada wish that they had been born Americans and want to see this trade deal go forward in order to see that come into effect. Other people are proud of the fact that they are Canadians and want to see to it that Canada is preserved independent in the future.

Regardless of where we stand on this profound choice, regardless of which direction we would like to see our country take, we have a democratic responsibility as a House of Commons to see to it that across Canada, the small people, in their cities and in their towns, get the chance to speak out as powerfully and as passionately as they possibly can.

• (1600)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Questions or comments?

Mr. Hawkes: Madam Speaker, I thought we were rising on debate but if there is a question or comment period, I would just ask the Hon. Member one simple question. Has the House pronounced itself with respect to support for the agreement? What does a vote at second reading represent?

What the Member seems to be saying is that we should revisit the issue of whether free trade is a good idea for Canada or not. The Hon. Member knows that the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade travelled across the country. He knows that many millions of dollars were spent by a commission on the economy which studied this country for three years and recommended to the Canadian people and this chamber that we seek a free trade agreement with the U.S.

You may notice that the Hon. Member talked very little about the legislative process, about the need to hear witnesses. That is peculiar. People who are listening may want to examine the "blues" to see whether or not he talked about the need to travel the country for the purpose of examining the fine print of the legislation and having technical experts tell us whether the words in the legislation reflect the agreement. He forgot, or maybe he does not know, that most of those people with that kind of expertise live here in Ottawa. That is where most of the witnesses with respect to fine print and the law come from at the legislative stage of most Bills.

Is he talking about trying to take the House backwards in time to some day when the House was not committed to this agreement? Or, is he simply seeking to filibuster the House, frustrate the House, frustrate the democratic process, by suggesting that the issue is not resolved?

This House has spoken and spoken clearly. This House wants this free trade agreement, and the job of the committee is to examine the fine print and make sure it is this agreement in the fine print. That is its job. Travelling the country is not its job.

Mr. Langdon: Madam Speaker, frankly, I can hardly believe what I just heard from the Parliamentary Secretary. First, unlike the Parliamentary Secretary, I was a member of that committee which crossed the country very rapidly. It heard a fair number of people speak with respect not to the trade deal itself but to a short, preliminary document which bore very little relationship to the details in the trade deal itself.

With respect to the Macdonald Commission, one of the major features of this trade deal is that it includes services for the first time in any significant trade deal in the world. Lest you think that services are a small part of our economy, they make up 72 per cent of the economic activity in Canada. The Macdonald Commission did not do any study whatsoever of the impact of a free trade arrangement with respect to services because it did not expect services would ever be part of a deal. Therefore, to refer to that document is also false.

With respect to the final comment of the Parliamentary Secretary, to say that all the expertise that needs to be consulted with respect to this Bill is in Ottawa is perhaps the most amazing statement which I have ever heard in this House.

Mr. Hawkes: Why don't you repeat the quote accurately instead of lying once again? You say "all". I never said "all". I said "most".

Mr. Langdon: I think there is cause for withdrawal on the part of the Hon. Member.

Mr. Hawkes: A little honesty in this debate would go a long way.

Mr. Langdon: He has accused me—

Mr. Riis: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I do not know if it was audible to you but it seemed to be audible to the rest of the House, and I suspect even to the gallery, when the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary called the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon) a liar. He said that he was lying. He called him a liar. As a respected and longstanding member of this House he ought to do the honourable thing and stand in his place and withdraw that unparliamentary remark.

Mr. Hawkes: Madam Speaker, I never hesitate, if I have offended the rules of the House, to withdraw any remark. What I am asking the Hon. Member to do is, if he is going to quote me, to quote me accurately and not present a distortion to the House and the nation about what I said. I never said, and the record will bear me out, that all the expertise is in Ottawa. I said most of the legal expertise around the fine print in legislation is to be found in Ottawa, and that is a fact.

Mr. Riis: Perhaps the Hon. Member did not understand the point I was making. He hurled the ultimate insult by saying my hon. colleague from Essex—Windsor was lying. I do not know how you would interpret that. I know the "blues" will certainly reflect that. It was audible here and I suspect audible to people in the gallery. It is what we have come to expect from the Hon. Member but it is strictly unparliamentary.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Chair must admit to not having heard such words, otherwise the Chair would have intervened right away. On the other hand, when he rose the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary did say that if he said anything unparliamentary, he was withdrawing. That I did hear very well so I think that should settle the matter for the time being. The Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor has the floor.

Mr. Riis: Until we see the "blues" at least.

Mr. Langdon: Regardless of whether or not the Parliamentary Secretary said "most" or "all", and I certainly heard him say "all", I want to make a very important point. The Government used to say this was a country of small communities. Now it says this is a country where expertise, by and large, rests in Ottawa. I say precisely the opposite. The expertise with respect to the fish processing and what will happen to it as a consequence of this trade deal, and therefore the details of the legislation as it deals with fish processing, rests with people who are involved in that industry in British Columbia, Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and the rest of Atlantic Canada.

The same is true when we talk about the agricultural parts of this deal. It is absolutely bizarre to hear the Conservative Party, which at one stage went off to Prince Albert because it felt that was where it should seek expertise with respect to agricultural concerns, now says no, it is not necessary.

• (1610)

This is a deal which will profoundly change the nature of agriculture in this country in the future. Yet, is the Conservative Government now prepared to go to Prince Albert? Is it prepared to go to Regina? Is it prepared to go to Calgary? Is it prepared to go to Winnipeg? No, the expertise is centred here in Ottawa. That is the Conservative view which indicates very clearly that after four years in power the arrogance of Ottawa has taken over what used to be at least some clear thinking in some parts of the Conservative Party.

It is regrettable that that last perspective should have been put forward, not by a back-bencher who somehow got caught up in the great enjoyments of the capital city, but by a Parliamentary Secretary, in fact one from the West, who is supposed to be able to reflect the Government's views.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time for questions and comments has expired.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, we are debating a motion that the committee be allowed to travel. The Member brings up the issue of democracy. We have witnessed for several months now continued attempts by the tyranny of the minority. The Member talks about visiting the country and representing constituents. Every single Member sitting across the way comes from a riding in which the majority of the people say yes to free trade.

Mr. Riis: False, absolutely false.

Mr. Hawkes: The New Democratic Party represents union bosses from a few very strong unions in this country. They do not represent the people of this country.

Mr. Riis: That's false, it's not true.

Mr. Hawkes: When the election comes they will find out. We should have a going away party for the NDP Members in this Chamber because they are not coming back, and that is because they are not playing square with the Canadian people.

Mr. Riis: Absolutely false.

Mr. Hawkes: They have lost their roots, those Prairie roots in which the movement began which was in touch with the small people of this nation. Now they represent the rich union bosses who drive Cadillacs. That is the view they express in this Chamber day after day.

They talk about dinosaurs.

Mr. Riis: You're one.

Mr. Hawkes: A lot of people in this caucus are proud to be dinosaurs. That is the emblem for the football team of the university where I come from. Dinosaurs are important to our history. Dinosaurs died on behalf of the oil industry a long time ago. Without the dinosaurs we would not have the oil and the energy potential we do have.

The New Democratic Party reminds me of another animal. It is spelled s-l-o-t-h. A sloth sleeps a lot and hangs upside down by its tail. It looks at the world from an upside down point of view. That is what the NDP is all about. It looks at the world upside down. The modern world is passing it by.

Mr. Riis: Have you checked the polls recently, Jim?

Mr. Hawkes: This House has approved, in two separate ways and on two separate occasions, the idea of the trade deal. After four years we need to explain it to them. The vote in favour on second reading is agreement in principle with the proposed legislation.

Mr. Orlikow: Be honest for a change. Tell us how you closed up the House by ringing the bells for 16 days.

Mr. Hawkes: That is behind us, Madam Speaker. This House and the elected people, of whom I am one, have approved the free trade agreement and approved this legislation in principle. The committee's job is to examine the fine print.

Mr. Orlikow: Tell the truth.

Mr. Hawkes: Does the fine print accord with the agreement?

Mr. Riis: You're afraid of the people, Jim. Admit it.

Mr. Hawkes: That is the job of the committee. New Democratic Members want it to go visiting. It would be lovely for committee members to visit Victoria, it is beautiful in Victoria. Let's go to P.E.I. and eat lobster. Let's go to Newfoundland and take a tour on a boat.

We were sent here to do a job, not to fly around the country in airplanes spending taxpayers' dollars on fancy meals, but to sit here, eat our sandwiches at suppertime, and do the job. That is what we were sent here to do and this Party will make sure that we do it.

Mr. Riis: Fifty million dollars on Conservative propaganda on the trade deal.

Mr. Hawkes: You can't have a vacation 365 days a year travelling around the world. You have to settle down and do some work from time to time.

The Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) moved the motion that the committee travel on July 7, six days ago. Overwhelmingly the committee members said no.

Mr. Gauthier: Of course, they're all Tories. Tories don't move.

Mr. Hawkes: If I spend eight hours flying to Calgary and back I cannot hear witnesses, pay attention to the fine print, and make the decisions which have to be made. If I fly off to Newfoundland it will take another day or two. The NDP wants to stop the Government from implementing the will of the Canadian people.

Mr. Riis: You couldn't be further from the truth.

Mr. Hawkes: Canadians want jobs and better paying jobs.

Mr. Riis: Prime Minister Mulroney campaigned against the trade deal.

Mr. Hawkes: We were elected four years ago on a platform of jobs, jobs, jobs. One and a quarter million jobs later they are telling us that everything we do is wrong.

Mr. Riis: You can't trust the Tories.

Mr. Hawkes: They have been saying it ever since the first Budget.

Mr. Riis: You can't trust the Prime Minister.

Mr. Hawkes: The people in the gallery should know that when they say we are wrong it is the best evidence that we are right. Every time they say we are wrong more jobs are created in the Canadian economy and more people have money to spend to put better food on the table and obtain better accommodation, better transportation, and a chance to take a vacation.

Mr. Riis: You're a joke, Jim.

Mr. Hawkes: This Party stands for equality for all Canadians.

Mr. Riis: The people of Canada know you can't trust the Prime Minister. He was against the trade deal.

Mr. Hawkes: This Party stands for equality for all Canadians. The government Members in this House are sick and tired of the filibuster tactics which is what the motion was today is. The legislation is in committee and members are working on it this very moment while this House is debating whether they should go on a jaunt to Victoria or maybe up to the Yukon. There is a lot of good fishing up in the Yukon.

Mr. Riis: You're a whiner.

Mr. Hawkes: Our Members say that we should do the job which Canadians sent us here to do, that we should get through the legislation on the Table. We want to get those kinds of things done on behalf of the Canadian people and then go to the Canadian people and seek a mandate.

Mr. Riis: You're scared to go to the people now, Jim. Admit it.

Mr. Hawkes: Madam Speaker, when the Opposition looks at the world upside down it comes to the conclusion that we are scared.

Mr. Riis: If you stood upside down you'd look a lot better.

Mr. Hawkes: Their behaviour tells us that they are scared. Every moment of delay is because they are afraid of the voters' judgment.

Mr. Orlikow: Call the election tomorrow.

Mr. Hawkes: They are afraid by how satisfied Canadian people are with the work of the Government.

Mr. Riis: Have you not read a single poll in the last four years?

Mr. Hawkes: They know how much it has meant to the standard of living of Canadians. They would like to keep us here forever. They would like to filibuster forever.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, it gives to me great pleasure to tell this House in the clearest terms possible that it is time to get on with the business of the nation. I ask for the support of all Members of this House and their approval of the following motion:

That this House do now proceed to Orders of the Day.

The filibuster has to end.

• (1620)

Mr. Langdon: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the Hon. Member was speaking in the same debate in which I was speaking, and it seemed unlikely at some stages, it seems

that the same requirement to answer questions at the end of his speech should exist, whether or not he moves a motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I listened carefully to the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor. However, the Hon. Member for Calgary West has put a motion before the House. I must put the question to the House immediately, as it is not debatable. Therefore, is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Hawkes), which was agreed to on the following division:

• (1630)

(*Division No. 474*)

YEAS

Members

Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand
Binns
Blackburn
(Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bourgault
Browes
Cardiff
Champagne
(Champlain)
Clinch
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt
Crofton
Darling
Daubney
de Cotret
Domm
Edwards
Ellis
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Fontaine
Forrestall
Fraleigh
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Greenaway
Halliday
Harvey
Hawkes
Holtmann
Jacques
Jardine
Jepson
Joncas
Kempling
Ladouceur
Landry
Layton
Lewis
Mailly
Malone
Marin
Mayer
Mazankowski
McDermid
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Nowlan
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Pennock
Plourde
Price
Reid
Reimer
St-Julien
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Stewart
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Valcourt
Van De Walle
Vincent
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)
Witer—78

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Benjamin
Boudria
Caccia
Copps
de Corneille
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Finestone
Frith
Gauthier
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
Killens
Langdon
Manly
Marchi
McDonald
(Broadview—
Greenwood)
Mitchell
Orlikow
Parry
Prud'homme
Riis
Skelly
Waddell—28

• (1700)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion carried. Orders of the Day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

AIR CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Robert de Cotret (for the President of the Privy Council) moved that Bill C-129, an Act to provide for the continuance of Air Canada under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares thereof to the public, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to be able to speak on behalf of the Government, in particular the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski), the Hon. Member from Vegreville, Alberta.

Some Hon. Members: Filibuster.

Mr. Hawkes: It is a subject close to his heart and I think it is a feather in his cap that we have come this far through the process. It is also the first time in my nine years in the Parliament of Canada that I have been the recipient of one of our Standing Order rules.

An Hon. Member: Nine is too long.

Mr. Hawkes: That rule allows me unlimited time. The temptation is absolutely enormous. There are so many things that I would like to say, but I will attempt to keep my comments relatively brief, and hopefully the House will see its way clear to follow that example and move along—

An Hon. Member: It won't. I guarantee that.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Order. It is really impossible for the Chair to hear the Hon. Member. The Chair would appreciate it if the House were to quieten down. The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary.

Mr. Hawkes: Thank you for the intervention, Madam Speaker. I could get louder, as Members know, but I would much prefer your solution of a quieter House so that we could have perhaps more of a reasonable debate.

Members will know that this Government has made a lot of changes in Canada in the last four years, and not the least of those was the passage of the new National Transportation Act which we passed in 1987 in this House. That Act eased the economic regulation of the industry and permitted greater reliance on market forces as the context in which airlines should operate.

It is true that that kind of increased opportunity system for the private sector is of great benefit to consumers. Those of us who fly back and forth to Ottawa from western points with some frequency can indeed attest to the reality that the service today is better and more frequent. We have more options, and prices indeed are competitive.

[*Translation*]

These changes lead to a restructuring of the air transportation industry, which consisted of a single national airline, a few regional carriers and several local carriers.

Hon. Members are well aware that today, our country enjoys the services of two national carriers, Air Canada and Canadian Airlines International. The two airlines operate on the same principle: they both have regional and local partners and alliance carriers that provide small communities with greater frequency of service.

In addition, Wardair, a company from Alberta, is becoming a strong competitor, both on the domestic market and on international routes.

As for those who maintained that regulatory reform and changes in ownership would bring about a drop in both quality and quantity of service, I would merely refer them to some very revealing statistics. Between 1984 and 1987, for example, weekly scheduled domestic departures across Canada rose from 6,200 to 9,300, an increase of 50 per cent.

[*English*]

In today's modern world—and earlier this day I spoke about the Opposition and their inability sometimes to comprehend a modern world—there are 17 major national carriers, and I say major national carriers in terms of their fleet size. I think we can proudly say that Air Canada is one of those 17 national carriers. In that group, only three of the major carriers in the world today are totally state-owned. What are the three? Before we pass this Bill, Air Canada is one of them. The second one is Aeroflot, the Russian state-owned airline. The third one is CAAC, the airline of the People's Republic of China.

It is time that we got out of the business, as other nations have done before us, of having a major airline carrier totally state-owned. It is time to join the modern world, as other nations such as Great Britain, Japan, Sweden, Switzerland, France, Italy, New Zealand, Spain and Australia have done or are in the process of doing. In the commitment to safety, which some suggest may have been compromised or may be compromised by this Bill, that kind of complaint simply does not hold water.

• (1710)

The Aeronautics Act, 1985, is another major achievement of this Government. It is further demonstrated that expenditures on air transportation infrastructure, including safety equipment and program expenditures have almost tripled over the last decade in response to initiatives of that kind.

Public participation in the ownership of Air Canada will have no effect—may I repeat that, Madam Speaker, no effect—on the framework of safety laws and regulations which apply with equal force to all air carriers operating in this country, whether we are talking about major air carriers or small air carriers.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, since the last Liberal Government passed the Air Canada Act, 1977, under which Air Canada was to operate on a commercial basis, the Corporation has always been guided by this principle in purchasing equipment. In fact, from its early beginnings fifty-one years ago, Air Canada has always purchased the kind of aircraft that was best suited to the type of work it was asked to do.

Initially, Madam Speaker, privatization will give Air Canada the freedom it needs to respond quickly and effectively to market demand, without being subject to the constraints and formalities of the Financial Administration Act. Furthermore, the Corporation will have access to the same venture capital markets as its competitors.

Public participation means that Air Canada will be able to compete with other carriers on an equal footing. According to the Canadian Consumers Association, this can only enhance the quality of service offered to Canadian travellers.

[*English*]

Air Canada's employees have indicated their support for this initiative too. It will give them the opportunity to share in the ownership of their own company. The interest on their part is probably the best assurance Canadians have that the people who work for the company, who believe in the company, would like to participate in the ownership of it.

According to studies carried out both by Air Canada management and the Air Canada employee ownership committee, representative of a broad cross-section of employees all the way from the machine shop floor to the executive suite, employees support the opportunity to buy

shares in the company. It is not something that just executives are interested in—

Mr. Orlikow: No membership, no list, no organization.

Mr. Hawkes: —it is something in which every employee of Air Canada at every level is interested. They would like to be part of the ownership element and therefore, through their votes, part of the management element of the company. Perhaps the greatest strength of privatization is that Canadians have a real chance to participate in the affairs of these companies which so dramatically affect their lives. It is not a time for politicians to tell them how to run their companies, it is a time for employees to participate in that way.

It is also important to reassure Canadians and this House that the provisions of the Canada Labour Code and some of the advances that we have made in worker safety and so on will continue to apply to the privatized company. Nothing in that area is changed. The collective agreements that have been negotiated historically remain in force. The safeguards under the strengthened Pension Benefit Standards Act will ensure that employees' interests in Air Canada's pension plans will not be jeopardized. The workplace that employees have enjoyed, their benefits and the future they are looking forward to is all ensured with the additional opportunity to buy shares and participate in that fashion.

Air Canada is committed to meeting its pension obligations under the Act and in relation to the contractual obligations it has with employees. The legislation also clearly specifies that Montreal's status as the headquarters of Air Canada is fully protected—we are not into a regional fight here—as are the operational and overhaul facilities in Montreal, Mississauga and Winnipeg. Those facilities exist in those locations because it makes sense. The legislation is helpful in making sure that that situation remains. The President of Air Canada himself has said that the Winnipeg base, something dear to the heart of western Canadians, is very efficient, it is doing good work and it is doing it in a location where it needs to be done. It makes common sense to have that facility in that location, and it will continue there. It makes a profit. With worker participation at the ownership level, perhaps profits will go up.

The legislation offers the opportunity for all Canadians to participate directly in the future of the airline. It is every individual's right to make an individual investment decision, the right to buy and sell shares and the right to vote on decisions affecting Air Canada as long as shares are held. They have that right with Wardair and Canadian Airlines International. Now they will have that right with Air Canada, a desirable consequence.

We want as a Government to make sure that the shares are widely held, that they do not fall into the hands of a small group of people, and that they stay in Canadian hands. This legislation specifies restrictions on the ownership of shares, and I think that makes sense. No one can own more than 10 per cent of the shares. Total non-resident ownership is being restricted to no more than 25 per cent of issued voting shares.

We talked earlier this day about the committee on free trade. Committees do good work in this Chamber. We have had many amendments to the language Bill, many amendments to the environmental protection Bill and many amendments to the refugee Bill. The committee on this Bill chose to amend Clause 6 for greater certainty to make that condition apply explicitly to each and every meeting of Air Canada's shareholders. In the future, non-residents will never be able to out-vote Canadian interests or Canadian shareholders. Their votes would be cast on a prorated basis and can never represent more than 25 per cent of votes cast. That is quite an achievement, and we thank the committee for that good work.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, public participation in the growth and development of Air Canada is in the interests of the Corporation, its employees, the air transportation industry and the entire country.

Madam Speaker and Hon. Members, I want to thank you for your attention.

[*English*]

It is time to pass the Bill and get it to the Senate. I hope Members will be brief.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Debate. The Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia)

Mr. Caccia: Madam Speaker, I would like to reply to the comments just made by the Parliamentary Secretary with his mellifluous voice and following a prepared text he was trying—

Mr. MacLellan: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Because the first speaker in the Opposition has unlimited time, and as I am the critic—although I do not want to forgo the time of my hon. friend., the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia)—I am sure that he would want me to have the floor.

Mr. Caccia: Madam Speaker, I am glad to defer to my colleague and follow him in debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I thank the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) for making life a lot easier for the Speaker. The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Madam Speaker, I just want to reply to a couple of the comments made by the Parliamentary Secretary. He welcomed to the modern world the privatization of Air Canada. If that welcome to the modern world and that privatization put us in the position of other countries dealing with totally privatized and deregulated airline services, then that is not the modern world. That is a regressive world.

If welcome to the modern world of privatization and deregulation means seats closer together, planes not maintained to the standard to which we have been accustomed in Canada, flights cancelled at the last minute, flight delays, crew lay-offs, improperly trained crews, no services on the flights, if that is the modern world to which the Parliamentary Secretary refers, then I do not think Canadians would want that modern world. But that is the world that will be created in air transportation if this government Bill gets through.

• (1720)

We have in Canada an outstanding airline service. Why do we have such good service? It is because we have three major airlines, Air Canada, Canadian Airlines International and Wardair. Two of them are private companies. Only Air Canada is a public company. Because Air Canada is a public company, it is regulated by the Government of Canada. It is told to be fair to the travelling public of Canada, and it provides a good service.

It may cost a little more to provide this good service. It may cost a little more to make sure that the maintenance is at the level to which the Government feels Canadians are entitled. At least the former Liberal Government felt that that was the level of maintenance to which Canadians were entitled. It is obvious that this Government does not feel the same way.

If the regulations that are now imposed on Air Canada because it is a public company are taken away, then Air Canada will not only diminish its standards in maintenance, service, employment and training but the other airlines will do so as well. They will then all have a free ticket to reduce service. They will all give equally poor service and will be able to save money. That is what has happened in other countries.

We do not have to imagine what will happen, we need only look at what has happened in other countries to see what it is the Canadian public will have to bear in the years to come if we privatize Air Canada in a deregulated airline industry. The terrible two, privatization and deregulation, will scuttle the ideas, objectives and standards Canadians want to maintain and believe they are entitled to.

The Parliamentary Secretary also referred to the committee doing good work. I have been a Member of Parliament for nine years and I have never been part of such a disgraceful exhibition on the part of the Government as was the case with the legislative committee which studied this particular Bill. We told the witnesses who wanted to be heard that they all had to appear on one day. The people of Canada were restricted to one day to voice their objections to this Bill.

Is this not a transportation Bill? Is it not a Bill dealing with Air Canada? Was Air Canada not brought into being 51 years ago because Canada is a wide, diverse country with people living thousands of miles apart? We thought that only a public airline could provide the level of transportation service to which we felt the Canadian public was entitled. Is this not why Air Canada was brought in? Yet the committee did not travel. The people in the metropolitan corridors will certainly suffer, but it is the people from the smaller regions of Canada who will really suffer as a result of this privatization, yet the committee did not travel. It did not allow these people to testify before it.

We finished debating the Bill on a Thursday and the committee hearings started on Monday. The hearings were over within eight days and only one day was given for the people of Canada to testify before the committee. If a witness could not be there that one day, that witness could not testify.

This is fine for Members of Parliament. I suppose we were inconvenienced a great deal, but we had second and third reading stages for speeches and we had report stage for amendments. However, the people of Canada had no other opportunity to speak to this regressive legislation than in the legislative committee. The legislative committee provided their one opportunity to speak to Members of Parliament and to testify to how they disagree with this Bill. Yet the Government told the people of Canada from Sydney, from Vancouver Island, and from Cape Breton Island that one day is all they had if they wanted to testify.

Even if we had applications for a large number of witnesses, that did not matter. We pruned the list to the extent that if it had been a tree, all we would have had left was a stump. The leaves, the branches and everything would have gone. The people of Canada were denied their opportunity to speak.

I would like to give an example of the sentiment that exists on this particular issue. Transport 2000 said in a letter to the Chairman of the legislative committee the following:

> I am gravely disappointed by the decision of the Legislative Committee on Bill C-129 to schedule only one day to receive and hear witnesses on a subject of national significance: the issue and sale of Air Canada shares. With its distinguished contribution to national development and prominent position in the transportation industry, Air Canada is clearly the most notable crown corporation in the current parliamentary session to be slated for privatization. By selecting witnesses from exclusive airline management, organized labor and academic circles, the Legislative Committee overlooked Air Canada's most important constituency—the travelling public.

Indeed, the legislative committee did overlook the most important source, the Canadian travelling public. Yet it was the Government's decision to hear witnesses on only one day. As a result, Canadians did not have the opportunity to make their presentation.

Why are we here? Why are we debating this Bill? Why do we want to mess around with our airline industry? What is the big need to privatize Air Canada? What will be achieved?

We are allowing some executives and others to increase their salaries, perhaps. We are allowing the private sector to invest in Air Canada. The Bill provides that 75 per cent of the shares to be purchased have to be purchased by Canadians since only 25 per cent of the shares can be held by non-residents. Is that what we are trying to achieve? No, it cannot possibly be because Canadians already own Air Canada. Canadians from coast to coast own Air Canada. We are not giving shares of Air Canada to the public because the public already owns it.

Why are we doing this? Is it because we want to reduce the number of Air Canada's domestic flights? Do we want to do that? Why would we want to do that? Why would we want to reduce the number of Air Canada's domestic flights and increase international flights? I am sure the pilots would certainly be interested in that. Air Canada has excellent pilots, but they can demand a higher salary if there are more international flights and fewer domestic flights. However, do members of the Canadian public want that? Why would anyone want flights cancelled?

What happens when flights are cancelled? One of two things happens. If Air Canada cancels a flight, it might not be replaced. Perhaps it will be replaced by one of the feeder airlines which fly Dash-8s, very nice planes which give a great frequency of service. Of course, however, they will not be run by Air Canada employees, and the employees who work for the feeder airlines will certainly not get the same kind of salaries as Air Canada employees. That is part of the plan: take away Air Canada service, put on feeder airline service, hire new employees and pay them less. That is the idea. Save money.

• (1730)

What about service to the public? If that is the idea, what about Halifax? There are no gates for the feeder airlines there. You have to walk downstairs and the planes are lined up like ducks on a pond. You do not know which plane is which because they all look alike, but someone gratuitously tells you which flight is yours. Then when you are going out the door, you are told to wait, a flight somewhere else is going to be leaving now and you cannot go. You have to go and sit down. However, the catch is that there are only four seats at that end of the terminal in Halifax. Four seats.

Atlantic Canada, as you probably know, has its health services centred mainly in the City of Halifax. Most of the major hospitals in Atlantic Canada are located there. Many people from my area of Cape Breton go to the Victoria General Hospital and others for whatever reason. When they are well enough to go home they book an airline flight. There they are, ready at the gate to take their flight, and what are they told? They have to go and sit down. Yet there are no seats. Someone may have been in the hospital for two weeks or a month, but they have to stand there for 15 or 20 minutes sometimes while the other plane taxis away and their plane starts to board. Is that why we do not want Air Canada's service? Is that why we want to privatize Air Canada?

To make it very simple and not belabour the point, there is no reason to privatize Air Canada. There may be a few people with vested interests who have reasons to privatize Air Canada, but the Canadian public does not have a reason. Once it is privatized, its standards will drop. Standards in other countries where privatization has taken place have dropped and once it happens to Air Canada, it will happen to other airlines. It will be the equivalent to sawing the legs off a table. Air Canada's standards drop, those of other airlines drop, and gradually all the legs on the table are gone. That is what is going to happen.

Yet the Government tells us we must have privatization. Air Canada needs a mandate. This Party believes that Air Canada should remain a wholly government-owned airline. In 1977 the Liberal Government proposed and Parliament approved the Air Canada Act under which the corporation now operates. That was in response to the recommendations made by the Estey Commission of Inquiry. That special inquiry was set up to deal with this question. One of the most prominent jurists in the history of Canada headed the commission. The commission's recommendation was the Air Canada Act, not privatization.

In essence, the commission proposed that Air Canada be given the legal and corporate structure, the flexibility and financing to operate on a commercial basis and on the same footing as its competitors in Canada and abroad. That is perfectly reasonable. As a result, Air Canada was refinanced with a debt/equity ratio equivalent to other North American airlines. It was split off from Canadian National and given its own Act. The Government used the Canada Business Corporations Act as a model.

The new Act admonished directors and officers to conduct the business affairs of Air Canada with prudence, diligence and in the contemplation of profit. The Government would have us believe that the directors and officers are not operating the company in that way. We are told it has to be privatized and in a position where it can compete with other airlines. Yet in 1977 Air Canada was placed on a commercial footing with a clear arm's length relationship to the Government. We do not need privatization to obtain that situation because it exists at present.

Let me turn once again to something else that has transpired. In 1984 the Liberal Government brought forward Bill C-24. It was passed by Parliament and now forms Part XII of the Financial Administration Act. One of the changes made through that Bill was a requirement that any acquisition or divestiture of a Crown corporation had to be approved explicitly by Parliament. In reviewing the committee's testimony and the debates on this matter there is no question in my mind that this requirement was imposed not only to ensure that Parliament's approval for privatization was sought, but also for the method, structure and detail of the privatization.

That being the case, we find Bill C-129 lacking. It is a travesty. The information we need is just not there. This Bill is just a few pages long. To say that we should amend the Act is a very nice thought, but when we go to amend it, it is not the equivalent of putting your finger in the dike, it is the equivalent of trying to keep out the tide. That is how big the gaping hole is with respect to the information we should have.

We do not know how the privatization is going to take place. We do not know who is going to make the decisions. The Minister responsible told us in his press release that only 45

per cent of the shares of Air Canada were going to be sold. The Government was going to hold the other 55 per cent. Yet there is nothing in this Act that tells us that that will be the case. It is ludicrous for us to deal with a Bill which contains so little information on such a very important subject.

Now I go to some of the amendments that we want to put forward. The Parliamentary Secretary mentioned an amendment to Clause 6 which this Party proposed and which was adopted in committee. I am very pleased about that. It takes the question of the ownership of Air Canada one step further. The Act did contain a provision that only 25 per cent of the shares of Air Canada could be owned by non-residents. This Party was concerned about what would happen if there was an annual or general meeting of the company and the 25 per cent non-residents formed over 50 per cent of the shareholders present. That would mean that non-residents would have a majority and their thinking would prevail.

• (1740)

This is not a precedent because the Government put this in Bill C-121, the Bill to provide for the eventual privatization of Eldorado Nuclear and its merger with the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation. The provision is that of the non-resident shares voted, a maximum of 25 per cent could be applied to non-residents. That protects the residents of Canada at meetings of the corporation.

A couple of other amendments were proposed to Section 6 which are very important and which the Government should have brought forward but, unfortunately, did not. One had to do with competition. There are so many things about this Bill which concern me.

One of the things which concerns me the most is that if we privatize Air Canada we will have three private companies. We look to the situation in Great Britain where there was more than one national airline. Before the privatization of British Airways, it reduced its staff by 23,000. After British Airways was privatized, it purchased British Caledonia Airways. There is now in Britain one national airline, British Airways. In Canada we have three.

If we privatize Air Canada, we are protected, of course, by certain sections of the National Transportation Act, to a certain degree, because it contains a great deal of discretion. One of the competitors of Air Canada is Canadian Airlines International. Canadian Airlines International was formed because Pacific Western Airlines purchased Canadian Pacific. That was done because Canadian Pacific could not purchase Pacific Western Airlines due to the fact that Pacific Western Airlines was formed under the statutes of the Province of Alberta which require a certain share structure in Pacific Western Airlines. Therefore, Pacific Western Airlines was required to purchase Canadian Pacific. That is how Canadian Airlines International was formed.

What happens if that statute in Alberta is amended at the request of Canadian Airlines International? That is conceivable. Alberta is a separate jurisdiction and has the right to make whatever decisions its wants. It can change that statute at any time. In addition, there are no restrictions on Wardair.

Therefore, even with the protection which exists to some extent in the statutes of Alberta and under the National Transportation Act, there is still a strong possibility that through mergers and buy-outs we could end up with only one airline in this country. If that happens the service will be closer to standing in the aisle holding on to a strap than to the level of service we enjoy from our airlines at this time. This must be protected.

This Party presented only two amendments, but they zeroed in on this particular subject. We wanted changes in this, but the Government would not agree to the amendment. I leave it to the Canadian public and to the other place which will be debating this Bill to deal with this shortfall on this very important issue.

Second, Section 6 says that a maintenance base is to be maintained in Winnipeg and that the head office is to be maintained in Montreal. However, there is nothing which actually requires that. This is supposedly looked after by the Canada Business Corporations Act. I do not think it is. The Government states that it is satisfied that the protection continues to exist.

The Government has not only made a very drastic error in privatization but absolutely refuses to modify its mistakes, even upon suggestion. That indicates to me that this is a headlong desire by the Government to plunge the national airline into privatization for none other than political reasons and to meet the strange doctrine of the Progressive Conservative Party.

What other reasons have we heard for this? The Government tells us that Air Canada needs privatization in order to have the flexibility its competitors enjoy. What better flexibility for an airline than to be a Crown corporation, to have the Government looking after the airline and being concerned about the travelling public? It may not be better for some vested interests, but how could it be better for the Canadian public than to have the Government looking after the airline? Because of the competition in this country, which may not continue if the privatization goes through, the Canadian public knows when it flies that we have airline standards and service as good as any in the world. Yet the Government says that Air Canada needs more flexibility. What is needed, of course, is for the Government to have some flexibility and some consideration in looking at the problem it will be creating.

On the other hand, the Government says that if it retains Air Canada it will give an unfair advantage to Air Canada's competitors. That is incredible. Air Canada has been in operation for 51 years. It was the first major airline to operate in Canada. Its competitors came afterward. The competitors which entered the field in competition with Air Canada knew

what they were getting themselves into when they went into business. Air Canada was here first with the interests of the Canadian travelling public at heart.

The Government says that Air Canada will not be able to raise money on the open market if it is not privatized. Since 1973 Canada has only had a deficit in two years. It made $40 million last year while maintaining the standards of convenience and safety for the travelling public expected by the Government of Canada.

From the time the Government was elected in September of 1984 it intended to privatize Air Canada. It has not put one cent back into the airline. It has allowed Air Canada's fleet to deteriorate for four years hoping that the need for aircraft would convince the travelling public that the private sector should look after this cost. Much of the problem has been created because the Government was trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the Canadian public by not looking after the state of the airline during its four-year mandate.

• (1750)

I admit that for every year that goes by it becomes more necessary for Air Canada to acquire new planes. We agree with its statement that new planes are required and that it needs a downpayment of $300 million. Is it not strange that the sale price of the 45 per cent of the shares announced by the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) was just about $300 million? It is incredible to think that the reason the Government is selling Air Canada is to acquire the downpayment for new airplanes.

The Government is not listening to Canadians. It was not following the amendments of the Financial Administration Act, 1984. It is not following the recommendations of the Estey Commission, or reading the provisions of the Air Canada Act.

The Air Canada Act was brought into effect in 1977 to recapitalize Air Canada. Air Canada can certainly buy new planes with some government assistance, part of its equity and part of its borrowing capacity. If public utilities like Ontario Hydro and Québec Hydro can raise money when they have a total debt of $50 billion, why can Air Canada not do the same? The Government would rather privatize Air Canada in order to raise the $300 million the company needs for a downpayment on airplanes.

Air Canada has made the industry as good as it is today because it set the standard. A reduction in those standards will be a great loss to this country.

This privatization does not make sense. Last year, the priorities and planning committee of Cabinet decided, after meeting in western Canada, that Air Canada would be privatized. Air Canada was prepared for the decree, but at the last minute Cabinet decided not to privatize. The market was stronger last year than it is right now, yet Air Canada was not privatized. This year, when the market is lower, the Government decides to privatize Air Canada. We will not get the same amount for the shares. In whose interest is the Government operating?

According to the Deputy Prime Minister's statement, the Government will sell 45 per cent of the shares of Air Canada, while its 55 per cent majority shareholding will be voted in accordance with the majority of the 45 per cent. This means that rather than a majority in public shares, 23 per cent of the private shares of Air Canada will be the majority.

It is purely a question of the Government's following its own political ideology. That should not be its priority. Should not the priority of the Government be the interest of Canadians, the interest of the smaller areas in the vast regions of this country?

Once Air Canada cuts back its jet service to those communities, the level of competition will decrease so that other airlines will reduce their service as well. The over-all standard of service in this country will decline.

I have already talked about the maintenance base in Winnipeg. While it is protected, we do not know how many people will be working there after privatization.

However, there is no assurance that the financial base in Winnipeg will be maintained. Hundreds of jobs may be lost in the financial centre if it is left unprotected. A private company would not have to give any consideration to public opinion.

There are six centres in Canada where the crews are based. They are Vancouver, Calgary, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal and Halifax. Many of the crews have families in those centres and have lived there for much if not all of their working lives. We do not know whether those six bases will be maintained.

If one of those bases is closed, those crews will have to move to other centres. While it is true that other people have had to move from their jobs, this is an example of the callousness of the Government in its lack of consideration about these questions.

One of the most irritating aspects that Canadians will feel about this privatization is that there may be only one reservation centre in Canada. Air Canada has already consolidated its reservation centres on a provincial basis and has only one reservation centre in the United States. With the computer technology available today, it is possible for Air Canada to establish one reservation centre in Canada so that no matter where one lives, one would have to call Toronto to make a reservation. We would not be able to speak to someone in our own area who may understand the problems related to flying from that region.

• (1800)

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL TRADE TRIBUNAL ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Tuesday, July 12, consideration of Bill C-110, an Act to establish the Canadian International Trade Tribunal and to amend or repeal other Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative commitee.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It being six o'clock, the House will now proceed to the deferred recorded division on the report stage of Bill C-110, an Act to establish the Canadian International Trade Tribunal and to amend or repeal other Acts in consequence thereof.

Call in the Members.

The question is on Motion No. 11 in the name of Mr. Langdon:

That Bill C-110 be amended in Clause 27 by striking out lines 43 to 49 at page 11 and 1 to 4 at page 12 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) In determining the question of injury under subsection (1), the Tribunal shall consider

(a) all relevant economic factors and indices having a bearing on the state of the industry, including actual or potential decline in output, sales, market share, profits, productivity, return on investments, utilization of capacity, production, employment, wages and volume of other imports; and

(b) Canada's obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and, in the case of textiles and apparel, under the Arrangement Regarding International Trade in Textiles."

The House divided on Motion No. 11, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 475*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Baker
Benjamin
Boudria
Caccia
Copps
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Finestone
Foster
Frith
Gauthier
Henderson
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
Killens
Langdon
MacLellan
Malépart
Marchi
Mitchell
Nunziata
Orlikow
Parry
Penner
Pépin
Prud'homme
Riis
Robichaud
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell—35

NAYS

Members

Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand
Binns
Blackburn
(Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bourgault
Browes
Cardiff
Champagne
(Champlain)
Clinch
Cooper
Cossitt
Crofton
Dantzer
Darling
Daubney
Domm
Ellis
Epp
(Provencher)
Fennell
Fontaine
Forrestall
Fraleigh
Gass
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Greenaway
Guilbault
(Drummond)
Halliday
Harvey
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Howie
Jacques
Jardine
Jepson
Joncas
Kempling
Ladouceur
Layton
Lewis
Lopez
Mailly
Malone
Mayer
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Nowlan
O'Neil
Oostrom
Plourde
Ravis
Reimer
St-Julien
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)
Witer—78

• (1820)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I declare the motion lost.

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)) moved that the Bill, as amended, be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Riis: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There seems to have been a slight error of judgment on my part. When you called for support on this motion we in this Party certainly meant to oppose the motion, and we are prepared to do so on division.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Bill is carried on division.

Motion agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It being 6.26 p.m., pursuant to Order made June 20, 1988, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 6.26 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, July 14, 1988

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to petitions Nos. 332-4703, 332-4706, to 332-4708 inclusive, 332-4710, 332-4712, 332-4715, 332-4823, 332-4824, 332-4833 and 332-4895.

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

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, this is really the first opportunity I have had to raise this point of order. I do so to get today's business off on a most positive and parliamentary note. I have just had a chance to review *Hansard* for yesterday. At page 17511, the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes), referred to the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon) as lying. I just make the point that this is unparliamentary language, and I would ask the Hon. Member to do the honourable thing and withdraw that remark.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I thought I had withdrawn any unparliamentary reference yesterday. I am pleased to be able to do so again. I would point out that the same page of *Hansard* shows that I did use the word "most". The Hon. Member kept insisting I used the word "all". I was correct. The statement made by the Hon. Member opposite was totally incorrect. He would not correct it. He was wrong. If I slipped into using the term "lying", an unparliamentary term, I am sorry, but I hope he might stand later this day and apologize for misrepresenting what I said.

Mr. Speaker: I think all Hon. Members know that there are times in this place when in the heat of debate, or what passes for debate, people say things that on quiet reflection they perhaps would not have said. I appreciate very much the Parliamentary Secretary withdrawing that remark and I appreciate the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap drawing it to the Chair's attention.

* * *

• (1110)

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION—PRESENTATION OF THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Bill Tupper (Nepean—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour this morning to present the third report of the Standing Committee on Regional Industrial Expansion, in both official languages. Furthermore, in accordance with Standing Order 99(2), the committee requests a comprehensive response from the Government.

This committee report deals with a study of an industrial policy for Canada. The committee heard from a great variety of witnesses from a great variety of backgrounds and from all regions of Canada.

The report provides an historical overview of the industrial development of Canada, the policies that have been in place over the years and how they have enhanced and, at times, impeded our industrial development.

Primarily, the report recommends that our industrial initiatives in Canada be market-driven, all the while having respect for our regional needs and programs, as well as having respect for our cultural and social priorities. Further, it recommends that there be a strong linkage always between our industrial initiatives and our research and development initiatives. Finally, it recommends with equal strength that there be good government-sponsored retraining programs in Canada to help those workers who are part of sunset industries to move to emerging industries.

Petitions

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS—PRESENTATION OF SEVENTH AND EIGHTH REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Felix Holtmann (Selkirk—Interlake): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to present from the Standing Committee on Government Operations the seventh and eighth reports to the House, in both official languages.

The seventh report deals with the National Capital Commission. With respect to statues on the Hill, it recommends that the NCC also consider erecting other statues as well as those of former Prime Ministers. Our main concern was with respect to monarchs.

In the eighth report we have entertained the Prince Edward Island Truckers Association in that consideration be given to it in terms of federal government tendering in that province and that it be treated the same way federally as it is provincially.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and honour to present a petition on behalf of a number of petitioners from the great City of Kamloops, British Columbia. They believe that the federal Government still lacks a mandate from the people of Canada to conclude a trade deal with the United States. They believe that in the course of the negotiations Canadian sovereignty was compromised. They also feel that this deal would deny Canada the policy freedom to determine its own economic future and would undermine Canada's ability to build a society distinct from that of the U.S.

Therefore, they call upon Parliament to dissolve now to allow the people of Canada an opportunity to accept or reject the proposed trade deal during a national general election.

PROHIBITION WITH RESPECT TO KNIVES

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to rise once again to present some 14 petitions containing several hundred names concerning the whole question of the danger of knives in public places.

The many people who have signed these petitions which I have been presenting for some time now are concerned that the high incidence of crimes, including murder, robbery and sexual assault, committed with knives is on the increase. In fact, there was an incident in Ottawa yesterday.

The petitioners call once again—and I hope that the Government and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) will take note—for amendments to the federal Criminal Code to prohibit the carrying of knives by citizens in public places. The exceptions to this ban include activities in which the use of a knife is integral to legitimate work, such as the fishing industry, or for a religious reason as in the case of the Sikhs.

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Bill Tupper (Nepean—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure this morning to present a petition signed by several tens of persons from eastern Canada. This petition addresses the striking down of Section 251 of the Criminal Code of Canada, which has left Canadians without any law restricting abortions.

The petition addresses the fact that nothing in the Supreme Court decision has established abortion as a right. Furthermore, it addresses the fact that human life is a continuum from the moment of conception to the moment of death and that there is no point in time between conception and the birth of an infant at which point we could say that this is not a human life.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to pass into law legislation that will protect the life of the unborn child from conception and at all stages of development, with the exception of the extremely rare situation in which an abortion is performed in order to save the life of the mother.

REQUEST FOR INSTALLATION OF SUPPLEMENTARY SAFETY DEVICES IN AUTOMOBILES

Mrs. Thérèse Killens (Saint-Michel—Ahuntsic): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure and duty to table a petition signed by 214 residents of Gatineau, Hull, Maniwaki, Shawville, Campbells Bay, Cantley, and Buckingham.

The highway safety campaign continues. The petitioners hope that car manufacturers will soon incorporate their requests into the production of future cars. Since 1974 highway safety regulations have allowed the installation of air bags for drivers of passenger cars. The petitioners believe that this device would reduce the number of serious injuries on the roads.

For these reasons the petitioners humbly ask Parliament to order car manufacturers to install air bags in the front seat of cars, and to install adjustable seat-belts with shoulder straps for the rear passengers.

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present three petitions signed by residents of the City of Winnipeg, as well as residents of Lauret, Selkirk and Tourond.

The petitioners say that the trade agreement negotiated by the Mulroney Government threatens the very fabric of Canadian political and economic sovereignty by removing the power of the Canadian Government to control effectively foreign ownership, to develop Canadian resources in the best interests of Canadians, and to equalize opportunities between regions.

Therefore they humbly pray and call upon Parliament to dissolve to allow the people of Canada the opportunity to accept or reject the proposed free trade agreement during a national general election.

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Jim Jepson (London East): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106, it is my pleasure and duty to present a petition from some 500 constituents of London. They state that many thousands of Canadian unborn children are killed by elective abortion, whereas medical science has provided ample evidence of the unborn child's membership in the human species, and whereas Canadian law does not provide sufficient protection for the unborn child. They call on the Government of Canada to take the necessary steps to ensure that unborn children are protected by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

[*Translation*]

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I have 20 petitions to table on behalf of Canadians who are strongly opposed to the signing of the Mulroney-Reagan free-trade agreement, and who respectfully argue that the Mulroney government has sent Canada down the river without getting anything in exchange; that Canadian industries are still not protected against American trade laws; that the United States got everything it wanted in the sectors that count, particularly agriculture, energy, the automobile industry, financial services and investments; that thousands of Canadian jobs are threatened; and that the Conservative government has not provided for any form of assistance to Canadian workers while they adjust to the new conditions.

For these reasons your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to censure the Canadian government for having signed the Mulroney-Reagan trade ageement.

* * *

• (1120)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, today the following questions will be answered: 364, 376 and 381.

[*Text*]

CPP—EARLY RETIREMENT OPTION

Question No. 364—**Mr. Angus:**

Order Paper Questions

Since the early retirement option of the Canada Pension Plan was enacted, have individuals in the (*a*) community of Thunder Bay, Ontario, (*b*) community of Atikokan, Ontario (*c*) constituency of Thunder Bay—Atikokan (*d*) area made up of the constituencies of Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Thunder Bay—Nipigon and Kenora—Rainy River applied for early retirement under this option and, if so, (*i*) in what numbers (*ii*) what number of these applications have been granted?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): (i) (a) Thunder Bay, 1,791; (b) Atikokan, 56; (c) Thunder Bay—Atikokan, 968; (d) Thunder Bay—Atikokan, 968, (excluding Thunder Bay, part (a) above); Thunder Bay—Nipigon, 923 (excluding Thunder Bay, part (a) above); Kenora—Rainy River, 906.

(ii) The number of granted applications is not available. Once an early retirement benefit has been granted, the CPP system does not distinguish between early and regular retirement benefits. All eligible applicants should have had their applications granted. Only ineligible applicants (for example those which had never contributed to the CPP) would be refused.

WATER QUALITY IN RIDEAU RIVER

Question No. 376—**Mr. Turner (Ottawa—Carleton):**

1. Does the Department of the Environment have any plans to work, through the Canadian Parks Service (Canals), with the National Capital Commission, the Regional Municipality of Ottawa—Carleton, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment and the cities of Gloucester, Ottawa and Nepean, in a collective effort to lower pollution levels and to improve the water quality in the Rideau River?

2. Is it possible for the Department of the Environment to allocate funds within the new national water policy in a co-operative context with the other concerned authorities, in an effort to locate and deal with sources of pollution flowing into the Rideau River?

Mrs. Pauline Browes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment): 1. The Canadian Parks Service works co-operatively with all levels of government to improve water quality on the Rideau and other heritage canal systems. The main responsibility for the control of water pollution and water quality along the Rideau River, however, rests with the Ontario Ministry of the Environment working in consultation with the various municipalities. It is the Canadian Parks Service's continuing role, while working with others, to improve and maintain water quality through the wise management of water levels and flows within the system of heritage canals.

2. No. There are no funds associated with the Federal Water Policy. However, under this policy, the federal Government will continue its water quality monitoring programs but in a more integrated manner with the provinces than heretofore so that the respective responsibilities of the two levels of Government are clearly delineated. The federal and Ontario Governments are continuing their negotiations towards reaching a federal-provincial agreement on water quality monitoring.

CANADA HEALTH ACT

Question No. 381—**Ms. Copps:**

Air Canada

1. To the knowledge of the Government, for each of Canada's ten provinces and two territories (*a*) what is, at present, the complete list of medical procedures and practices that are covered by provincial health insurance plans to ensure compliance with the *Canada Health Act* (*b*) what additions or deletions to the list of medical procedures and practices covered by provincial health insurance plans to ensure compliance with the *Canada Health Act* have been made since it became law?

2. Does the Department of National Health and Welfare (*a*) have an active bureau which ensures provincial and territorial compliance with the provisions of the *Canada Health Act* (*b*) use particular procedures to ensure that provinces and territories are complying with the provisions of this Act and, if so, what are they?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. (a) Instead of a list of medical procedures and practices that are covered by provincial health insurance plans to ensure compliance with the Canada Health Act, the Act difines physician services as being insured health services. The Act goes on to define physician services as any medically required services rendered by medical practitioners, and medical practitioners as persons lawfully entitled to practise medicine in the place in which the practice is carried on by that person.

Thus, insured coverage for medical services is linked to and governed by the principle of medical necessity. In practical terms, this principle in the Act is given operational application by provincial governments and professional medical organizations which are responsible for and provide medical services.

An item by item, province by province list does not exist. The closest to such a list would be the individual province's schedule of benefits with details on specific medical services and provincial plan payments for these services. These schedules list thousands of services which are provincial benefits. The information is in minute detail and uses medical terminology throughout.

(b) Provincial health insurance plans have not had to make additions or deletions to insured medical procedures and practices to ensure compliance with the Canada Health Act. Provincial coverage has always proceeded from, and functioned on the basis of medical necessity. Provincial plan coverage that has evolved since the passage of the Canada Health Act is a combination of medically necessary and not medically necessary services.

The much publicized de-insurance of certain health services in Alberta in 1987 overlooked a fundamental fact—that the medical procedures continued to be insured in cases of medical necessity. This provincial government policy was verified by NHW officials to ensure that requirements of the Canada Health Act continued to be met. In any instance where some question exists about insured coverage of medically required health services, the matter is clarified with the province to ensure that non-compliance does not exist or occur.

2. (a) The Health Insurance Directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare monitors and assesses provincial and territorial compliance with the provisions of the Canada Health Act.

(b) The Health Insurance Directorate monitors developments in provincial and territorial health insurance plans through a combination of sources including: provincial and territorial legislation and regulations, print and electronic media, provincial information submitted for the Canada Health Act Annual Report, and contacts with provincial officials.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The questions as enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 353 could be passed as an Order for Return, the return could be tabled immediately.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House that Question No. 353 be deemed to have been made an Order for Return?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN WINDSOR—WALKERVILLE

Question No. 353—**Mr. McCurdy:**

Since September 4, 1984, has the Government spent money in the constituency of Windsor—Walkerville and, if so (*a*) in what amount (*b*) on what programs or initiatives?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

AIR CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Wednesday, July 13, consideration of the motion of Mr. de Cotret that Bill C-129, an Act to provide for the continuance of Air Canada under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares thereof to the public, be read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan) had the floor.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned yesterday I was speaking about the retrogressive policies that will be undertaken by Air Canada when or if this privatization takes place. The major losers of these retrogressive steps will be the Canadian public, and they are not being taken into consideration. Yesterday I was mentioning that what was likely to happen is that there will be one central reservations area in this country. This is what Air Canada has done in the United States. It has provided one reservation area and if one calls for a reservation or information, the call goes to one city in the United States. That is possible in Canada with the technology that is in place at the present time. There is no reason, technologically speaking, that this cannot be done. This is what the Government and the management of Air Canada are saying can be done.

What is not being considered are the feelings of the people of Canada having to call to a special telephone line, for example, to some person in Toronto that perhaps has never been to the area in which the caller lives, or experienced the difficulties that the caller has experienced in arranging flights from that area, or the weather conditions. These are things that were not conceivable a few years ago, but now with privatization on top of deregulation, not only is it conceivable, but it is very possible.

In the one day of committee hearings held we asked what questions we could within that one day time frame. We asked the management of Air Canada about maintenance and contracting out maintenance and flight attendants' times. The management said: "No, that was not going to be done". But what we heard from the unions that appeared before the committee was totally different. The unions stated that contracting out has very definitely been considered and discussed by the management of Air Canada. They said that they have openly considered the possibility on their flight from London to Singapore through Bombay of actually contracting out flight attendants in the portion between Bombay and Singapore, and that that is now being actively considered.

What about maintenance? Maintenance has been at a high standard in this country. We have always boarded our airplanes in Canada and felt that they were maintained as well as any airplanes in the world could be maintained. Now, what about contracting out of maintenance and doing maintenance outside Canada? This is something that most Canadians would not even consider being possible, but it is something that is and has been talked about.

The management of Air Canada has stated that it is not considering that, but in a statement before the committee by the National Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers Union of Canada they stated: "More recently, in an issue of Air Canada's in-flight magazine, *EnRoute*, Mr. Jeanniot sang the praises of contracting-out work to other countries". They went on to state: "What is hailed by the company as global generosity is a mean-spirited attempt to find cheap labour. When a government does nothing to prevent the possibility of such business practices, it gives its consent." I think that says it as well as anyone can say it.

Obviously the Government knows that contracting out is being considered, and the Government is going along with the practices that Air Canada will be undertaking if privatization takes place. That is not only a mean-spirited attitude on the part of the Government, but it is an irresponsible attitude.

In committee we heard from the executive of Air Canada that employees of Air Canada will share in the largess that will occur as a result of privatization of this Crown corporation, and they will be able to buy shares. Nothing was said about whether some employees of Air Canada can afford more shares than other lower paid employees. Nothing was indicated about whether employees with more seniority would be offered the shares at a reduced price. There were questions along those lines, but no assurances were given.

What happens if the employees of Air Canada are successful in being able to buy the shares of Air Canada? The Government will have us believe that this would give the employees a voice in the operation of the airline. That path has been trodden many times, particularly in the United States with airlines that were in difficulty. Employees were told that the company could not afford to pay the salaries that they were asking for, and were even telling employees that they would have to take a cut in salary, but in exchange the company was going to give the employees shares in the airline. The employees were not pleased about this and did not want their salaries reduced, but the shares in the airline would at least give them an opportunity to have some say in what the airline would be doing. Well, it meant absolutely nothing. The employees had such a small number of shares that they were insignificant in comparison to the number of shares held by the rest of the private sector that the employees were not even contemplated. When their actual in depth knowledge and experience in the airline was brought up, it was not listened to. All that was considered was the bottom line. That is exactly what the situation will be with respect to Air Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, Canada is a very large country. We need a service such as Air Canada currently provides, because it is a public company and only a public company can provide such a service in a country as large as Canada.

If there is no public company to provide this service, the citizens of Canada will feel the difference, because the service will be completely different. The service will be less regular, with fewer flights, less comfort and fewer in-flight services.

There is no doubt that this will happen. That is because if Air Canada is not a public company, there is no need for a service of that sort because that service costs money. It is

expensive! But if it is possible to provide the same service at a lower cost than Air Canada does now, Air Canada will cut its expenditures. When Air Canada cuts its expenditures, other airlines—Air Canada's competitors—will do likewise. This will not result in good service for Canadians.

• (1130)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, Air Canada has been a Crown corporation in this country for 51 years. Fifty-one years. We have a company on which all Canadians can rely. We are going to destroy it because the Government finds this offensive to its political ideology. Air Canada has not received a government subsidy in 25 years.

It is interesting to hear that one of the Conservative Members complaining is from the Northwest Territories. If anybody in Canada should know the importance of the servicing of our regions, it would be that Hon. Member. We are not going to help the employees if we privatize the airline, because whether the employees gain shares or not is insignificant. They are not going to be heard. In addition, the employees already have shares in Air Canada, as does the public of Canada right now.

Why the erratic behaviour on the part of the Government in not really coming clean and telling us why it wants this privatization? Why has the Government denied the public of Canada the right to be heard to the extent that they should have been heard? We had one day of hearings—and that was on June 22—yet a couple of weeks went by before we actually got to report stage. We could have heard many more Canadians, many more groups, without delaying this Bill one day. In fact, in testimony before the committee, the member of the Canadian Labour Congress said that when she called to find out why there was not more time allowed for witnesses, she was told that this Bill had to be passed by June 30. We knew, when she made the call, that the House was going to be sitting in the month of July. They could not use the excuse that the House was going to be closing. This is the irresponsible, clandestine, derogatory nature and atmosphere in which this Government has forced the Canadian public to consider the privatization of this very valuable asset.

Yesterday I mentioned that there will be a reduction of flights, that more communities will cease to be serviced by Air Canada. What Air Canada and the other major airlines would like is to just fly between and among the large centres of this country, the metropolises of this country, where the big volumes are. They do not want to go to Sydney, Nova Scotia, to St. John's, Newfoundland or Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, or areas like that. They may have a token presence in Halifax, but that would be all that they really would have.

We will have to serve the feeder aircraft with people coming out of hospitals having to stand and wait until each airline gets its engine started and backs away. The major airlines want to reduce service in Canada, to reduce the number of cities and centres in this country between which they have to fly and, of course, to broaden their international activity. That is something they really want to do.

They are going to be competing against other international airlines. They feel that Canadians should be proud. This is something that is supposed to fulfil and gratify Canadians, that their former national airline is going to be playing with the big boys internationally. How can a Canadian feel proud when that same Canadian is being rejected by their own Crown corporation? The service in Canada is going to be diminished. Why should we feel proud about increasing foreign flights when our own service in Canada is being diminished? We are not going to have the same service, and Air Canada does not deny that.

I referred yesterday to Great Britain, which privatized British Airways, and then British Airways proceeded to purchase British Caledonian. There is now only one airline in Britain. It is one thing to deregulate because you are going to lose services. It is even worse if you add privatization to deregulation. Then you have Air Canada not forced to keep a certain standard, and the standard of all of the airlines is going to suffer.

If you only have one airline in Canada, it is open season on the Canadian public, not to mention the employees of Air Canada. When British Airways was getting ready for privatization, they laid off 23,000 employees. What is the value? How will the value of Air Canada be determined? We are going into the privatization for two reasons: first to satisfy the ideology of this Government; second, to provide a down payment for new planes.

How is the value of Air Canada going to be determined? We have not been told that. We have not been told how the value of this very valuable national resource is going to be determined. Are we are giving up *carte blanche* in this House of Commons to an underwriting syndicate decision-making on the value of Air Canada? We are giving up, without any parliamentary review, to an underwriting syndicate the right to determine the value of Air Canada. That is incredible, particularly in view of the changes that were made in 1984 to the Financial Administration Act.

Under the Financial Administration Act, Parliament should be provided the opportunity to review that very vital aspect of a privatization of our national airline. We are not being given any consideration on that. Not only that, but both the Government and Air Canada have hired separate advisers on how they are going to handle the privatization. It is difficult to arrive at a fair price. It seems that the Government and Air Canada have no idea as to how they are going to arrive at that fair price. The people who are continually going to be left in the dark and in the lurch are the public of Canada.

What consideration should the people of Canada be given? One thing that should not be happening is the public of Canada being treated with indifference in the attempt by this Government to privatize Air Canada with obscene haste. That

is exactly what is happening. The Government does not want public scrutiny of this privatization. That is the reason why it is pushing the Bill through so quickly. That is the reason why it only allowed one day of hearings, without opportunity for the people in the regions to be heard. Air Canada has not only been a service; it has been a builder of Canada. It has had a binding effect and it has been a source of bilingualism in Canada. It has been in existence for 51 years.

• (1140)

[*Translation*]

It was a reason and a force for bilingualism in Canada. Now bilingualism is no different from any other subject, and it is not very important to this Government.

It is incredible! But thinking about public issues, about the needs of the public, about the future of bilingualism, is not very important to this Government.

[*English*]

The privatization of Air Canada is giving us a tremendous insight into this Government. Along that same vein, the Government does not want Air Canada to be a window on the commercial airline practices of this country. The Government says it knows what is going on in the airline industry because it has a Crown corporation that is a player. The Government says: "Let's get rid of it and turn it over to the private sector. The people of Canada have no reason to know about what is going on in the airline industry in Canada or internationally."

What about prices, Mr. Speaker? We have been told by the Government that prices will go down with privatization. We were told that airline fares would go down with deregulation. Prices are not going down in the United States. They are going down on some select sexy routes people may want to take for winter vacations or routes between certain large cities. You see the rates advertised in the various newspapers and magazines. But if you ask people in the smaller towns and smaller cities, they tell you prices are going up because there is no regulation on what airlines can do or charge. If one company raises prices, you will certainly not get a reduction in price by another airline, Mr. Speaker. You will most probably get an increase and maybe competing airlines will hold on to the prices they had before. When one airline increases its prices, they all increase their prices. That is the way things have worked. We saw that happen at the gasoline pumps and with drug prices. There is no reason to think that this sort of thing will not happen with airline fares.

I would like to speak about some of the witnesses who came before our committee, particularly the unions who I thought gave excellent testimony. They were very sincere and pointed out an awful lot about the inside workings of Air Canada and the airline industry about which the people of Canada have a right to know. I am referring to the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers who complained, as did all unions, about the way the Government was rushing this Bill through committee without adequate debate and the hearing of sufficient witnesses. That was a position taken by all unions which appeared before the committee. With respect to the Canadian Union of Public Employees, CUPE, it said:

> New owners can contract out the work to foreign nationals possibly creating a lay-off situation. Air Canada threatened this in 1985 but backed off under political pressure. Once privatized, they will try again.

That is the word before a committee of a very important and significant union in this country which obviously knows what Air Canada tried to do in 1985. Although we were told that contracting out is not being contemplated, the union knows that contracting out was contemplated. CUPE is concerned not only about jobs but the level of service.

Air Canada wants more international routes—

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. At this time I would like to give the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan) an opportunity to make a correction to something he said in his speech. I heard the Hon. Member say that he had questioned as many people as possible during the committee hearing. I was a member of the committee and I am sure the Hon. Member will recall that when the Air Canada Employees Ownership Committee appeared before us the Hon. Member refused to question its witnesses. That is on the record of the committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That is not a point of order.

Mr. Orlikow: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): If the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North is going to elaborate on the same statement, it will not be a point of order either. It is debate. But I will listen to the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, as you have already pointed out the Member's intervention was not a point of order. The Member will remember that I did question that so-called committee and it had very few answers about its membership, its constitution—

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, I made reference only to the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys has the floor.

Mr. MacLellan: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall having said what has been attributed to me by the Hon. Member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception (Mr. Johnson) because we could not have possibly questioned all the witnesses, so few came before the committee on that one day that we were allowed to hear witnesses. I will certainly mention the group to which the Hon. Member referred. I have not left that out by any means. I am coming to that and I will be doing it very shortly.

Mr. Orlikow: A group of phoneys.

Mr. MacLellan: I want to refer now to the National Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers Union of Canada, the CAW. I have referred to its statement about contracting out. In the statement other good points were made which I think bear mentioning. These people reminded the committee that at least three criteria were identified by the former Minister of State for Privatization, now the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mrs. McDougall), as prerequisites for a Crown corporation to be turned over to the private sector.

The first of these criteria is that the Crown corporation in question no longer serves a public policy purpose. Air Canada certainly continues to serve a public policy purpose. It is serving the needs of the public of Canada. Air Canada is serving the Canadian public and is looking after the interests of Canadians with respect to the expected level of maintenance as well as competition. If we do not have that public policy purpose, then, of course, it is the Government that is throwing away the public policy purpose. Certainly one is there if the Government is to recognize its responsibility.

The second criteria governing the sale of Crown corporations is that the corporation adds to the national debt. Air Canada does not add to the national debt. Air Canada has not been granted any funding for a great many years. Since 1973, I think, there have been only two years when Air Canada had a deficit. But the Government will ignore that. In 1986, Air Canada reported a profit of $40.4 million. In 1987, Air Canada reported a $45.7 million profit, a 13 per cent increase over the profit in 1986.

The third criteria stated by the previous Minister of State for Privatization for a change from public to private status is that the Crown corporation is unable to compete effectively. Air Canada has shown that it is perfectly able to compete effectively. The Government sets out these three criteria and has proceeded to ignore them. How many times have we seen that happen not only with respect to Air Canada but with respect to so many other things? The Government tries to set out policy, then does not like the results of the policy it set out and proceeds to ignore it. Perhaps it is because the Government has become bored trying to act in the public's interest or because it offends some of the vested interests to which this Government tries so hard to be nice.

In the same brief it is quoted by the CAW that:

> Air Canada workers in Atlantic Canada, Quebec, northern Ontario, Saskatchewan and British Columbia can look forward to a choice between leaving their homes and communities or accepting a $6 an hour job with a commuter carrier or being out of a job altogether.

That is a sad commentary if that is what is going on in this country. We were assured that that is exactly what is going on in this country today.

• (1150)

The major airlines are dropping services to many communities and some of these services are being picked up by feeder airlines which pay their employees considerably less than the major airlines. The alternative is that service is not being provided at all.

We were told something very interesting by the executive of Air Canada. We were told that there was no surplus in the Air Canada pension plan. Yet, the presentation made to us by the CAW states:

> As of December 31, 1987, according to the company's annual report, the Air Canada pension fund had a market value of $2.35 billion (this was *after* the October 1987 stock market crash), compared to liabilities of $1.87 billion, for a surplus of $485 million. This pension piggy bank will be a very tempting target for a private corporation.

The company told us that there was no surplus in the pension plan. I refer this very important question to the other place when it gives consideration to this Bill, as it undoubtedly will shortly.

I want to refer to the group that the Hon. Member from Newfoundland mentioned just a few minutes ago. This is a group called the Air Canada Employee Ownership Committee.

Mr. Orlikow: Who are they?

Mr. MacLellan: Who are they indeed. That is probably one of the best kept secrets in Canada.

We have to take this in the context of the situation in which it occurred. We have to consider first that the Government only allowed one day for witnesses in committee, and the pilots were our first witnesses. Then all the other unions were lumped together in one group. Then as our third set of witnesses we heard two people from the private sector. The fifth group, the executives of Air Canada, followed in the evening, but the fourth group of witnesses was this group called Air Canada Employee Ownership Committee.

This is a group with no constitution, no executive, no standing before the law whatsoever—

Mr. Orlikow: No membership list.

Mr. MacLellan: No membership list whatsoever. It is one of the most clandestine organizations, evidently, in Canada. This group was brought in even though public consumer groups such as Transportation 2000 were denied access to the committee. This group was brought in to refute the testimony of the unions. It was the equivalent of union busting.

The Government flatly denied that the unions had the right to speak on behalf of the workers of Air Canada so it brought forward this group comprised of employees of Air Canada. The only criteria for being a member of this committee is to send in $2.

The Hon. Member from Newfoundland is correct. I refused to question this group because I refused to be a part of what the Government was trying to do. I took this as an affront. Even if the union executive did not have any members who agreed with it, the union executive still, constitutionally, has the right to speak for its membership. The Government did not

recognize that and it agreed to let the union speak only to try to overturn its testimony by having members of the government side put the same questions to this bogus group as were put to the unions in the morning.

I have no objections to the members of this committee. They are good people. I do not want to be condescending to them, but I do not—

Mr. Blenkarn: You wouldn't even question them. You wouldn't even talk to them.

Mr. MacLellan: That's right, because they don't have any standing. It was trumped up by the Government to override what the unions were saying.

Mr. Blenkarn: You're so high-handed, you wouldn't even talk to them. God, you think a lot of yourself.

Mr. MacLellan: It just goes to show the inferiority and insecurity of this Government, with 208 Members—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. This is only Thursday. I would hope that the Hon. Member would allow the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys to finish his speech.

Mr. MacLellan: This is another example of government Members not wanting to hear the truth. The truth stings their little eardrums. I will simply continue as if I had not been rudely interrupted by the Hon. Member.

In its presentation, the Air Canada Employee Ownership Committee said:

> In the early summer of 1984 our committee started a campaign in Air Canada to develop awareness and interest from our fellow employees. We focused this campaign on the benefits and opportunities that privatization would present. Two years later we had received donations from over 7,500 employees.

However, the committee does not have a membership list. There could be 7,500, 750, 75 or 7 members of this committee. It is obvious that the committee was set up primarily and exclusively to try to push through the privatization of Air Canada. It is incredible that it was allotted standing by the Government before a committee when so many people in Canada were denied access to the committee.

I think the whole situation is a travesty. We are privatizing a public corporation that is already owned by the people of Canada. We are telling them how great it is that they will be able to buy shares in a company they already own. However, 25 per cent of the shares they already own will be held by non-residents. We are trying to tell Canadians that they will have lower fares when actually the experience in other countries has shown that fares have increased.

We are telling Canadians that they are going into a brave new world, probably the same brave new world that George Orwell described. The new world of deregulation and privatization is a world in which aircraft will be late, flights will be cancelled, seats will be jammed in closer to allow for more passengers, food services will be worse, there will be overbooking and maintenance will be pushed way down on the priority list of the airline. Perhaps there will even be contracting out of maintenance, as the unions warned would happen.

Canada is a large country that needs a public airline. Air Canada has set the standard for airline services in Canada. If Air Canada is allowed to reduce its services, then of course the others will follow suit and all of them will make more money. That is what the Government thinks is great. It does not matter that the services to the public will be reduced and that the consumers will be inconvenienced. It is important, though, that some people make more money.

We have heard that most of the airlines in the world are now privatized. Why is this Government following like a bunch of lemmings, taking the Canadian public over the cliff with it, by privatizing this asset just because it has been done in other countries? This will be a day that Canadians will remember, along with the day this Bill gets Royal Assent, because this is the day the Government of Canada has disregarded the interests and jeopardized the safety of the Canadian public by throwing away the standard of airline services we have had in Canada for 51 years.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, members of the New Democratic Party have opposed this Bill from the day it was introduced. Everything we have seen and heard since then has convinced us more than ever that we were right.

We saw the spectacle of the Government imposing closure at second reading stage. We saw the spectacle of the Conservative majority members of the committee ramming through a motion that provided that all witnesses would be heard on one day. That meant the committee could not travel. That meant the number of witnesses that could be heard was very limited. That meant those witnesses who were heard were given a very short period of time.

• (1200)

I am sorry that the Parliamentary Secretary is not here because yesterday I heard him make one of the most unfair, dishonest and partisan speeches I have ever heard. He accused members of the Opposition, who wanted a longer debate on another Bill, of filibustering. He was a member of the Conservative gang who stormed the Speaker's chair, disrupted this House, kept the bells ringing for 16 days, and he has the gall to accuse Members on this side of perverting the parliamentary process and being undemocratic. He was a member of the parliamentary task force in 1980 which travelled this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, visited almost every major city and many towns, looking into the problems of employment in the 1980s, and he has the gall to accuse Members who want the free trade committee to travel of wanting to travel so they can go fishing and have fancy meals. It takes an awful lot of gall and a big set of blinders so that he can see only what he wants to see.

The facts are that we are dealing with a situation of tremendous importance to this country. I remind Hon. Members that it was the first Prime Minister of Canada who realized that the economic lines of this continent run north and south. He realized that without a railway there would be no Canada. He got the people and Government of Canada to give hundreds of millions in loans, grants and land so a railway would be built. Today that would amount to tens of billions of dollars.

It was a Liberal Government, more than 50 years ago, on the instigation of the best businessman in that Government, C. D. Howe, who realized that we needed a national airline and that the private sector was not ready to participate because they could not see a profit, and who set up a national, publicly-owned airline. That company, first called Trans-Canada Air Lines, now Air Canada, has been a major success in every way. It has provided service to the people of Canada. It has made a profit in almost every one of the 51 years it has been in operation. It already belongs to all the people of Canada, so to suggest that we privatize it in order to give the people of Canada the right to participate in ownership is, to say the least, misrepresenting the facts.

I remind Hon. Members that the current Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said on January 15, 1985, that Air Canada was not for sale at that time. He said: "There may be some persuasive arguments in the case of Air Canada some people can make in regard to the disposition of equity. I will take a look at it. But Canada needs a national airline". Yet what we have is a proposal to sell 45 per cent of Air Canada. Not only that, when the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) gave notice of this he said: "The legislation will permit the transfer of all Air Canada shares to the public". In other words, this is just the first bite.

How do the people of Canada feel about this? On March 31 of this year *The Toronto Star* published the results of a poll taken by Angus Reid. The question was: Should the Government sell any of the following Crown corporations to the private sector? Air Canada: Not sell, 53 per cent of the people. Sell, 35 per cent of the people. On March 5, 1988, *The Globe and Mail* published the results of a similar poll taken by Environics. The question was: Do you think the Government should or should not sell Air Canada? Should, 31 per cent. Should not, 51 per cent.

Why is the Government doing it? There is no reason. It does not have to do it because Air Canada is not operating efficiently. It does not have to do it because the people of Canada want Air Canada sold. It is doing it because of its commitment to the idea that the private sector can do anything better than the private sector. Therefore, sell off everything that can be sold off.

This ignores the history and experience of Canada. Our experience is that Governments, federal and provincial, Conservative, Liberal, Social Credit, PQ, CCF or NDP have at various times realized that there was a need for a certain service which the private sector was not prepared to provide. Therefore, the Government of the day, federal or provincial, set up a Crown corporation to do what was necessary.

The Liberal Member who led off this debate talked about how the committee was restricted in its hearings. Yet we heard some very potent points made by some of those who appeared. The unions pointed out that the share price which will be set for the 45 per cent of the company that will be sold would be low because it is only a minority of the shares and therefore the private sector would be loathe to buy it. Besides that, since last October the value of shares has plummeted. That view was expressed not just by the unions, it was expressed by representatives in the industry who market shares. It was shared and expressed by the head of British Airways, which is privately owned.

We are seeing a Government so determined to do what its ideology tells it to do that it is going to sell a controlling interest in the company for $300 million. Yet the company has assets worth close to $3 billion.

Let me just take a moment to talk about this so-called Air Canada employees group which came forward to argue for the privatization. This group has ostensibly been in operation for four years or more, yet when I asked them who they were, they admitted they had no officers, they had no membership lists, they had no executive, they had no constitution, and in fact had no real organization. So much for that organization.

We are told that the Government is proposing in this Bill to sell only 45 per cent of the company and 55 per cent of the shares will still belong to the people of Canada. The Government says they will be handled in a passive way. That means that the government shares will not be voted when any questions are discussed. That means that the owners of the 45 per cent of the shares will decide on issues important to Air Canada. The Government says that no one person can own more than 10 per cent of the shares. The Government is not saying that one person will own one-tenth of the shares but that one person or one group of people can own 10 per cent of the 45 per cent which will be voting on decisions the company has to make. That means that if two groups have 10 per cent each they will in fact control the company, they will make the decisions about company operations, company purchases of planes, and everything else.

• (1210)

We moved an amendment on the issue of foreign ownership because this Bill says that the foreign ownership of Air Canada shares will be limited to 25 per cent. We moved an amendment which, of course, was defeated, that foreign ownership be limited to 5 per cent. We did that because a 5 per cent foreign ownership restriction would prevent Air Canada from falling into foreign hands.

As I have said, the Government has indicated that 45 per cent of Air Canada shares will be sold and that the remaining 55 per cent will be voted passively. In other words, the 45 per

cent tail will wag the 55 per cent dog. The foreign-held 25 per cent could well constitute a majority of the 45 per cent total of privately held shares. Clearly the people of Canada do not want Air Canada controlled by foreign interests because Air Canada is Canada's national airline.

We should also realize that the 25 per cent limitation exists because that is the limitation the United States places on foreign ownership of its airlines. If and when the United States changes that proportion, as it is widely expected to do in the next two years, as a result of free trade Canada will be under tremendous pressure to harmonize. When that occurs partnership arrangements will be extended when, for example, American Airlines buys out Canadian Airlines as a partner in the building of the third terminal building of Toronto.

These were warnings given to the committee by Professor Fred Lazar, a transport economist at York University which, of course, the Conservative majority on the committee ignored completely.

We moved an amendment which would limit the number of shares that the Minister could sell or otherwise dispose of to 45 per cent. Nowhere in this Bill is there a limit on the amount of Air Canada shares that can be sold. The Government says it will sell only 45 per cent of the shares but Clause 8 leaves the percentage figure entirely open. It could be 1 per cent, 100 per cent, or anywhere in between.

This amendment takes the Government at its word that it wants to keep a majority share and inserts 45 per cent which would still give the Government majority control. We believe, of course, that Air Canada should be 100 per cent publicly owned and the Government, if it meant what it said, should have supported our amendment which, of course, it did not do.

Clauses in this Bill supposedly guarantee that Air Canada will maintain its maintenance and overhaul bases in Winnipeg, Montreal, and Mississauga. Very significantly, this Bill says nothing about the finance office located in Winnipeg which employs about 500. It was very clearly stated at committee that the Air Canada workforce, particularly the machinists, have no confidence in the maintenance bases being kept in the cities of Winnipeg and Montreal.

The major base and most of the major offices of Air Canada were in Winnipeg from the day the company was formed. Without the approval of the then Government the officers of the then company, step by step, moved more and more of the company's operations, including the main overhaul base, from Winnipeg to Montreal. We say, as do the unions, that there is nothing in this Bill which guarantees that the workforce in the bases in Winnipeg or Toronto will remain at the numbers which they have at the present time.

The amendment we moved extended the guarantees to those cities by adding that the workforce at each would equal those attained in the 1987-88 financial year. In this way Air Canada management will guarantee jobs in these cities. That amendment was rejected out of hand by the government Members of this House. Of course, nothing has been said about the finance office.

We moved an amendment which would guarantee that flight attendants would also be considered to have permanent bases in these cities where Air Canada now has bases; Montreal, Halifax, Calgary, Winnipeg, Toronto, and Vancouver. Air Canada now has six bases. The flight attendants' union, CUPE, wants these bases maintained for the same reasons that the machinists want bases maintained. They believe that Air Canada is a national airline and should represent the entire country, not only the largest cities. They see Air Canada heading toward only two bases; Vancouver with its international focus, and Toronto. Smaller regional centres will be squeezed out.

What this will do to the staff is simply horrendous. They will have to move, which will create tremendous problems, work for one of the feeder lines at a fraction of the wages they now get, or lose their jobs. That amendment was rejected by the Government.

We moved amendments which would require Air Canada to maintain its existing standards in respect to safety, maintenance, and customer service. That amendment would require the Commissioner of Official Languages to monitor the bilingual nature of Air Canada because we understand that Air Canada management has been lobbying to have Clause 10, which supposedly guarantees that, removed. However, we failed in all these amendments.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, there is no legitimate reason for this proposal by the Government. The company is efficient. It is providing service for the people of Canada. Where it has cut back on its service to smaller centres, this has been done because of deregulation and because it is cheaper for feeder lines, which do not have the same standards of wages and safety which Air Canada has, to service these areas. It has been a financial success.

We are dealing with a Bill brought forward specifically to meet the very right-wing, pro-enterprise ideology of this Conservative Government. We say that this Bill is wrong. We said that at the beginning and will continue to say it. I hope that in the not-too-distant future we will have a government which is not Conservative, a government which will reinstate Air Canada as a publicly-owned corporation.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few brief comments. When opposition Members talk about the need for the Government of Canada to have a national airline or a national railway, I believe they are forgetting that the first railway across this great country was built by private enterprise.

• (1220)

It was built by Canadian Pacific and is still operating and providing good service. I doubt anyone in the Opposition can deny that Canadian Airlines International is presently serving

more cities and towns than our national airline, Air Canada, is serving.

The Opposition talks about contracting out of services and the fear that aircraft would be serviced overseas. Certainly no one in their right mind would think that an aircraft that needs servicing would not be serviced in another country but flown back to Canada. If it requires servicing in another country overseas, I am sure no pilot would take his plane off the ground to fly it back to Canada. Pilots have the greatest respect for safety and we should be proud that all Canadian airlines operate with a good safety record. We know that there will be accidents. Some of them will be a result of mechanical problems and some will be from human error. I do not think we will ever erase that possibility.

The airline employees who appeared before the committee were received quite favourably by the Liberal Government in 1981 when it was looking at the possibility of privatizing Air Canada. That is how that group of 7,500 came about.

Members have said that they did not have a chance for questioning enough people. The Canadian Air Line Pilots Association appeared. All of the unions representing the employees appeared, and there were two from the private sector. I might add, they were on the list of witnesses which the Opposition wanted to appear.

As far as I know, the Conservative majority on the committee willingly gave approval for the appearances of witnesses that the Opposition put forward.

I do not know why they did not want to have a group of people representing some 7,500 who voluntarily contributed to that association to appear before the committee and add their views on what was being said.

Of course, Air Canada management appeared. I was somewhat taken back when the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan) refused to question the airline ownership committee witnesses. I was astonished because I thought he would have wanted to get another view from the employees.

I do not know why the opposition Members want to travel across Canada. This matter has been discussed for some time and contrary to their view that people who appeared before the committee did not have enough time to prepare briefs, I suggest that they had months to prepare their briefs. They knew what they were doing. I was somewhat surprised that they could not put up stronger arguments against privatization.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, this supposed Air Canada group that believes in privatization has been in existence, they say, for more than four years. They have no formal organization, no membership list, no officers and no constitution. They certainly did not present us with a list of the 7,500 employees who have contributed. That is why we are skeptical about them.

The Hon. Member says that the railway was built by private interests. Of course it was, but surely the Member knows that the CPR promoters were encouraged to build the railway because they were given loans and grants, which were never repaid, in the form of hundreds of millions of acres of land which were worth hundreds of millions of dollars at that time and probably worth hundreds of billions of dollars now.

The Member suggests that our airlines are safe. I remind the Member that a royal commission led by Mr. Justice Dubin looked into airline safety and procedures in northern Ontario. His report was scathing.

I remind the Member from Newfoundland that the former Leader of the NDP in Alberta, Grant Notley, was killed in the crash of a small feeder airline plane which, according to reports, should never have travelled. The pilot travelled because the company was so determined to make a profit that it told him he either fly or be fired. This was not once, but many times.

We have very legitimate reasons for being very suspicious about the downgrading of safety standards in the airline industry in this country because of deregulation and because of privatization. The Member comes from Newfoundland, which has a very small and sparse population. He should be much more interested in safety than he seemed to be in his remarks today.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member will take the time to read *Hansard*, he will recognize that I did not say that airlines in Canada never have accidents. I said that we should be proud of the fact that our airlines have such a high standard of safety as they do.

I am concerned about safety, whether it is in Newfoundland or any part of Canada. To try to put fear into the people of Canada, as some members of the Opposition are doing, to say that our standard of safety will decrease, is hypocritical, I suggest. They should not do that. They are putting fear into the minds of people that it is not safe to travel on any airline except the one owned by the people of Canada, Air Canada.

Other airlines in this country have a good safety margin. I am not afraid to travel on any of them. We all realize that even if you walk down the street there is a certain element of danger. When one takes into consideration the number of people driving automobiles and the number of people who travel by air, it is safer to travel on an aircraft than it is to drive a motor car. Why do they not admit that?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Does the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North wish to respond?

Mr. Orlikow: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments are now terminated. Debate.

Mr. Roland de Corneille (Eglinton—Lawrence): Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not stand up and express my opposition to Bill C-129 in its present unamended form.

There are problems with this Bill from the most basic point of view, which is the question of the Government's responsibilities. We are certainly aware that there are many Crown corporations which outlive their usefulness as Crown corporations. Sometimes the private sector can be more effective and efficient.

Some Crown corporations need to be reviewed and undoubtedly, where there seems to be evidence that they can be run as well or better by private enterprise, there is no need for the Government to be in that particular business. I do not think that such a review should be criticized offhand. When the Government looks at Crown corporations to see whether they deserve to be turned over to the private sector, I think it is to be commended not criticized. However, having said that, the question has more to do with the rights of the Canadian people as such. The Government is supposed to be representing the people of Canada. It is supposed to be looking after our best interests, all of us throughout the entire country. When the Government undertakes in a philosophical way to decide all Crown corporations should be privatized, that is carrying the question from one extreme to the other. It is a most regrettable philosophical approach.

• (1230)

Obviously, there are some things that are much in the public interest. No government has the right to turn over to the private sector, out of its hands, those instruments which are essential to public safety, public welfare. That is what this debate really turns on. The issues of the Post Office, Air Canada and Petro-Canada are issues about which we have fundamental differences of opinion with the Government. We can see that the public interest is endangered by privatizing some of these organizations which we see will be lost to the best interests of the total public. Why do I say that? I say it for the simple reason that it is obvious that the objective of any private organization is to render a profit. The more competitive the issues are, the more important it is to render that profit. The more competitive the forces against you, the more is the temptation to try to cut service and cut safety, those things which are in the best interests of the public and you will do that in order to be more competitive. That is very obvious in the area of the airlines. We have seen what has happened in the United States and in other countries.

It is quite obvious that such corridors as Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal, and, perhaps, Québec City, are very lucrative. That is true for the Post Office, for Air Canada and for any corporation looking at the Canadian scene. Where we have a concentration of population, we can very well afford to utilize and exploit it for profit and operate on a relatively narrow margin. But when it comes to the wider areas of this vast nation, the Government has a responsibility to the people, to the public interests, not just at the moment but in case something happens.

We do not privatize the Armed Forces in case there is an emergency. We feel it is important that the country itself govern its own safety, protection and well-being. The same thing should apply to security of supplies of fossil fuels. It is imperative that this country retain enough control of the resources of this country so that in times of crisis or in war, it is not going to be compromised in terms of its lines of supply. The same thing applies, I suggest, to the whole question of the well-being of our people in the more remote areas. When we talk about their well-being, we can give lots of lip-service, as political parties sometimes do, to the concern of making Canada more accessible in the other regions and about regional development. It is nice to give lip service to this but we should also take action.

I suggest that our actions in terms of moving to the privatization of, for example, Air Canada, will inevitably lead to questions being raised by those concerned about efficiency and profit as to whether some of the flights should be reduced because they are not profitable and because they do not carry as many people as in the Toronto-Ottawa-Montreal corridors. These corridors are profitable because they have enough people and the airlines can have full scheduling. But we can see that the private sector might be tempted to cut some of these flights in areas which are not exactly lucrative.

I suggest the Government of Canada has a responsibility to look after the remote parts of Canada where there will be in fact a loss of service, and that is true of the Post Office, Air Canada and even of the railroads. This is a responsibility we have as a nation to those who are trying to live in the more remote parts of this country. They already pay a premium. People who live in the Northwest Territories, in Newfoundland which is remote to some of the heartland of our industry, or northern British Columbia and northern Ontario must be serviced. But it will not be profitable to give these people service. That is why the Government had to encourage the transportation industry in terms of the vast area of our country.

I was absolutely stunned by comments of the Hon. Member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception (Mr. Johnson) when he was talking about Canadian Pacific. It was, if I may be forgiven, Mr. Speaker, an ignorant statement, an ignorant comparison. We know perfectly well that in fact it was the stimulation of the Government of Canada that made CP Rail a possibility, the giving of lands and property and the Government's encouragement by way of loans. That was not an example of how private enterprise in fact brought about transportation links in this country. It was an example of how the co-operation between Government and private enterprise can work to advance such causes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception.

Mr. Johnson: First, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am not ignorant of the fact—

Mr. de Corneille: Mr. Speaker, I protest. This is not a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will make that decision, and I will listen to the Hon. Member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, I want to declare that I am not ignorant of the fact that the railway that was built by Canadian Pacific was financed in part through grants and loans to Canadian Pacific. Neither am I ignorant of the fact that it was a Progressive Conservative Government that made those loans.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member will have an opportunity to put that question to the Hon. Member for Eglinton—Lawrence after his speech.

Mr. de Corneille: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in listening, I noticed we were entering into a debate from the very beginning. I am sure you now notice that as well.

Continuing with my observations about the objectives of the Government in serving the people of Canada, I think we are all concerned, if we have any kind of sincerity at all, about service to people in remote areas of this country. If we are going to allow our public services to be governed by motives of profits, we are going to betray the development possibilities of the remote parts of Canada. They must be, as they were with the CPR, given some advance Government encouragement. That is what the people of Canada have always felt. That is how our country has been governed. That is why I suggest that this Bill in itself threatens the well-being of the people of Canada as a totality because when our remote areas are threatened, our future is threatened. We want to encourage people to go to the remote areas and feel they are Canadians with an equal chance. That is where the future of Canada may indeed exist.

First, I am opposed in principle to this Bill because it tends to move us from national concern in the field of air transport towards the realm of profit motives which may not necessarily be in the national interest.

The next point I wish to make is that we must examine the Bill itself. Where does the mandate come for the privatization of Air Canada? Was this the platform of the Conservative Government in the last election campaign? I do not recall hearing that and I guess I would have noticed it if it had been there. I do not remember that the people of Canada were told that if the Conservative Party was elected to become the Government of Canada that it would move to privatize Air Canada. In fact, I think there were some comments from the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) to the effect that Air Canada was not for sale.

• (1240)

I object to this because I do not believe the Government has a mandate to proceed with this Bill. Yet, with its heavy majority, it is proceeding nonetheless to put this Bill through the House at third reading. I do not believe that the public wants this. When I say that I understand that not long ago polls were conducted which asked Canadians whether they wanted to see Air Canada made a privatized institution. My understanding is that that poll indicated a rather strong opinion against privatizing Air Canada.

I understand that another poll was conducted later, a poll which asked about some of the company being privatized in order to give Canadians an opportunity to share in terms of giving capitalization to Air Canada. There were various reasons given as to why Air Canada might be privatized partially. Canadians are not conservative but careful. They thought that this proposal might be all right. They thought that to bring more capital into the situation in order to make the airline even more successful for the future was a good idea. The poll indicated that Canadians might be willing to go along with a partial and not a full privatization.

If we were to follow the wishes of the public, then we would see that this Bill does not achieve that. The Bill does not stipulate that the Government will stop at a partial sale of Air Canada. The Bill allows a large percentage of the company to be sold. While the Government may make announcements at the present time that it intends to sell 45 per cent of the shares, it might decide tomorrow that it would rather sell 90 per cent of it.

It is unfair for the Government to bring in a Bill which is as inaccurate as this Bill. It lacks in detail in that it asks the Parliament of Canada to pass a law which allows total *carte blanche* to Orders in Council or to decisions of a Prime Minister with respect to what he will do with something as important to the people of Canada as Air Canada.

It is tragic that in this Bill which I have in my hand one sees so little detail that protects the public, the workers and the future of the company. There is no statement about how much will be turned over finally. It is simply a press release. It is an opinion at the moment which considers how much right now the Government thinks should be sold. We have not been given proof that the sale of the shares that it does intend to sell is really going to bring about fair value to the people of Canada for what it is sold for. If 45 per cent is sold for $300 million, is it really worth it? Are not the company's goodwill and potential and present assets worth a lot more than that? Is it a good deal for the Canadian people? There are no figures, no commitments in the Bill put forward by the Government as to how much it will restrict itself to the selling off of Air Canada. Nor in this Bill are there any details relating to what the Government also promises verbally but which it refuses to put down on paper. There is nothing in the Bill about salaries.

What does the Bill say about salaries of employees in the future? What does it say about the pensions of people in Air

Canada who have devoted their lives and careers to this company and to the people of Canada, those people who chose Air Canada instead of some other carrier? What does it say in this Bill about their pensions? What does it say in the Bill about the pension fund that exists? I see nothing in the Bill about salaries, pensions or pension funds.

In the Standing Committee on Human Rights we have been studying the issue of older workers and their pensions. We have been worrying about what may be unfair to people who are older. We then find the Government turning around and not putting one word into this Bill to protect the human rights of these people. If some private group takes over and it has some power to exert its issues and views, some 22 per cent of the shareholders of the company can decide to eliminate, reduce or divert funds that belong to the workers, as we have seen in other corporations. There is nothing here in the Bill to protect them.

What is there in the Bill to consider the benefits of the workers? Where in the Bill is there a single word about their benefits? Where is there anything in the Bill about the relationship between unionized workers and the airline? Where is there protection about the agreements and understandings that usually take place between Crown corporations and their workers, the unions and their rights? Where are the human rights looked after? I also ask about employment equity. Mr. Speaker, can you find one word in this Bill which protects their rights or looks after these concerns?

I have spoken about the rights of Canadians. I am now talking about the rights of those workers who work for Air Canada. Their rights are not being protected. I suggest that efforts should be made to look at the Bill again in order to make it a decent Bill, a Bill that is worthy of being brought forward before the House of Commons. This Bill is simply in the loosest terms giving *carte blanche* to whomever may be sitting in power to be able to rule over the future of Air Canada on the one hand in terms of the percentage of shares or, on the other hand turning over to some unseen group of private people what has been over the decades built up as an equity by the employees in terms of the years they have worked. Not a word of protection has been put in the Bill by the Government because it is not concerned about the fate of these people.

Is this not incredible? I find it tragic that the Conservative Members do not want to protect the people. On the one hand we talk about human rights and all these fine pious ways in the committee on human rights and then turn around to see that the Government itself is not carrying out a protection of those people.

From the point of view of the people of Canada in general, or from the point of view of the people who are working for this corporation, I find this Bill to be unacceptable.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Are there questions or comments? The Hon. Member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the statement the Hon. Member made in regard to salary protection, I have to ask him if it is not true that in the event of an economic slowdown and a severe recession that Crown corporations in the past have used large scale lay-offs as cost-cutting measures. Is it not also true that salaries and wages in major private couriers are indeed higher than the Government's own counterparts? Is it not true that after this Bill passes that out of the 17 major airlines in the world there will be only two that will be wholly state owned, that in is Russia and in China.

• (1250)

With regard to protection of the employees, how come the Opposition did not have any amendments to put forward to that effect in the clause by clause debate? The Official Opposition had one amendment to make, and did not even make it. A government Member had to introduce it after the Member of the Liberal Party sitting on the committee left the room. I do not know why he left, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if he was sulky or what it was. He said it was because we had already started. The opposition Member had the same notice as government Members that the committee meeting was convening at a certain time and we were there, but members of the Opposition left without even introducing their own amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): On a point of order the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys.

Mr. MacLellan: Such drivel, my God!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Eglinton—Lawrence.

Mr. de Corneille: First, it is generally the ruling of the Speaker that comments about a person's presence or absence are regarded as being out of order. This has been a most impolite comment that has been made about whether or not the Member was present.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I do not know what happened in committee. This is the House of Commons. What happens in committee has nothing to do with the House of Commons. A committee is an arm of the House of Commons. Therefore, I hope that Hon. Members will keep their questions to what happens here. I will recognize the Hon. Member for Eglinton—Lawrence to complete his rebuttal to the Hon. Member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception.

Mr. de Corneille: I am glad you said that, Mr. Speaker, because I agree with you that it is most inappropriate to make comments about people's attendance in committee or in the House of Commons.

In terms of what was said about what other countries have, the thing that has to be said is what Canada has may be peculiar to a nation which has a very large geographical area and a very small population. What may apply to France does not apply to Canada.

Second, it is quite obvious, if there is nothing wrong then why fix it. For the reasons that I have cited one does not try to change something if there is nothing wrong with it. Over the years Air Canada has shown itself to be very competent and efficient.

I was asked about the salaries of employees and whether they would be dropped if there were some type of recession. As I pointed out, Crown corporations are less prone to start cutting because they would be cutting off routes if it were less efficient and less profitable than would be companies that do not have that mandate from the Government to perform. The whole point is that the Government of Canada has to mandate a protection of the remote parts of Canada whether or not those routes are always profitable. That is the Government's responsibility. The purpose of having a government is to look after the well being of the total population, not only those who are rich or happen to live in affluent areas.

This Government is not prepared to share the wealth with those areas that are less profitable. All this does is encourage Canadians in remote parts of the country to pour into the few cities, and that is not a direction that Canadian people want to have. That is why in this particular Bill there is another step in this direction. It is a negative direction and gives the message that the Government is not going to look after, encourage, and uphold the people in more remote parts of the country. Air Canada and Crown corporations will be less inclined to dismiss employees if their profits are threatened than companies that have to make it no matter what and have to survive because profit is their sole reason for existence.

Mr. MacLellan: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and on a point of misinformation brought forward by the Member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception (Mr. Johnson). There was more than one amendment presented. The amendment that the Government accepted was the one that it thought it could take credit for, which is the snivelling attitude that prevailed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That is not a point of order. I do not know what happened in committee. I would like to recognize the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister for a question or comment.

Mr. Hawkes: I found the Member's opening remarks rather outstanding in identifying a basic difference between the Government and the Opposition. Yesterday I talked about the Opposition being sloths—sleeping a lot, hanging upside down, and looking at the world upside down.

The Member said that an airline company that provided bad service and a bad safety record would produce maximum profit for shareholders. As someone who flies a lot, I would like to say to the employees of Air Canada, Canadian Airlines International, Wardair, and the other airlines that, as a customer of airlines, the better your service, the better your safety record, the more likely I am to pick you to fly on.

I suggest that it is the view of the Government that the move in the direction of privatization of Air Canada and leaving it unfettered in the competitive world of the airlines is already producing for Canadian airline travellers lower prices, better service, more frequent service, and a better safety record. In a competitive world it matters that an airline serves its customers well. That is the consequence. Profits will flow if an airline serves its customers well. Profits will not flow if it does not.

I wanted to put on the record the clarity of the two views: the Opposition states that bad service and a bad safety record produces profits. I say that it does not. Good service and a good safety record produces profits for airlines.

Mr. de Corneille: Indeed that would fit the philosophy of Adam Smith. That is a nice theoretical concept which is not borne out by the facts. It is tragic that the Hon. Member is unable and unwilling to look at the fact that cutting corners in order to be more competitive is an inevitable by-product that also comes from competition. Perhaps, in some cases there is cheaper service, but there is not safer service.

Those who are wealthy are in a position to be able to buy seats on airlines that have good records and will provide the service that they want in a nice, comfortable corridor between Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa, and Québec. But it does not guarantee and does not provide that safety for companies that are operating on a shoe-string budget that want to provide minimum service in order to be profitable in areas that are more remote.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Comments are now terminated. Is the House ready for the question? The Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong) will have the floor when the debate resumes.

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

CARMANAH VALLEY SPRUCE TREE HERITAGE

Mr. Roland de Corneille (Eglinton—Lawrence): Mr. Speaker, recently all Members of Parliament were sent a

spectacular poster depicting the giant Sitka spruce trees which grow in the Carmanah Valley of British Columbia. Unfortunately, the fate of these trees is very much in doubt.

MacMillan Bloedel has been granted a tree-farming licence for the area. To its credit, MacMillan Bloedel has placed a self-imposed moratorium on any logging or road-building operations. However, that moratorium will expire as of June 18.

Various conservation groups from divergent parts of Canada such as the Western Canada Wilderness Committee of Vancouver, B.C., and Nature Action of St. Bruno, Québec, have requested assistance from Members of Parliament in their fight to save the valley and these magnificent trees. At present, consultations are going on between MacMillan Bloedel and interested groups on how many hectares of this part of Canada's ecological heritage can be saved from the loggers' chainsaws.

I would like to add my voice to the campaign to have the Carmanah Valley preserved, and I ask and invite other Members of this House to lend their support. Hopefully, the Government will see fit to step in and add the valley to the Pacific Rim National Park before it is too late.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ANNUAL SOFTBALL GAME BETWEEN MEMBERS AND PAGES

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, "It's one, two, three and you're out at the old ball game"! And that is the way it was at the annual softball game last night between the all-Party "Expo" MPs and the "Blue Jay" Pages, played on the front lawn through the courtesy of our Hon. Speaker, with equipment secured and loaned by our co-operating security staff.

The game featured two home runs by Expos: The Hon. Member for Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle (Mr. Moore) and the Hon. Member for Westmorland—Kent (Mr. Robichaud), while Page Stephen Cassivi walloped the ball into the tulip patch. An outstanding pick-up by Page Suh Won Kim of a hard hit grounder brought applause from all sides as did a magnificent catch by Page Byron Horner. Every Page and every MP played magnificently.

The game featured happiness, goodwill and sportsmanship. Our esteemed Pages demonstrated that they not only perform with excellence in this Chamber but are able to carry the same expertise into all phases of their lives. Three cheers for our Pages!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

LAY-OFFS AMONG GRAIN HANDLERS

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, seasonal lay-offs in the Seaway grain trade threaten to become long-term lay-offs this summer. Five hundred of Thunder Bay's 1,300 grain handlers are laid off at the moment. So are 200 rail workers, nearly 100 seafarers, and 35 grain commission employees. About 500 seafarers in other Seaway communities are also laid off.

There are fears that one-third of Canada's inland fleet will be tied up throughout the coming crop year. The prairie drought is reducing yields sharply and special efforts will be required to keep the Seaway grain trade functioning.

The Wheat Board has always sent most of the grain bound for Atlantic markets down the St. Lawrence Seaway. The West Coast capacity limit of 18 to 19 million tonnes requires export via Thunder Bay in any good year. It is in the interest of the farmers as well as grain handlers, seafarers, and others involved in the Seaway trade to maintain the effectiveness of this most efficient system.

I urge the Minister responsible for the grain trade and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Bouchard) to ensure that Thunder Bay and the other Seaway ports have enough grain in the coming year to keep the system in good shape.

* * *

ABORTION

SUPREME COURT CASE—OPPOSITION TO POSTPONEMENT

Mr. Jim Jepson (London East): Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of distress that I learned, through the press unfortunately, that officials in the Justice Department have asked to defer the Borowski trial indefinitely. This trial is long overdue and many Canadians are awaiting the outcome to see if the court will indeed recognize that the innocent unborn child in the mother's womb has legal status and protection under the Charter.

I urge the Minister to allow this trial to proceed and that the justice system be allowed to follow its due course. I, for one Member, do not appreciate the intervention of Justice officials, and hope that the Borowski trial will proceed this October, as scheduled.

S. O. 21

[*Translation*]

MULTICULTURALISM

THE CANADA OF TOMORROW

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, we have talked a lot about multiculturalism this week, and so I thought that today, we would give a concrete example of what multiculturalism means, and that is why I decided to invite, from Montreal, people like Father Saitanis, Father Salatellis, Mr. Crilis and a number of youngsters who, at age 10, 12 and 14 speak excellent French and excellent English and who, above all, have the greatest respect for their culture and traditions—the culture and traditions of Greece. This is more or less the speech I wanted to make on multiculturalism, the speech I didn't have time to make. It is this concrete example we see today which is a symbol of the Canada we are building together, the Canada of tomorrow.

* * *

• (1405)

THE PRIME MINISTER

TRIBUTE TO PRINCIPAL SECRETARY

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to Bernard Roy, Principal Secretary of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) since 1984, who is leaving us this week to go back to Montreal. Quebecers and Canadians are aware of the fundamental role played by Mr. Roy in this Government, and we have all been able to appreciate his integrity, wisdom and strength of character, and his exemplary performance.

Mr. Speaker, we are sad to see Mr. Roy leave us, but I am sure that his wife Madeleine and his son Philippe will agree that our loss is their gain. Thank you, Bernard!

* * *

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

MINIMUM WAGE RATES

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, when a federal government contract is announced for some region of the country, most people generally react as though the region has been given a gift, or a little bit of pork, if we want to use the vernacular, but this is not true for everybody who is at the receiving end of those contracts.

The P.E.I. Dump Truck Association was before the Government Operations Committee and pointed out to us that it is the experience of its members that they get ripped off. While money is included in the original contract bid to cover the cost of hauling by dump truck, the wages and fees they are paid are bid downward and they work at a very marginal rate.

In response to this, the Government Operations Committee has recommended that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McInnes) take action to adopt the minimum fees that provinces put in place for the same sort of work, and that a little bit of justice be extended to these small independent entrepreneurs.

* * *

VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

TRIBUTE TO 4-H CLUB MOVEMENT

Mr. Felix Holtmann (Selkirk—Interlake): Mr. Speaker, "I pledge my head to clear thinking, my heart to greater loyalty, my hands to larger service, my health to better living, for my club, my community and my country".

With those chosen words, Mr. Speaker, tens of thousands of Canadians have become members of 4-H clubs, broadened their horizons and enhanced their lives.

The 4-H movement was founded 75 years ago by Mr. E. Ward Jones, Director of Extension Services in Agriculture at the University of Manitoba. The very first clubs were known as Boys and Girls Clubs and were formed in the towns of Roland, Starbuck, Warren, Darlingford, Manitou, Stonewall, Oak Lake, and Neepawa in the Province of Manitoba. In 1952, clubs became known as 4-H clubs.

I would ask this House to congratulate with me and acknowledge the tremendous benefit this great organization has provided for Canada's youth over the past 75 years.

* * *

ENVIRONMENT CANADA

CLOSURE OF ATMOSPHERIC ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICES

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the House Environment Canada's plan to close up to 50 Environment Canada atmospheric environmental offices across the country.

These offices are being closed due to technological and scientific improvements in the atmospheric environmental service, according to environmental officials. I applaud any move by Environment Canada to improve our weather forecasting service. However, I would like to caution the Minister that technology and machines should only be used to help augment the human capacity, not to replace it.

The Minister will know that many farmers, fishermen and other primary producers rely heavily on their local weather stations for accurate weather reporting. To remove this service

from these people would be a great disservice to their particular industries. I urge the Minister and the Government of the day to refrain from closing any of these offices at this time.

* * *

YOUTH

"STREET KID" SYNDROME—CALL FOR STUDY

Hon. J. Robert Howie (York—Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, there is a growing phenomenon in Canada which has become known as the "street kid" syndrome. It involves an increasing number of young people who are living in a variety of unoccupied spaces near our streets. They have very limited means and are subject to all the dangers and indignities which that implies. It is a growing problem which is no longer restricted to our largest cities. For run-aways, the problem runs much deeper than simply tracing their whereabouts.

I feel the federal Government should initiate an in-depth study of this problem, identify the causative factors, and blueprint the responsibilities of all three levels of government and the private sector, and propose remedial measures. We may discover an erosion of traditional family support resources.

These kids come to the streets for many different reasons but they do have one thing in common, they all need our help.

* * *

• (1410)

FORESTRY

RENEWAL OF FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL AGREEMENTS

Mr. John Parry (Kenora—Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, for more than a decade the federal Government has supported forest management activities in all provinces through federal-provincial forestry agreements. The agreements with Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are set to expire early next year.

The federal Cabinet must get its act together and direct the Minister of State for Forestry (Mr. Merrithew) to start renegotiating these agreements immediately. There is no time to delay. The federal Government's foot-dragging in this matter draws the question, is it not going to renew the agreements? This has already led to the Government of Ontario unwisely cutting back on reforestation.

The inaction of the federal PC Government and the actions of the Ontario Liberal Government could hurt the forestry sector in our province for years to come. As the forestry spokesperson for the New Democratic Party, I call upon the federal Government to move quickly to renew the agreements, and on the Government of Ontario to scrap its plans to reduce tree planting and, instead, increase its reforestation budget.

S. O. 21

CHILD CARE

INCREASED FEDERAL FUNDING

Mr. Albert Girard (Restigouche): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say that sincere congratulations are in order for the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp). With the announcement yesterday of an extra $1 billion, the total federal funding for day care will exceed $4 billion.

The objective to double the amount of day care spaces will be achieved, and I am pleased to note that my home Province of New Brunswick was the first to go on record as stating that this plan will work and we will achieve this goal.

Clearly the Progressive Conservative Government has listened to the Canadian people and has responded reasonably.

This program is the biggest infusion of public funds for child care that this country has ever known. Yet the Liberals say that it is not enough. It is easy for them to sit in opposition and criticize, but the real question is, what did they do for day care in the 20 years they were in power? We all know the answer to that question.

Again, hats off to the Hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GREAT LAKES PORTS—OPPOSITION TO WATER DIVERSION PROPOSALS

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the International Association of Great Lakes Ports held its annual conference in Valleyfield, Québec. One of the items dealt with at that conference was the diversion or possible diversion of water from the Great Lakes anywhere out of the basin.

This morning a resolution was passed which I would like to read into the record:

> WHEREAS, the Great Lakes represent a precious, God-given natural resource directly serving some 90 million residents of the United States and Canada, and
>
> WHEREAS, the Great Lakes region encompasses ports, cities, counties, states and provinces whose business, industry, recreation and ecology are in large measure dependent on the Great Lakes and their tributaries, and
>
> WHEREAS, the Great Lakes hold 20 per cent of the fresh waster in a world whose supply of fresh water is being rapidly depleted, and
>
> WHEREAS, maintenance of the fresh water supply in the Great Lakes is critical for the present and future well-being of the region, and
>
> WHEREAS, every inch of available water in the Great Lakes is essential for purposes of safe navigation for the carriage of agricultural, mineral and manufactured cargo through ports served by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway system,
>
> NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the International Association of Great Lakes Ports hereby goes on record as unequivocally

opposing any proposals to divert water from the Great Lakes for any purpose whatsoever.

I think it is time that this House pass legislation that would do the same thing.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

FEDERAL PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS—INCREASED OPPORTUNITIES FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. Don Ravis (Saskatoon East): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Jelinek) has recently announced a program that will improve the access of small business to federal government procurement. The program will increase the number of contracts awarded on a competitive basis and will increase the number of bidding opportunities.

As a result of these changes the most dynamic sector of the Canadian economy, which today accounts for 80 per cent of new jobs, will be able to benefit fully from government procurement. It also means that western business will have a much better chance to compete for federal contracts. In Saskatchewan, this will provide an additional source of diversification and will further stimulate small business growth.

As a small businessman I am proud to be part of a Government which is helping to make our small business community a better place in which to work and provide greater opportunities for employment.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ROAD SAFETY

OPPORTUNITY TO INSTALL SUPPLEMENTARY SAFETY DEVICES IN AUTOMOBILES

Mrs. Thérèse Killens (Saint-Michel—Ahuntsic): Mr. Speaker, I read in the papers that 1988 Chryslers are equipped with air bags for drivers of private cars. This additional protection for the driver is now standard equipment on the 1988 Chrysler Fifth Avenue manufactured since June 1988. It was, in fact, a Chrysler Fifth Avenue that my husband was driving when we had a head-on collision in September 1985, as result of which he suffered severe lacerations to his face, requiring intensive plastic surgery.

We all survived the accident because we had buckled our seat belts. However, the two passengers in the back suffered very serious spinal injuries because the back seat was not equipped with shoulder seat belts.

Since the accident, I have tabled petitions signed by 33,168 Canadians who are asking the Government to take immediate action and make the installation of air bags in the front and shoulder seat belts in the back of the car compulsory. I would urge all other automobile manufacturers to follow Chrysler's example and install the same safety devices.

* * *

• (1415)

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF NUCLEAR POWERED SUBMARINES

Mr. Brian White (Dauphin—Swan River): Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing the NDP cannot be accused of, it is letting the facts get in the way of good propaganda. A prime example is the Government's plan to build nuclear propelled submarines. The NDP's motto is: Where there is confusion, there is concern".

Here are some facts. The program will create 55,000 person years of work for Canadians. It is not a violation of the non-proliferation treaty. Nuclear propelled subs are the only ones that can control our Arctic.

The cost is $8 billion spread over a quarter of a century. The NDP, with its usual economic logic, has promised to reallocate that money many times over. However, the NDP defence policy will cost $1.9 billion more than that of the Government. That does not even include the cost of NORAD and NATO withdrawal.

Should Canada defend itself? Should we rebuild our navy? The Government says yes. What does the NDP say?

* * *

• (1420)

[*Translation*]

SOCIAL AFFAIRS

GOVERNMENT RESULTS

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montréal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, we are a few weeks or a few days from an election, and I hope that Monday the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) will call a general election so that we can rid the country of the Conservatives as quickly as posible.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Malépart: As the election draws near, it is important to remind everyone of this government's record with regard to families. It de-indexed family allowances and the child tax credit, and lowered the triggering income threshold, making fewer families eligible for the child tax credit. Insofar as daycare is concerned, this government has deceived the

population because the number one problem, as my colleague the Member for Outrement (Mrs. Pépin) has said, is the number of daycare spaces, and the fact that they need to be increased.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian people will remember this Conservative Government. Today I had the honour and the privilege of having lunch with Mrs. Solange Denis, the woman who buttonholed our very own Charlie Brown, and rest assured that she will not be voting Conservative.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

BENEFITS OF EMERGENCY MEASURES ACT

Mr. Vincent Della Noce (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State and Minister Responsible for Multiculturalism): Mr. Speaker, allow me to share with you the content of a telegram I received yesterday from a constituent, following the passage of Bill C-77. It reads as follows:

"I write to you as leader and spokesperson for the Italian-Canadian businessmen of Québec and as a native citizen of Canada, incarcerated and interned at Camp Petawawa, Ontario, in 1940, in the name of hundreds of family members of Italian origin and speaking also for those from the City of Toronto who were arrested and interned in the middle of the night, without arrest warrants, detained without charges being laid against them, and denied the right to consult a lawyer, and were then incarcerated for four years like common criminals and kept apart from their families. In the light of these facts, please congratulate the Right Honourable Prime Minister, Brian Mulroney, and his Minister, the Honourable Perrin Beatty, and the Government for having brought in and passed Bill C-77.

This is a very positive day for Canadians whatever their origin or religion. The new law will prevent the repetition of events such as the ones that occurred in Montréal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver and other cities in Canada during the Second World War when Italians, Germans, and Japanese Canadians were interned because of their ethnic origin.

Your Government will by this gesture go down in the history of our country as an honourable defender of the rights and the respect due to individuals, as opposed to the Liberal Government of 1940 that claimed to be the protector of minorities and ethnic groups."

I will conclude by saying this: the greatest honesty will lead to the greatest safety.

Signed: A wounded Canadian, Antonio Capobianco.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

DAY CARE

NUMBER OF SPACES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. This Minister's statement yesterday in the House is a fraud, misrepresentation and completely unacceptable. Mr. Speaker, the more one studies the statement, the closer one looks at it, the more one finds it is trickery.

With the dishonest statement he made yesterday, the Minister gave Canadian families the illusion that he was adding more day care spaces, when in fact . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order! I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Member, but such a comment is unparliamentary and I would ask the Hon. Member to withdraw the word "dishonest."

Mrs. Pépin: I withdraw the word "dishonest."

What I mean is that he was giving families the illusion that he was adding day care spaces, when in fact he has decreased the number of spaces promised in 1987.

What the Minister announced in December was mediocre. What he announced yesterday is worse. Why?

[*English*]

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, obviously not associating myself with any of the comments the Hon. Member makes, the Hon. Member must realize that the amount of money the Government of Canada put forward in December was based on the cost of a day care space at that time and the target of 200,000 spaces.

I was very clear in the announcement I made yesterday. I was not trying to create an illusion of anything other than the 200,000 space target. I said that the costs of spaces, our negotiations with the provinces, and the plans that had been submitted had come to a certain amount of money about which I have been very public. After some refinement and critical analysis of those plans the announcement was made of an additional $1 billion to be put into the child care package.

I find it interesting that the Member was wrong in her analysis yesterday and is wrong in her analysis today. She is leaving the impression that there were to be more than the 200,000 spaces created. That is not what I said and that is not what the statement says. She should go back to the drawing board, not only to read what I said but to understand exactly what was said.

Mrs. Pépin: Mr. Speaker, I did go back. I do not think that with $102 per child per year we can have more spaces.

Oral Questions

MINISTER'S POSITION

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, will the Minister admit today in this House that he is recycling child care spaces and toying with the expectations of Canadians? Will he admit that after four years of empty promises there will be no access to child care for at least one million children? What games are the Conservatives playing? Do they think that the parents of this country are so stupid that they cannot see through this?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe Canadian parents are that at all, but I think the Hon. Member is just as stupid as is her question.

Let us look at the Liberal record.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Epp (Provencher): They don't want to hear. In 1982-83 the Liberal Government of the day spent $83.3 million on day care. Its share was 39 per cent of the total costs. In 1983-84 it became very generous. Its expenditure went up to $87.2 million, and its share was reduced to 36 per cent.

The plan which we have brought in puts $6.4 billion into child care. It is an expenditure plan which, for the seven-year period, provides for almost $1 billion a year. At the end of the plan there will be $800 million a year to support it, that being the federal share only.

Only a Liberal could say that the expenditure in their last year in office of $96.9 million is more than our expenditure of $800 million per year.

• (1425)

PRIME MINISTER'S PROMISE

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, during his election campaign in 1984 the Prime Minister promised us a daycare program and national standards which would guarantee that the parents of Canadian children in cities, suburbs and rural areas would not have to worry about the quality of services their little children would receive. However, the Prime Minister broke his promises. There are no national standards and the provinces can do whatever they want.

Why did the Prime Minister break his promise to provide child care to everyone who needs it, and why did he break his promise to provide national standards? Why is he subjecting the children of this country to a lottery when it comes to child care?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister did not break his promise. He kept it.

The Prime Minister and my Cabinet colleagues have come forward with $6.4 billion and a comprehensive child care plan.

They may say it is not enough. The plan they want is one in which the state will have a space for everyone whether parents want it or not. The cost of it under the Katie Cook study is $11 billion a year. That is almost equal to the health care costs of the federal Government for running the entire health care system and the medical system.

Talk about smoke and mirrors. That is what she is doing. That is exactly the illusion she is trying to create in the House. There are $6.4 billion over seven years, 200,000 spaces, a program for native people, a program for initiatives, a program for stay-at-home mothers. The Prime Minister has kept his promise. They are the ones who have not.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—PROCEEDINGS IN U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. A few weeks ago the Prime Minister sent his Principal Secretary to Washington to try to get removed from the draft American bill to implement the trade deal a provision that would allow the American Government to set up a new system of investigating and monitoring Canadian imports. We have just learned that the Finance Committee of the Senate has approved a version of the bill that continues to contain this provision.

Why is the Government continuing to try to force its trade deal through Parliament when it is becoming increasingly clear that all this deal will do is expose Canada and its exports to even more trade harassment than was possible before? Why is the Government continuing with this foolish and harmful deal?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the Senate Finance Committee in the United States has just voted 11 to 0 in support of the free trade agreement.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McDermid: It is fascinating to see how the opposition Members represent progress in this regard as failure.

The Hon. Member knows full well that a number of issues were discussed both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate that we felt did not belong in the free trade agreement legislation. The recommendations which, I might say, are recommendations to the administration, contain no new powers, and do not single out Canada at all. The Hon. Member is absolutely wrong in his preamble.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. The Government does not seem to realize that the

United States Senate and its committees are there to serve American interests, not Canadian interests. I do not know why the Government does not have the guts to serve Canadian interests as strongly as the Senate is ready to serve American interests.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Does the Deputy Prime Minister not realize that the harmful provision that the Prime Minister sent Mr. Burney specifically to Washington to have removed is still in there, with one small change, that it will also apply to any other country foolish enough to enter into the same kind of free trade deal with the United States?

Why is the Government continuing with this deal in the face of this continued commitment of the United States to harass our exports?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, existing U.S. law allows United States industry to request of Government the investigation and monitoring of subsidy practices. That is allowed now. There are no new powers whatsoever in this suggested recommendation from the Senate. There are no new powers at all and it does not single out Canada. Nevertheless, we don't like it. We will be examining the final Bill very carefully to ensure that the free trade agreement benefits are not impaired. That is our responsibility and we will carry it out for all Canadians.

* * *

• (1430)

NATIONAL DEFENCE

TASK FORCE REPORT—NATIONAL BOUNDARIES RECOMMENDATION

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. Last week Southam News in Washington broke the story of a June 1987 task force report by officials in DND, External Affairs, and International Trade, who recommended in an executive summary the elimination of national boundaries in the area of defence between Canada and the United States.

The implications of this suppressed report are far-reaching insofar as they spell total Canadian defence industrial integration into the U.S. military industrial complex, and also imply a unified continental approach to defence planning itself.

Will the Government make this document public and clarify for the Canadian people whether it is government policy, and I quote from the document, to "eliminate national boundaries" in the area of defence?

Hon. Paul Dick (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I noticed a report appeared in one of the newspapers last week. It was unfortunately inaccurate because this report summary has been known to the public for about six months. It has been released and available to people. It was well known that this committee was sitting for a period of two years to look into the defence infrastructure of this country to see whether or not we were duplicating what the Americans have, or if we were doing something differently and how we could best co-ordinate, as we have done over many, many years.

CANADIAN SECURITY AND PRIORITIES

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the Associate Defence Minister is prepared to name the report and those who are responsible for writing the report, or whether he would table the report as I have just requested. The perspective of this report is continentalist. Canadian sovereignty receives no mention and is in fact viewed as detrimental to the defence relationship which should not be evaluated "in terms of costs and benefits to a single state".

Does the Minister acknowledge that Canadian security interests and priorities are in fact very different from those of the United States and that these very different perspectives cannot simply be rolled into one view of North American security?

Hon. Paul Dick (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that Canada's interests are different from the interests of United States. If the Hon. Member would read the White Paper he would find out that we want to protect Canadian sovereignty, we have suggested ways of doing that, whereas the New Democratic Party would like to give up Canadian sovereignty.

Mr. Rodriguez: Get serious!

Mr. Dick: It wants to withdraw from certain areas.

This is an ongoing process which looks at the infrastructure in Canada so we can be sovereign and independent in this country. Rather than quoting from some newspaper, why does the Hon. Member not read the White Paper?

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): Obviously the Associate Defence Minister is pretty desperate if he has to resort to that kind of childish rhetoric on the eve of an election.

INDUSTRIAL PLANNING—MILITARY PERSPECTIVE

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): This report also advocates the militarization of the Canadian economy and recommends that Canada:

> Incorporate a military perspective when considering industrial planning.

Is the Government going to follow the U.S. model of militarizing industry, which has undermined that country's productivity and competitiveness, and which some American economists argue very forcefully is destroying the American

economy? Is that what the Canadian Government, the Conservative Government, wants to do to the Canadian economy?

Hon. Paul Dick (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I think all Parties in this House agreed at the time of the White Paper that we had to do something to refurbish the Canadian Armed Forces. We decided we had to buy some new equipment. Instead of buying equipment overseas and off the shelf, we are trying to make it in Canada. We are trying to spread it around within the regions of Canada to have the best industrial benefits for the various regions. That is Canadian, that is sovereignty, and that is common sense. He should try it sometime.

* * *

DISASTERS

1985 GANDER AIR CRASH—REQUEST FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF JUDICIAL INQUIRY

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister and concerns the Gander air crash of December 12, 1985, which resulted in the unfortunate deaths of 256 people. Four members of the Canadian Aviation Safety Board, a former member of the board, several respected members of the aviation community, and Mrs. Theresa Griffin, the widow of the pilot who perished in the Gander tragedy, called earlier today for a judicial inquiry into all the circumstances surrounding the crash.

Given that the Deputy Prime Minister himself repeatedly called for such an inquiry into the 1978 crash at Cranbrook, British Columbia, which resulted in 43 deaths, and given that he himself later commissioned the Dubin inquiry, can he give his commitment here and now that he will ask for a judicial commission of inquiry into the Gander air crash?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the Act requires that a draft report be issued and that is exactly what we did with respect to the Gander crash in 1985. The Act also proposed that we could receive any representation by any concerned party in terms of the conclusions of the draft report. I think it would be more than irrelevant that the Minister or any government party could call any kind of inquiry without waiting for the final report.

My friend will admit that we could not reach a conclusion on a preliminary report. I think the Act is structured that way and I hope that my friend will respect an Act which was introduced by his Government.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, that response is totally inadequate. The Minister knows perfectly well there has been conflicting evidence, that there has been testimony which has been ignored, and that there has been information kept from the Canadian Aviation Safety Board. He will know that he himself sent a letter to the new chairman asking members of the board to obey the new chairman. Given that kind of interference already by this Government, is it not reasonable to expect that justice be done? Isn't the only way to do that to call for a Royal Commission of Inquiry into this accident? Otherwise justice will never be done and Canadians, Americans, and everyone else will never know the truth concerning this crash.

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it is always the same. Any kind of regular proceeding is decided by an Act, not by me, but by an Act of this House. This Act has decided we have to provide a preliminary report, and as I said before, we did, and any concerned party, including those who appeared yesterday, have the right to make a proposal, or to criticize, and then we will have a final report. At that time the Minister will consider the recommendations.

Once again, this Act was passed by your Party and I have to work within the rules. This was decided by you and I hope that you understand that, and will respect the Act that decided that I have to play the game by those rules.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF NUCLEAR-POWERED SUBMARINES

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister who will know that with each passing day more and more Canadians are speaking out against the Government's decision to spend billions of dollars of taxpayers' money on nuclear-powered hunter-killer submarines.

Mr. Siddon: Look at the Gallup polls, Nelson.

Mr. Riis: One defence analyst recently stated that "if the subs are really meant to scare anyone, the threat is surely half hearted. What would one of our new subs do if it came across a Russian or American sub in our waters? Sink it? Hardly . . . I believe that a fleet of icebreakers, along with super sophisticated underwater monitoring systems would do a better job of protecting our Canadian shores". Would the Deputy Prime Minister agree that this defence analyst is correct and that these submarines are in fact not only wasteful but a dangerous way to spend taxpayers' money?

Hon. Paul Dick (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, an analysis has been done and the proposal to use nuclear-powered submarines is $1.9 billion less then the proposal of the New Democratic Party. It gives a more effective coverage in the Atlantic, in the Pacific, and in the Arctic. If the Member felt he was going to protect the lives of

sailors by having them on an icebreaker going at four knots, and maybe being stuck in the ice and perhaps getting bombed, I think he was crazy, compared to what you can do by being under the ice.

• (1440)

COST OF ACQUISITION

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): This is somewhat perplexing, Mr. Speaker. I took these quotes from a document, a copy of which I have in my hand, which was sent out by the Conservative Member of Parliament for Nanaimo—Alberni, to individuals in his own riding. The document is entitled: "The Schellenberg Report".

The Minister will also know if he read *Maclean's* magazine that the Conservative Member of Parliament for Don Valley East commented on the nuclear submarines and stated: "The cost of these things boggles the mind". In the same article the Conservative Member of Parliament for Duvernay stated: "The problem that I have is to explain the $8 billion".

Is it not time for the Minister now to admit that not only are the people of Canada becoming disenchanted with this initiative by the Government but his own back-benchers are now starting to inform their own constituents that they too are against this expenditure?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Paul Dick (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to see how the New Democratic Party likes to propagate misinformation.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Dick: The fact is that the nuclear-powered submarines are a cheaper method of defending this country than what the New Democratic Party has suggested.

Mr. Riis: Better tell that to some of your Members, then.

Mr. Dick: The fact is that the average cost per year is $300 million, which is less than one-half of one per cent of what the social programs in this country cost on an annual basis.

The fact is that it is less than 3 per cent of the annual budget of the Department of National Defence.

If Hon. Members opposite would deal with facts they might even show that they had some common sense and knowledge, but they do not.

Oral Questions

CANADA POST CORPORATION

SYDNEY, N.S., POST OFFICE

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister responsible for Canada Post I direct my question to the Deputy Prime Minister. On June 17, 1988, in the House the Minister responsible said in response to a question from my colleague from Hamilton East with respect to the closure of post offices in 66 cities in Canada, including Sydney, Nova Scotia: "—post offices will be increased in number, not decreased, not closed."

Yesterday it was confirmed in the House that the post office in Sydney, Nova Scotia, which serves some 22,000 Canadians, would be closed, and some of its operations transferred to the private sector.

I would like to ask the Deputy Prime Minister why the Minister responsible for Canada Post on June 17, 1988, deliberately and wantonly left the impression with this House and those Canadians in those 66 communities, including Sydney, that there would be no closure of their post offices, nor would there be any privatizations of the facilities in those communities.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Lise Bourgault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, once again, with respect to the Sydney Post Office, those in charge were advised to move. So what Canada Post is doing now is to transfer the existing service to another building.

The Hon. Member is not informed if he asks such a question.

[*English*]

REQUEST THAT CORPORATION BE DIRECTED NOT TO CLOSE POST OFFICES

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are very much aware of the distortion and misleading statements coming from the Government concerning Canada Post.

Will the individual responding to the question give a clear and unequivocal undertaking to the House concerning the postal facilities named in those 66 communities, particularly in Sydney, Nova Scotia, that a directive will be given pursuant to the Financial Administration Act to Canada Post that there be no closures, none whatsoever, in those communities, and no privatization of the operations in those communities? Then maybe Canadians might believe.

Mrs. Lise Bourgault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely unbelievable to hear such a question. No, there is no closure of post offices. Again, no.

Oral Questions

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

MOVEMENT OF GRAIN THROUGH THUNDER BAY

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. As the Minister will know, there are over 800 workers in Thunder Bay who are involved in the grain industry lay-off, another 500 elsewhere in the Seaway system, and the suggestion by the lake carriers that up to one-third of the fleet will be tied up for more than a year. I want to ask the Minister of Transport what steps his Government will take to ensure that Thunder Bay gets it fair share of the movement of grain.

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for his question. I believe that everyone will admit that the drought that we have in western Canada is something which is extremely unfortunate.

At the present time the Canadian Wheat Board has not yet decided the levels of grain that will be transported. I believe that we are very sensitive to the issue that my friend has raised in terms of Thunder Bay. We are monitoring the situation very closely. We hope to be able, with the collaboration of the Canadian Wheat Board, to consider what the Hon. Member called a fair share of the transportation of grain.

LAID-OFF WORKERS ELIGIBILITY FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is to the Acting Minister for Employment and Immigration, whoever may be responding for the Minister today.

Thunder Bay is in a situation in which, because of the variable entrance requirements, 17 work weeks are required to be eligible for unemployment insurance. In addition, these individuals who are losing their jobs because of the drought situation should be treated in the same way that the prairie producers are being treated.

Is the Government prepared to waive the normal requirements of variable entrance so that those workers who only have 10 or 12 work weeks will now be eligible for unemployment insurance?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Monique Vézina (Minister of State (Employment and Immigration)): Mr. Speaker, I think that I can remind this House that unemployment insurance is to compensate workers who have lost their jobs; it is not a supplementary income program. We asked for a report on the situation that now exists in Thunder Bay. Our Department is studying it and I am convinced that with the Jobs Strategy and the number of programs we have in place, we can provide these workers with alternate income to help them through this difficult period of unemployment.

[*English*]

ABORTION

SUPREME COURT CASE—REQUEST THAT HEARING NOT BE POSTPONED

Mr. John Reimer (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. I was shocked and angered to learn through the media that the Minister was intervening to defer indefinitely the Borowski case scheduled to be heard by the Supreme Court in October.

Surely in light of the Morgentaler decision that left the rights of the unborn in a vacuum, and given the Minister's own words to the press that he does not want to go through trials and appeals wondering if the new abortion law Parliament might pass would be constitutional, why doesn't the Minister stop allowing his Department's bias to prejudge the case, withdraw his intervention, and allow the case to be heard?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I should correct the Hon. Member. There is no bias within the Department of Justice. I take full responsibility for any advice that I give to the Government. Indeed, in this particular case I am sure the Hon. Member, on reflection, will agree with me that we would want to have the case brought forward by Mr. Borowski considered in a legislative context.

The court has generally not wanted to talk in abstract terms but, rather, to have legislation or the opinion of Parliament with respect to a particular issue upon which to base its decision. Rather than being negative, I think I have taken an action which is supportive of having the Borowski case heard at an appropriate time in the future when Parliament has spoken on this very important and sensitive issue.

Mr. Belsher: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

ABORTION DEBATE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, in today's article in which that news was reported there is also a quotation attributed to the Minister that the Government has a preferred option in the abortion debate. Will the Minister clarify if that is fact, or whether or not he is being quoted out of context?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I was questioned fairly extensively in the Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General. If the Hon. Member were to ask his colleagues, the Hon. Member for London East and the Hon. Member for Kitchener, who were there, with respect to this particular issue he will find out what I actually did say and be able to draw his own conclusions.

TIMING OF COURT HEARING—MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the same Minister. I want to challenge his

assertion that he has responsibility to stage-manage the agenda of the Supreme Court of Canada. He indicated that the Supreme Court of Canada has a preference for not hearing cases in the abstract. I remind him that the Supreme Court of Canada agreed to hear this case. His opinion about preferences is his opinion.

What right and what authority does the Minister have to ask the Supreme Court of Canada to fall into line with the Government's legislative, and election timetable, since that is a factor, too?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1450)

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, this application as made will be decided by the court. We have received the factum of the appellant with respect to this issue in which he acknowledges that three of the issues before the court were not valid because the *Morgentaler* decision had indeed determined that Section 251 was unconstitutional.

We are not doing anything except taking our position, and we can make application to the court. We are not prejudging what the court will do. We are making an application, which I am entitled to do on behalf of the Government.

Mr. Nunziata: It's politically motivated, and you know it.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: It has nothing whatsoever to do with politics. Only a Liberal would say that. You should be ashamed of yourself.

GOVERNMENT POLICY

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister the following question. It is not a question about House business, it is a question about government policy.

What is the Government's policy on abortion? Six months ago the Supreme Court of Canada invalidated the law. My Leader called on the Government to act promptly to ensure that women received fair and equal treatment across Canada. The opposite has happened.

A three-headed resolution was put forward. It is on the Order Paper. It has been withdrawn, or has it been withdrawn? Where does the Government stand on abortion, and when will we have some action in the House?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada want us to deal with this issue.

Mr. Kaplan: Well, deal with it.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: They do not want the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party making it a partisan political issue. They want Members of Parliament to speak with their own conviction on a matter of conscience.

Our policy is quite clear. We want a free vote on the floor of the House of Commons. The Opposition has been obstructing us in every respect to bring this matter to a resolution. The Government House Leader will be moving very quickly to make sure that we do move and have a chance to debate this issue. I hope there will not be obstructionist tactics on the part of the Opposition with respect to a very complex and sensitive issue that the women of Canada and all people of Canada want resolved by us as parliamentarians.

* * *

REFUGEES

UKRAINIAN REFUGEES—ADMISSION TO CANADA

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Immigration I would like to direct my question to the Deputy Prime Minister. There are now more than 200 refugees from Poland, all of Ukrainian origin, in Vienna. They have applied for permission to come to Canada as refugees. They have been receiving support from the Department of External Affairs, but there seems to be some difficulties with the Department of Immigration.

Would the Deputy Prime Minister use his influence to speed up approval of those applications?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Monique Vézina (Minister of State for Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, if you allow me, I will take as notice the question that has just been asked and I will ask my colleague to pursue the matter with the Hon. Member.

[*English*]

REQUEST FOR EARLY APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, these applications have the support of the Ukrainian-Canadian Committee, and of the Ukrainian-Canadian Immigrant Aid Society. I have been told that the Department has a quota for refugees from eastern Europe of 3,400 per year. Virtually no Ukrainians have come in under this quota.

I would ask the Minister to ask the Minister of Immigration to use that quota to approve these applications as soon as possible.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Monique Vézina (Minister of State (Employment and Immigration)): Mr. Speaker, we have a level of immigration that we accept every year and of course, as a Government, we respect it. As I just said, with respect to this particular case that was just mentioned, I will ask my colleague to follow up.

Oral Questions

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

SPACE AGENCY—MONTREAL—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion or to the Minister responsible for Science and Technology. It concerns the awarding of research and development contracts to Quebec. As months go by, it becomes increasingly clear that Quebec is the federal Government's poor relation. We get the leftovers!

Some Hon. Members: Question!

Mr. Malépart: If we consider the figures for April, only $190,000 out of $13 million; in May, $788,000 out of $14 million. The Quebec Government and even the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Parizeau, have said that Quebec was not being treated fairly by the federal Government. And we are still waiting for a decision on the space agency.

My question for the two Ministers is this: Is the Government waiting to announce that the space agency will go to Quebec until all contracts have been awarded, which would mean the space agency would only administer contracts being carried out outside Quebec, or is the Government simply waiting for an election to be called so it can put this to political advantage?

[*English*]

Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of State (Science and Technology)): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is simply repeating what he has done in the past, and that is to quote selectively the performance of one Department, that is, the Department of Supply and Services. I can tell the Hon. Member that, in terms of contracts for the Province of Québec, in the term that we have been in power Québec has received in the grants area 49 per cent of the total national performance.

It is true that on the contract side it is somewhat less, but the average was 34 per cent. I can tell the Hon. Member that in one month the Department of Supply and Services issued 47 per cent of its total allocations for science and technology to the Province of Québec. It is quite true that in other months the performance has not been as high, but Québec has been treated very well by the federal Government in terms of science and technology.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST THAT MONTREAL BE CHOSEN AS SPACE AGENCY SITE

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, Quebec wants to know who is telling the truth. The Minister has certainly put himself in an awkward situation. Yesterday, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources said at a press conference in Quebec that it was true Quebec was not getting its fair share. And the Hon. Minister just told us we were getting more than we deserve. Quebecers would like to know who is telling the truth. I am convinced that Parizeau, Bourassa, the Mayor of Montreal and the Official Opposition are all telling the truth—that Quebec is not getting its fair share. Why don't you announce right now that the space agency will go to Montreal, with contracts?

Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, there are certainly a lot of people who are telling the truth, especially the Government. However, sometimes I have my doubts about the Opposition.

If we look at the published statistics, my colleague was quite right. Monthly figures on contributions and contracts for research and development in science and technology across the country vary enormously. I think the Hon. Member will have to admit that according to statistics published in recent years, percentages have varied from very low in certain months to as high as nearly 50 per cent.

If we look at the average federal contributions for research and development to industry, we see that in 1986-87, and the latest figures we have are for that year, Quebec received 34.3 per cent of federal contributions, while Ontario received 28.8 per cent, the Atlantic provinces 8 per cent and the rest 14.3 per cent. For the benefit of the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie, I would like to say that these statistics were provided by Statistics Canada in a report called: *Federal Government Science Expenditures by Region 81-82 to 86-87*. So I think that the distribution is fair and equitable, and that using monthly statistics only distorts the picture for Canadians.

* * *

[*English*]

HOUSING

PUBLIC WORKS—TRANSFER OF LAND TO VAUGHAN MUNICIPALITY

Mr. Reginald Stackhouse (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Minister of Public Works. Public Works Canada is about to transfer 100 acres of land to the municipality of Vaughan just north of Metro Toronto.

In view of the critical shortage of affordable housing in the entire Metro region, I ask the Minister if the Government will reconsider this matter to see if a town of 57,000 people needs 100 acres for its institutions, and if the Government can arrange that a majority of this land will be devoted to affordable housing?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the land to which the Hon. Member has referred has not yet been sold. As a condition of any sale Public Works is seeking a commitment from the Town of Vaughan that part of

those lands will be used for affordable and conventional housing, and an answer is expected from the municipal authority very soon.

* * *

• (1500)

PATENTS

PULP AND PAPER MAKING—DE LONG PROCESS

Mr. John Parry (Kenora—Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Hon. Minister of State for Science and Technology. It concerns the patent for the de Long process which has been owned by Canadian Patents and Developments Limited for some seven years now. It has the potential to revolutionize pulp and paper making by making possible, through the process of breaking down cellular fibres, the use of the hardwood so-called weed species.

Since Canadian Patents and Development Limited has held this patent for some seven years, could the Minister explain why no licences have ever been granted to commercialize it?

Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of State (Science and Technology)): Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with this dossier and I am also familiar with the fact that the inventor has had a licence to commercialize the technology for some time. However, there were some unfulfilled obligations which the inventor had to CPDL which put certain encumbrances upon the transfer of the technology to the private sector.

In any case, we are very much concerned that this technology should be utilized particularly in Canada, since it appears to be revolutionary and beneficial. CPDL, I am informed, has engaged a consultant to give it the advice it needs to bring this matter to a satisfactory conclusion. The consultant's report has now been received and CPDL will act accordingly on the advice.

USE OF TECHNOLOGY

Mr. John Parry (Kenora—Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, since this country has a deficit in pulp and paper machinery and processes, and since we have had expressions of interest in this technology from the U.S.S.R., Italy, and China, will the Minister assure this House that everything will be done to clear away the administrative obstructions to enable the marketing of this technology by Canadians for the benefit of Canadians?

Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of State (Science and Technology)): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Hon. Member that whatever we are able to do, that is the Government particularly in the sense of dealing with CPDL, will be done. However, should the case have to be resolved in the courts we would encourage the Crown agency to proceed in that fashion as well.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

TREATMENT OF OBSCENE VIDEO MAKERS

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Solicitor General I would like to ask my question of the Acting Prime Minister.

A year and a half ago the Liberal Party asked the Government to convene an independent inquiry into allegations of sexual harassment in the RCMP. The Government refused and we now see the results of that refusal.

Reports today confirm that almost one year after a female RCMP officer was the subject of a pornographic and an obscene video while she slept, the so-called punishment meted out at this point to her colleagues involved only "a fine and/or counselling". There was not a single day of work lost, nor a single suspension. Does the Government feel that that is an appropriate reaction and response for the activities of sexual harassment existing in the RCMP?

Mr. Murray Cardiff (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows full well a thorough and full investigation was completed by the Commissioner of the RCMP. It was decided that charges were not warranted at this time and the matter, we feel, has been cleared up.

REQUEST FOR INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF SITUATION

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where the female officer involved has been forced to transfer out of the Musical Ride. Obviously if she were in that kind of a situation she would not feel too comfortable staying there. Her colleagues haven't had a fine and haven't had a single day lost at work. They have not been suspended.

I want to ask the Government once again whether it feels the response to the obscene video that was prepared by officers in the RCMP, which is basically a fine or counselling, is an appropriate response. If not, will the Government do what the Liberal Party suggested a year and a half ago, and that is to have an independent assessment of the situation of sexual harassment which has been ongoing in the RCMP?

Mr. Murray Cardiff (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated previously, an investigation has been completed. There is still the possibility of disciplinary action being taken against the individuals involved. That will be taken care of.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Windsor-Walkerville, a single question.

THE ECONOMY

EXCHANGE VALUE OF DOLLAR—INTEREST RATE LEVELS

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Finance.

Yesterday in Windsor the Commissioner of Development indicated that several auto parts firms are seriously considering moving to the United States because of the appreciation of the value of the Canadian dollar, presaging the kind of thing that can happen particularly under free trade arrangements.

When will the Minister of Finance take action to do something about the interests rates which are elevating the value of the dollar, disadvantaging Canadian manufacturers in continuing their operations in Canada, and encouraging them to move to the United States at the cost of Canadian jobs?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I think that if the Hon. Member would look at the level of interest rates today relative to the United States and compare that interest rate spread to any time during the past eight or nine years, he will find that that is not out of line. My understanding is that the average for that period was about 1.40 per cent. The spread now is between 1.50 per cent and 1.60 per cent for the last number of months. We are in the same sort of ballpark as we have been.

I think that if people are looking at moving out of the country, there are other reasons. I would also caution the Hon. Member that, in the discussions that I have had with a number of manufacturers, they feel that they can be quite competitive at this level of the Canadian dollar because there are number of other considerations in the competitive position besides simply the level of the Canadian dollar.

Mr. McCurdy: Why should they have to?

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the House Leader for a statement of the business he intends to call for the coming week.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, as the Order Paper as of today has outlined, we will again be proceeding this afternoon with Bill C-129, the Air Canada Act, followed by Bill C-121, the reorganization and divestiture of Eldorado Nuclear and certain Acts in consequence thereof; followed by Bill C-110, third reading of the Canadian International Trade Tribunal; followed by Bill C-103, the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency; followed by Bill C-126, consideration of report stage of the Bretton Woods Bill; followed by Bill C-82, the lobbyists Bill; followed by Bill C-30, report stage of the National Parks Act and Bill C-73, an Act to provide for the implementation of an agreement respecting Indian lands in Ontario.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I note the Government said nothing about whether it intends to deal with the question of abortion either through the motion it has on the Order Paper or otherwise. I ask this not in any confrontational way but to seek clarification in terms of the operation of the House and because of the great interest in the how the Government will deal with this subject on the part of the public.

As the Government House Leader will recall, the Deputy Government House Leader said last week when I asked this question that he intended to call the Government's motion on abortion on Monday with a view to enabling any procedural issues to be argued and ruled on by the Speaker. Then it was well known and understood that the Government would call a motion for formal debate, if I am not mistaken Thursday of this week, today. Then on Monday morning I, and I presume my NDP counterpart, received a telephone message hours before the House was to open saying that the Government was not going to call the motion. The Deputy Government House Leader later said to the press and to myself that, in effect, the matter was going back to the government caucus.

I go through this because I want to provide an explanation as to why I am asking the question and also to make clear that contrary to what was said by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) in Question Period, there was no obstruction on the part of the Official Opposition preventing the Government from calling this matter for debate or bringing this matter for debate. In fact, we do not have the authority or ability to obstruct even if we wanted to because the Government controls absolutely the use of government time and designates what measures will be discussed.

I repeat, I am not raising this in a confrontational way. I think, however, that I should try to clear the air on this subject so as to give the Government a chance to clear the air because of the perplexity on the part of many people over what has happened on this subject this week as well as the interest of the public at large in having some clarification.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to respond.

Clearly it had been our intention, and it still is our intention, to bring forth the resolution to have the abortion issue debated. One of the reasons there was reluctance to proceed was that clearly both opposition Parties served notice that they would fight this issue on procedural grounds. That is a fact because in a preliminary way they clearly served notice that this would be fought on procedural grounds.

• (1510)

Having regard to that fact, the Deputy Government House Leader is in the process of organizing a meeting with House

Leaders. He is out of Ottawa today, but he will be around tomorrow. He hopes to meet with House Leaders to talk about this issue in more detail, to see if once again we can get some consensus and some understanding as to how we might proceed so that we do not have to get involved in a procedural wrangle. Quite frankly, we have always tried to approach important issues of this nature on a consensus point of view, particularly if there has to be some modification of the Standing Orders. We would hope that we could illicit that same kind of co-operation from both opposition Parties. That is the spirit in which the Deputy House Leader will be approaching, once again, the House Leaders of the two opposition Parties.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) that when the motion was first put on the Order Paper, it was very clearly a highly irregular motion. I think it is the first time in history that it has ever been put on the Order Paper in that form.

Naturally, all Parliamentarians want to ensure that it would be procedurally acceptable. In our humble evaluation, since it had no precedent, since it went against the Standing Orders in so many different ways, we felt that this was an inappropriate way for the Government to deal with this issue. If the Government wants to deal with the issue in the form of a motion, I suggest that motions can be put that are procedurally acceptable, or legislation can be introduced that is also procedurally acceptable.

I want to make it very clear that the Opposition does not control the business in the House of Commons. The Government introduces Bills or motions and proceeds, and we respond. I want to make that point, because the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) is trying to give the impression that we are somehow stopping this advance.

While I am on my feet, I want to ask the Deputy Prime Minister this. Earlier in the week the Deputy House Leader indicated that tax reform was now being considered for debate prior to the summer recess. I noticed that the Deputy Prime Minister did not mention that in his outline presented today. Can he either confirm that that is on the agenda or indicate whether that is off the list of legislation that the Government wishes passed prior to the summer recess?

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, to respond to the first part of the NDP House Leader's remarks, if I could take his remarks as an invitation to once again seek a consensus as to how we might proceed with an abortion resolution, I would be very pleased about that. I am sure the Deputy Government House Leader will want to explore that with him and with the opposition House Leader of the Liberal Party.

Second, with regards to the tax reform measures, I have simply outlined what I consider to be the order of business until next Thursday. I understand that there have been some discussions between the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) and/or his representatives, and representatives of the critics of the other two Parties, about the prospect of moving the tax reform legislation ahead. Hopefully, if we could arrive at some parameters of time to move it into committee so that the committee study could be proceeded with, that would be in the best interests of all Members of this House. Naturally, we will be exploring that, and I suspect that the Deputy Government House Leader will be exploring that with his counterparts when they meet, hopefully tomorrow.

Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) what has been a surprise to many, and that is the disappearance from the Order Paper of Bill C-79. I am talking about amendments to the Elections Act. There is an understanding between Parties that we want to plug the loopholes that allow one to drive a truckload of unreported election expenses—

An Hon. Member: All expenses have to be reported.

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): I thought there was an agreement. There is already a proposal that has been arrived at by an ad hoc committee of the three Parties. There is a letter that has been sent by the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan (Mr. Angus) to which this Party also subscribes. Can we have the assurance that these loopholes in the Elections Act will be plugged before we go into a national election? We would like to know what is happening with Bill C-79.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Hon. Member has raised that. On May 3 I wrote to both House Leaders of the two opposition Parties and I set out a proposal, including a new definition of election expenses which would be incorporated consistent with the recommendations of the Chief Electoral Officer. This proposition was turned down by the other two Parties. We are still prepared. I outlined eight different conditions, and I refer the Hon. Member to the letter.

An Hon. Member: Make it public.

Mr. Mazankowski: Because there was no agreement with regard to the definition of election expenses, I said fine, let us withdraw that for the time being but let us move on the other items with which we agree and then we can deal with the election expenses at that particular time.

Mr. Cassidy: Do you want to leave a loophole for the election?

Mr. Mazankowski: That is totally incorrect, and you should not say that. The Hon. Member from Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) takes great pride in speaking from his seat without any knowledge of the facts. The facts are here. I am prepared to table the letter, which clearly outlines our willingness to deal with the new definition of election expenses which would clarify the loophole to which the Hon. Member refers. If the Hon. Member is suggesting that we should open up the election expenses to include office equipment, rental expenses,

after the close of polls, and advertising taking place after the closing of the polls and transfers between registered Parties, candidates and local associations, and expenses incurred by candidates seeking nomination, which would have the effect of driving up election expenses and thereby asking the public Treasury to fund more of the election expenses, if he wants to create more of a boondoggle and a haven for people seeking office at the expense of the taxpayer, we are not going to accept that. We are prepared to debate it in committee and we are prepared to debate it on the floor of the House.

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, I would like to come back to the letter of eight points that the Deputy Prime Minister has just referred to, and remind him that a subsequent letter by the Hon. Deputy House Leader for the Government asked us to pass Bill C-79 and offered only seven conditions this time. It was seven concessions and not eight, which is a new definition of election expenses. Why do we not deal with a new definition of election expenses, or have the Government clearly admit that it wants to be able to overspend as it wants in the coming election?

Mr. Mazankowski: Because you were not prepared to deal with it.

Mr. Speaker: I will hear the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister in a moment. I do want to say to Hon. Members that this exchange, which has followed the usual Thursday afternoon question concerning the Government's intentions for the next few days, is getting far beyond that usual point of order. I will hear the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister, but I am not going to hear Hon. Members debate endlessly on matters which have really nothing to do with the appropriate question that was put to the Government and to the reply of the Government. The Hon. Deputy Prime Minister.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify only two points, and that is clearly that the letter of May 3 included a proposal to incorporate a new definition of election expenses pursuant to the recommendations of the Chief Electoral Officer. Because there was disagreement with regard to that, I again sought the co-operation of both opposition Parties to see if there could be a consideration given with regard to moving on all of those elements which we agreed on, with the exception of the election expenses.

It was only in an attempt to move it ahead. There was no agreement with regard to the proposal on election expenses. We are prepared to move in either direction and I am prepared to put in the legislation, either in the form of amendment or in the form of a new Bill, a new definition for election expenses, which I hope would be supported by all Parties.

Mr. Speaker: I am inviting Hon. Members to meet in the lobby to carry on this discussion. There are other Hon. Members with important matters. I would recognize the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue (Mrs. Mailly) on a question of privilege.

• (1520)

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I would prefer to hear this question of privilege. I have delayed it for some time.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGE

ALLEGED INTIMIDATION ATTEMPT WITH REGARD TO THE HON. MEMBER FOR GATINEAU

Ms. Claudy Mailly (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise today the question of privilege I gave you notice of, and I quote Beauchesne, the *Compendium of Canadian Parliamentary Practice*, Fourth Edition, citation 110, page 100.

> On the 26 of February 1701, the House of Commons of the United Kingdom resolved that to print or publish any libels reflecting upon any member of the House for or relating to his service therein was a high violation of the rights and privileges of the House. But to constitute a breach of privilege a libel upon a member must concern his character or conduct in his capacity as a member and the conduct or language on which the libel is based must be actions performed or words uttered in the actual transaction of the business of the House.

And further, Mr. Speaker, citation 111, paragraph (1), states that one of those breaches of privilege is the following:

> (1) Wilful misrepresentation of the proceedings of members is an offence of the same character as a libel.

And further on, citation 113 states that:

> An attack in a newspaper article is not a breach of privilege, unless it comes within the definition of privileges above given, and then . . .

. . . and further on it is said:

> . . . a member is bound to lay on the Table the newspaper in which the article complained of appears.

. . . and a bit further, Mr. Speaker, in citation 114, one reads:

> Sir Robert Atkyns, sometime Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, says that "the Commons' right and privilege so far extends, that not only what is done in the very House, sitting the Parliament, but whatever is done relating to them, during the Parliament and sitting the Parliament . . .

And the following is mentioned among others:

> . . . where a member sends to a minister the draft of a question . . .

or there is a communication between a member and a minister.

So, basing my argument on these articles of our practice, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask you to bring your judgment to bear on a question which affects me. The Public Service Alliance of Canada delivered a press release to my House of Commons office on July 7, 1988 which it distributed to all the media in the region and which bears the heading: "Memorandum to reporters/Editors". The title: "Language teachers are pressuring a Conservative Member." The by-line is: Ottawa. "federal government language teachers will personally deliver hundreds of postcards signed by supporters to Claudy Mailly, federal Conservative Member for the riding of Gatineau. The postcards are addressed to Ms. Mailly and bear the following message: "Yes, I support federal government language teachers in their negotiations with Treasury Board to maintain their preparation time and I ask you to intervene in their favour."

The text continues, and I now come to the purpose of my intervention:

"Ms. Mailly is a Federal Conservative Member in the National Capital Region who has not supported the teachers." The text then states that the language teachers will be holding their demonstration on July 6, on the eve, then, of the day this press release was delivered to me—at 2 o'clock pm, at 300 Notre-Dame Street, Gatineau, at Claudy Mailly's riding office, and there follows a phone number where additional information could be obtained.

So I would like to submit this document. First, not only do I find it an act of intimidation directed at me, but they want me to intervene, Mr. Speaker, in a collective agreement and to take sides with one of the parties.

Second, Mr. Speaker, what is even more serious is that it is false. Not only did I support the teachers when they called me during this demonstration, but CHOT Television filmed and broadcast it. I supported the teachers then, not as an intervenor in the collective agreement, because I know that it is my duty not to intervene in such matters, but as a Member of Parliament, by telling them that I was going to speak on their behalf to the President of the Treasury Board (Miss Carney) regarding their demands for preparation time and language of negotiations.

We were told that the negotiations were held entirely in English. So I interceded with the President of the Treasury Board. The Alliance was aware of this because I told the Alliance representative who was in my office. Television and radio reported these facts, but the weekly newspaper *Le Dimanche Outaouais*, of which I will table a copy, published a photo under which it says, "Demonstration at Claudy Mailly's Office: About thirty teachers of French as a second language working for the federal Government demonstrated in front of MP Claudy Mailly's office last Wednesday. Ms. Mailly is the only Member of Parliament who has not supported this group of 700 teachers who have been without a collective agreement for two years. The demonstrators gave 1,200 post cards of support from the people of Gatineau to Ms. Mailly's executive assistant in her absence." It does not mention at all that I spoke to them . . . Furthermore, I was away, Mr. Speaker, because I was in the House to vote on Bill C-72, which was really my duty as I saw it.

They took advantage of it, knowing very well that I fully supported Bill C-72, and that I would earn a reputation as a defender of French language rights. They chose that time to demonstrate in front of my office, without warning me. But despite that, I took the trouble to telephone the representative. They still distributed the erroneous communiqué and left it at my office.

I later wrote, Mr. Speaker, to the Public Service Alliance, to tell them that if they did not publicly apologize in a press release, because they knew they were wrong and admitted it, I would have to raise a question of privilege because I find it terrible that one would want to intimidate a Member of Parliament in the exercise of her duties in that way.

So I submit the case to you, Mr. Speaker, because I know that election fever is in the air and I would not want irresponsible journalists who do not check their sources to use what the Public Service Alliance has said with other unions, that they have blacklisted me to defeat me in my riding and that they have already begun to work at it. I find that is intimidation against me and besides, Mr. Speaker, if anyone defends francophones well, I do!

[*English*]

Mr. Della Noce: Mr. Speaker, during Question Period, the House Leader of the NDP—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Is it another point of order?

Mr. Della Noce: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Later. I listened with interest to the Hon. Member's statement and of course I will consider all comments and reserve my decision until perhaps next week.

Ms. Mailly: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, I confess myself a bit frustrated. I had hoped as a private Member to be able to raise a question about a private Member's Bill, Bill C-273, during the course of the House business question which took place a few minutes ago. I was on my feet on two or three occasions and was unable to raise the question.

I did send a note to the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) who is handling the House business question today. Unless he is in the government lobby, it will be a bit difficult to put the question to him. Perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary who is here can respond.

Perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary could say what is now the Government's intention with respect to the request which has been made jointly by the Hon. Member for Ottawa West (Mr. Daubney) as the sponsor of the Bill, the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) and myself and which was communicated to the House Leader and Deputy Prime

Minister last week by letter offering co-operation so that this Bill could be brought forward as a Government Order or so that some other means be found in order to ensure that it would be debated and pass third reading before the possibility of an adjournment leading to a summer or fall election.

• (1530)

Is it now the Government's intention to expedite the Bill so that action on political rights, which the Conservative Party promised in 1984, as well as my Party and I think the Liberals, will be taken and the Bill will be passed on third reading and into the Senate prior to the adjournment which may take place at almost any time?

Mr. Speaker: Just before I call on the Parliamentary Secretary, I want to say to the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre that I apologize for not having seen him earlier. My concern was that the exchange that was taking place was going well beyond its normal purpose and I do ask the Hon. Member to accept my apologies.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this is a subject dear to my heart. I served on the committee that dealt with the Private Members' Bill and I have great confidence that the committee worked well in a non-partisan fashion and came up with a piece of legislation that has a lot to commend itself to this House and to the nation.

I think the Government has made its position quite clear historically and perhaps I could repeat it. The Government is reluctant to intrude on the privileges of the House and of Members. There have been some very substantial advances in the handling of Private Members' Business which came about as a consequence of parliamentary reform in 1984-85. The Government would not want to be seen as dictating to the House in any fashion what the House should do about an initiative from a Member through Private Members' Hour. I think that has been explained before and the best I can do with respect to this particular intervention is to repeat it.

If the Hon. Member wants me to seek further clarification from the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski), I would be glad to do that. However, the House must remain master of its own destiny and procedures, in particular when it comes to Private Members' Hour.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I find that a little bit frustrating as well given that the Government chose not to present its own legislation over the course of the last three or four years and then let it be known it felt it was fulfilling its commitment through the Private Members' Bill which, as the Parliamentary Secretary said, was dealt with in a very responsible and co-operative way by all three Parties.

Could I have an assurance from the Parliamentary Secretary, speaking on behalf of the Government, that the Government, that is the Ministry and the Parliamentary Secretaries, will not deny unanimous consent if the Hon. Member for Ottawa West (Mr. Daubney) or some other Member were to seek unanimous consent for this matter to come forward through whatever procedural device is required so that it can be debated and pass third reading next week? Can that assurance be given so we will not have a situation where, in its anxiety to respect Private Members' Business, the Government winds up frustrating an initiative which is important to a lot of people and which is just on the brink of being adopted by this House, being threatened only by the clock.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I thought the Hon. Member went a little outside the line of questioning when he referred to the Government not bringing forward a Bill of its own. I would like to put that in context.

The country was in a great deal of trouble in September, 1984. This Government brought forward more legislation and dealt with it more efficiently than any Parliament in the history of this country. In June, 1988, alone we faced 19 dilatory motions which resulted in the wasting of the House's time with votes and so on. Those motions were put by his Party. With a little more co-operation we might have been able to deal with even more legislation.

I just wanted that on the record. To blame the Government for not solving all the nation's problems in four years is a bit much. With a little more co-operation and fewer dilatory motions and filibusters, we could have solved a few more. However, we will go to the people and see who gets to solve them for the next four years.

On the specific comment concerning this Bill and the Government's intentions, I repeat: The Government has not interfered with Private Members' Business in this Parliament, that is, the notion of Private Members' Business. To ask whether the Government will refuse unanimous consent is to imply something that simply does not need dealing with. The Government does not intend to interfere with Private Members' Business. The nature of this House, the precedents, and principles related to Private Members' Business are very important.

Mr. Cassidy: And you are killing the Bill.

Mr. Hawkes: The Member says "You are killing the Bill". The Government will not interfere with Private Members' Business.

Mr. David Daubney (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, it might be helpful if I were to advise the House of some developments relating to this Bill which stands in my name since the matter was raised, I guess, a week ago today.

As I understand it, there have been discussions in the caucuses of all three Parties and it would appear there might very well be unanimous consent to have this matter dealt with as if it were a Government order. However, I have also had discussions today with the Government House Leader, and understanding that this is a somewhat unprecedented request,

at least under parliamentary reform, and also understanding that he would like a period of time to discuss it with his Cabinet colleagues, I would like to take this opportunity of indicating in a friendly and informal way, give notice really, that I intend, perhaps on Monday of next week, to seek unanimous consent, after the Ministry has had an opportunity to examine my Bill and determine whether or not it would be in the public interest, to have it adopted as a government item.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Don Valley East on a point of order.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ALLEGED MISQUOTE IN *MACLEAN'S* MAGAZINE

Mr. Bill Attewell (Don Valley East): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) attributed a comment to me in this week's *Maclean's* magazine. He said it as though I had said the cost of the submarines would boggle the mind. I want to put the record straight. That is not a quote of what I said. I did say that some of my constituents have some genuine concerns about the cost. I did say that some of my constituents have some concerns about whether or not these submarines might be armed some day. I also went on to say that what we really need as a government is better education and more information for the public. I would use a word of caution at this stage about this program as well, and I am supportive of it, but that we do proceed but not too quickly. The public needs to be well informed on this as we proceed.

ALLEGED INCOMPLETE QUOTE IN *MACLEAN'S* MAGAZINE

Mr. Vincent Della Noce (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, my point is almost the same point as my hon. colleague. The NDP House Leader quoted me as saying in *Maclean's* magazine of July 18 something that I would have a hard time to explain. As usual, the NDP does not always read the whole article. However, I must confess this time that even if he had read it, it is not exactly what I said. *Maclean's* magazine did not report everything I said. What I said was: "No matter, $8 billion is a lot of cash. It is very hard to explain, but once you have the explanation that it is over a 25-year period and it is only $300 million a year, I have no problem at all. It is still a lot of cash but I have no problem at all to solve that. To update the fleet will cost more than that". I also said that at least 65 per cent of the project will be Canadian built and will create 55,000 person-years of work.

• (1540)

I just want to make it clear that the NDP did not quote me correctly and that *Maclean's* magazine did not quote the whole line. I have no problem in defending that. It is very easy to explain. It is too bad that my hon. colleague did not at least read the full line.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I will recognize the Hon. Member for Regina West on a point of order. I hope the Hon. Member for Regina West is not going to continue this afternoon's debate on defence.

Mr. Benjamin: Far be it from me to do that. I only want to quote the bard. Me thinks the last two speakers doth protest too much.

Mr. Speaker: On that note perhaps we could move to Orders of the Day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

AIR CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. de Cotret that Bill C-129, an Act to provide for the continuance of Air Canada under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares thereof to the public, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker: When the House rose at one o'clock the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong) had been recognized. Since he is not in the House I will recognize the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin).

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, east or west, in the case of Regina the twain shall meet.

I am delighted to have an opportunity to attempt to persuade the Government to change its mind on legislation, the whole foundation of which is based on the worst kind of mythology. I want to deal with some of the specific points of the Government and those outside of Parliament who have attempted to justify the privatization of one of the best airlines in the world on grounds of business management. The five-year business plan of Air Canada itself shows why the legislation is unjustified, unnecessary, and a waste of taxpayers' money, the money of Canadian investors, and money which otherwise could have gone to Air Canada.

I will deal first with Air Canada's five-year business plan which takes it up to 1991 inclusive. Air Canada's business plan specifically excludes any privatization or the selling of shares to the general public. Air Canada specifically states that its five-year plan does not taken into account privatization. Air Canada's business plan says:

> Profitability improves throughout the plan as does the debt/equity ratio because existing debt is retired and additional debt is not required. By 1990 the return on equity achieves the Corporate objective. Retained earnings grow steadily throughout the planning period.

That is without this Bill, Mr. Speaker. Air Canada has not changed its five-year plan since this Bill was brought in. Air

Canada is still operating on the basis of its five year business plan, which is without any privatization.

It has been stated repeatedly by the present Minister of Transport (Mr. Bouchard) and the two previous Ministers that the purpose of privatization is to give Air Canada capital to buy new planes. That may be a valid position except that Air Canada, in its five-year plan, says:

> —Air Canada will proceed with fleet renewal to take advantage of operating efficiencies available through new aircraft. The funds required for this multi-billion dollar investment will come largely from internally generated funds and borrowing. The airline's current drive to substantially increase earnings will therefore be maintained to generate the corporate share of the funds needed.

There is not a single word in Air Canada's own business plan about funds from the sale of shares.

It has been alleged by spokesmen from the government side, from outside this House, and from competing airlines, that Air Canada has the backing of the national Government, has access to government borrowings, et cetera.

My colleagues and good friends opposite forget that Air Canada itself says that it has received no equity infusion from the Government since 1977. That is 11 years ago. It says that it has received no government subsidies since 1962.

How does the Government explain its case that it is necessary to sell shares to the public in a company it already owns? That is another Barnum and Bailey con game if I ever saw one. As evidenced by Air Canada's own words, it does not need a nickel, has not received a nickel from the Government in equity since 1977, and has not received a nickel of subsidies since 1962.

Mr. Malone: Why do they want to be privatized?

Mr. Benjamin: My hon. friend asks why they want to be privatized. Mr. Jeanniot and Mr. Taylor of Air Canada are exactly the same as Mr. Lawless, the Chief Executive Officer of Canadian National who told the Transport Committee: "We'll take the capital money any way we can get it". I will explain to my hon. friend in a moment how Air Canada can and should be getting it. I will be happy to elucidate for my hon. friend.

The other reasons given for the legitimacy of privatizing Air Canada are better management, flexibility in management, and corporate decision making overnight without having to go to the Cabinet, Government, or Parliament of Canada. I raised this matter in the Transport Committee with officials of the Government, the Minister, and officials of Air Canada.

• (1550)

I asked whether Air Canada felt any restrictions on flexibility or management decisions in their daily and monthly operations. Air Canada said no. In fact, the Hon. Member for Dartmouth—Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall), who I believe was a member of the Transport Committee at the time, will know that the Liberal Government in 1977 decided that Air Canada should operate in a business-like fashion. According to the previous Government and the present Government, operating in a business-like fashion means one has to make a buck and not ask the Government for money. Air Canada has not asked for money, nor has it received any money.

When I asked that question in committee, the answer was no. It has not operated any differently than any other airline in this country. In fact, when Air Canada hears that Canadian Airlines International or Wardair holds a seat sale, Air Canada management has all the flexibility to announce the same fare or even a lower one overnight. When Air Canada announces a discount fare or seat sale, the other airlines can act overnight. There is absolutely no difference between any of the airlines in this country in terms of flexibility and management decisions. None of them conduct their affairs any differently, whether they are privately or publicly owned.

Therefore, the Government's argument for better management and flexibility is sheer nonsense. That argument falls on its face in front of the actual experience of Air Canada.

Air Canada has received international awards and gold medals as one of the best managed airlines in the world, but the Tories cannot stand that because it has the words "Crown corporation" in front of it. I would be quite happy to amend the Air Canada Act to eliminate the words "Crown corporation" if they would like. The point is, however, that it is a public utility that is owned and controlled by Canadians through its Parliament and its Government. That is the way it should be.

The Government and others in the private sector, particularly stockbrokers, have suggested that the public and employees can buy shares as a good investment in Air Canada. If it is a good investment, which it is, why would we not want the Government of Canada, on behalf of the taxpayers, to increase its investment?

Mr. Malone: It does not pay a dividend.

Mr. Benjamin: Exactly! My hon. friend has made my argument. In the last 11 years Air Canada showed net profits of $102.5 million, with $45 million last year and $40 million the year before. What did the shareholders in Canada get by way of a dividend? Not a nickel. The record speaks for itself. It has not paid any dividends. Surely the taxpayers of this country, as investors, are just as much entitled to an opportunity for a return on their investment as anyone who buys a share on the Toronto stockmarket or anywhere else that these gamblers operate. That is another nonsensical argument put forward by the Government as justification for selling to Canadians shares in something they already own.

The Government obviously intends to turn its social and economic responsibility for a national airline over to private interests so that it can continue to say, as the former Minister of Transport said, it will not interfere with the day-to-day operations and management decisions of the CNR or Air Canada. They want to place that responsibility with those in

the private sector so that the federal Government can avoid the responsibility for a national airline.

What are the costs of this privatization? I have been reading the figures about the brokerage fees and commissions when the British Government privatized several companies in that country. While I do not have anything to do with shares or the stockmarket, from what little I have been able to find out from some of those in the business, if 45 per cent of the shares of Air Canada are sold for $300 million the brokerage fees and commissions would come from that amount which Air Canada will receive. If the brokerage fees and commissions amount to $30 million on $300 million in share sales, Air Canada will get $270 million. That is somewhat short of what the Government claims it needs to buy new airplanes. In fact, Air Canada has said that it does not need that money to buy new airplanes.

Any net revenue taken in on the sale of shares will not be used to buy aircraft, it will be used to reduce the $2.3 billion debt of Air Canada, with assets in excess of that, in order to make it more attractive to sell off the rest of the company. This charade has gone on long enough. This is a corporation built and payed for by the taxpayers of Canada. They are entitled to a return on their investment but they are not getting it. The Government has put up nothing else but the wrong reasons for privatization. It is not to buy planes. It is to reduce debt. It is to reduce pressure on the Government.

• (1600)

The law already provides that the authorized capital for Air Canada is $750 million. The people of Canada in fact have less than half of that, $329 million, and the Government already has the authority to purchase additional share capital for Air Canada even to reduce debt or buy planes. It is already there.

This Bill is totally unnecessary. Its foundation is mythology. It is terrible when a democratic socialist has to teach Conservatives something about sound business practices. I hope the Government will have second thoughts and withdraw this Bill and not deal with it any further.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments? Debate.

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I thank all Hon. Members opposite who have stayed in the Chamber to hear my remarks with respect to this particular Bill. I particularly want to thank those Members from New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island who obviously have a great interest in the subject matter and want to hear a viewpoint which is probably shared by them. Unfortunately, they have not found the courage nor, indeed, the conviction to stand up in the House of Commons and condemn what is best known in Atlantic Canada as a sell-off of a very important ingredient to the economy of Atlantic Canada.

The events surrounding Bill C-129 in coming to the House of Commons are indeed disturbing, not only to Members of Parliament but to the general public and various interest groups across this country. The legislative committee on this particular Bill spent approximately one day contemplating its advantages and disadvantages.

My colleague, the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan), the official spokesperson for our Party, has demonstrated very clearly the position of our Party and why we are opposing this Bill. He has received numerous complaints from Canadians across this country who wanted that particular committee to review the Bill in detail and to hear their views on the importance of a nationally owned airline. Notwithstanding the substance contained in the McGrath report on parliamentary reform, the Government, which promised democracy, openness and fairness, has decided to say no to the commitments it made some time ago and to push through this Bill in a very quick fashion.

In addition to allowing only one day for the legislative committee, the Government refused Canadians in those regions of the country an opportunity to express their views in their own region. The committee did not travel to Atlantic Canada, western Canada, Ontario, Québec or British Columbia. In fact to no part of this country did the committee travel.

Transport 2000 expressed it best when it said: "By selecting witnesses from exclusive airline management, organized labour and academic circles, the legislative committee overlooked Air Canada's most important constituency, the travelling public". How true that is. An airline conceived and implemented by a national government to service all the country is now in the hands of a Government which does not wish to hear the views of ordinary Canadians nor, indeed, those Canadians who use the airline the most. This is another example of a Government which is wedded to a concept of privatization notwithstanding the consequences. It is a blind and ill-conceived attitude on the Government's part.

Hon. Members opposite do not understand, nor do they appreciate, some of the institutions that a national government must put in place in order to sustain and enhance national unity and opportunities throughout the country. Partial privatization of this Crown corporation, I believe, will have negative effects on the various regions of this country. We have all heard Members opposite, as well as those on this side, speak glowingly and with a great deal of passion and concern in terms of trying to provide additional economic opportunities in their regions. We now have a Government which is backing off the very important clause contained in the Constitution, equality of opportunity. This legislation will, in the short run as well as in the long run, decrease the type of service we have in our regions. I speak primarily of my own region in Atlantic Canada. It will have an immediate as well as a long-term impact.

It is one thing for the Government to suggest that by selling 45 per cent of the shares, which value is yet to be determined, I am told, but taking the hypothetical figure of $300 million, it

is certainly not going to be sufficient to embark upon the purchase of new aircraft, which we are told may cost to the tune of $2 billion to $3 billion.

Air Canada will only want to have those routes which are exceptionally profitable. For example, flights from Halifax to Toronto are normally full to capacity. As a result, those flights, and those flights directly to Montreal, take place on a daily basis. They enable Air Canada as a Crown corporation to have a profitable margin on those flights so much so as to enable it to extend out into the hinterlands of the country to service such places as Corner Brook, Stephenville, Newfoundland, Yarmouth, Summerside, Charlottetown, Fredericton, Moncton and communities of that nature. Not all of the runs of Air Canada are lucrative enough to sustain its operations, so its most profitable operations such as the Halifax-Toronto run or the Halifax-Montreal run generate the needed revenues to provide the necessary, and I underline "necessary", service to the regions of this country.

• (1610)

One does not have to be a schoolteacher, a Philadelphia lawyer or a graduate of a business school to understand that those of us in the regions of the country, such as the region of Atlantic Canada, require the services of a national airline operating in our communities. Not only does a national airline provide service but it provides the necessary infrastructure which business, investment and the ordinary economic spin-offs need.

But what has the Government said to the regions of the country? It has said: "We are going to privatize Air Canada". Thereafter what will happen? You will see, Mr. Speaker, that the jet service into places such as Corner Brook, Newfoundland, Moncton, Fredericton and Sydney, which is in my own constituency, will be terminated. That will have an impact on economic developments in those communities. For what? The concept of privatization, a concept being espoused and expounded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson), by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), and by the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski).

What is even more alarming is what the Prime Minister said on January 14, 1985. I do not want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, what my constituents think of this particular statement or the person who made it. The Prime Minister said: "Air Canada is not for sale. Canada needs a national airline. There is a possibility that shares in Air Canada will be sold to the public, but the Government would certainly retain a majority interest". I am not going to repeat, because I think it would be very unparliamentary, what my constituents were saying when I was in my constituency on the weekend. The language that they used is not, shall we say, very supportive. It is not very favourable to the Prime Minister or to the image of the Prime Minister and his Government.

On April 12, 1987, the Deputy Prime Minister, when he made a statement in the House of Commons, stated that the legislation would permit the transfer of all Air Canada shares to the public, which is essentially the first phase. Once again, as we have seen from time to time in this Chamber, the Government says one thing and then does exactly the opposite. This is an affront to those regions of the country which do not share in the bounty and the wealth that the country has. The results will affect us and affect us negatively.

My colleague, our spokesperson, quite succinctly pointed out all the difficulties that we will have with regard to the privatization of Air Canada.

I just wish to underline for those Members who are in the Chamber and, indeed, for those Canadians who may be viewing this particular debate, that we said that, when it comes to regional economic development and when it comes to maximizing the opportunities for those of us who live in non-economically viable communities, the erosion of Air Canada as we now know it will will result in the eventual lessening of service to those communities. It will happen sure as next year will be 1989. Governments are very much aware of that because they will cherry pick, the poor ones will be sold off to some other form of airline, which may or may not for a period of time use those runs for their purposes, and thereafter services will be terminated in their entirety to those various communities.

Air Canada was a symbol of national unity. It enhanced the feelings that we are one country, one nation, linked by our railroads, something which has since been terminated, and linked by an airline which the Government is trying to get away from. There are not only economic reasons why we in the Opposition are opposed to this measure, but there are other fundamental reasons as well.

There will be a reduction in the number of jobs as a result of this partial privatization. Earlier my colleague talked about the centralization of the reservations system. In fact, Air Canada's system in the United States is already centralized in New York. The day will come, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is not very far away—perhaps within the next fiscal year—when there will be nothing more than a centralization of reservations in the country, perhaps in Toronto or in Montreal.

What will happen to the rest of the country? There will be lay-offs in Moncton, which has already sustained more than its fair share of lay-offs with regard to the CN shops. There will be the lay-off of individuals at facilities such as those in Sydney and in Yarmouth. There will be lay-offs in Summerside and in Charlottetown. There will be lay-offs as well in Newfoundland, in parts of Corner Brook and Stephenville. This privatization will certainly result in the loss of jobs as a result of the centralization of reservations.

Airline stewards may have to leave their families in order to locate in one central area, otherwise they may have to give up their high-paying jobs. Employees on feeder lines will no longer be unionized. Their wages could fall from $14 to less than $8 an hour. Let us talk about that for a moment. That is

a very sizeable decrease in the wages that are paid to union members.

Those opposite ought to realize that it is the working person who is really the backbone of the Canadian economy. The more money one can pay an individual on an hourly rate, the more he or she can make a significant contribution. It is those people who have the surplus moneys to buy the durable goods, something that makes the economy go around. It is better to give to those producers and those workers than to lay it on in terms of corporate profits to Canadian banks or multinational pharmaceutical companies. That is where Canadians should be placing their dollars, which gives a true picture of a Canadian investing in his own country because of additional dollars.

Work will be contracted out. No longer will the services of many employees be needed. No assurances are coming forward with respect to how many employees will be retained in Winnipeg, although the legislation states that the maintenance base will not be closed. One would think that if one can give a commitment to keep the base open, then one can certainly give a commitment in terms of the number of employees who will be employed there. But, again, that identifies the hidden agenda of the Government.

We have heard many times before in this Chamber the Deputy Prime Minister say that there would be no lay-offs in Moncton when it came to CN. The Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie), previously the Minister of Transport, stated to the communities of Glace Bay and Port Hawkesbury that there would be no closure of their water plants, only to find that within a short period of time that was changed. There is no assurance that 500 employees at the financial branch located in Winnipeg will continue to be located there. The Government cannot give the community, the municipality, and the residents a clear legislative undertaking that that particular branch will remain in operation in Winnipeg. The Government is saying one thing, and on the other hand it does something that is entirely the opposite.

• (1620)

There will also be downgrading of services to less profitable routes, for example, Halifax to Sydney, frequency of flights versus the quality of the service, jets carrying disabled people, express freight, and industrial machinery.

There are a number of serious issues in those smaller runs. I mentioned the economics, but a great number of individuals travel from Sydney, Nova Scotia, to Halifax in order to attend the Victoria General Hospital for proper medical care. Now they have to get on what we call little puddle-jumpers. This is inconvenient, difficult, and requires them to wait at wickets where there is no seating, if they are disabled, particularly in Halifax airport. Perhaps some Members are saying that that is not a major problem. It is a major problem when a substantial number of individuals and patients must go from one area of the province to another on a regular basis. By downgrading and doing away with the jet service once again we are hurting those individuals who need the assistance of a Government, and of a caring Government.

There has been no opportunity for parliamentary scrutiny of the public share offering. The decision with respect to the value of Air Canada is being given *carte blanche* to investment dealers. Is it not nice that the investment dealers will get a bonanza of a return for their efforts? If it is $300 million, they will probably pick up $30 million. That is not a bad days pay for some of those investment brokers. Canadians have not had the opportunity to go forward and state their views as to what they believe to be the appropriate amount.

In conclusion, the privatization of Air Canada and the method the Government has chosen will be difficult for those of us who live in Atlantic Canada. The difficulties are compounded, because it will directly interfere with provincial, federal, and municipal Governments in their attempts to maximize and enhance economic opportunities. There will be a lessening of service to those communities that I have mentioned such as Sydney. There will be a major inconvenience to those in the travelling public, whether they are patients going to the Victoria General Hospital, or small business people who must travel to the capital city for a variety of reasons.

I hope that the Government in its conclusions and in reviewing what it has done will come to its senses and recognize the suggestions that have been made by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan), who has been our official spokesperson and who has made numerous suggestions on how to enhance a situation which we believe could have a very serious and negative economic impact on our entire region.

Mr. Angus: I listened with interest to the Member in his participation in this debate, and I would like to raise a question that government Members have been putting as their reaction to speeches by the Opposition, and that is, the comment and the reality that Air Canada has not been the airline flying into the smaller communities, but that it has been one of the private sector airlines. Therefore, in the twisted logic of the Conservatives, they think that by privatizing Air Canada that will change.

From his experience in Atlantic Canada, could the Hon. Member indicate why Air Canada was not in there and aggressively providing that service? Was it because of the mandate of the Government of the day? Was it because there were private sector services there? How does the Hon. Member see that being affected by the change in Air Canada? Will we see Air Canada all of a sudden expand into those smaller communities, or will we see a situation where nothing changes?

Mr. McMillan: What a loaded question.

Mr. Dingwall: It is becoming more and more apparent that questions of that nature, which are to the point and rather forthright in terms of their substance, have to be addressed by all Members. In communities in Atlantic Canada Air Canada

has provided the service. It has led the way and taken the initiative to provide service to those communities, both in terms of passenger and cargo service. Transportation and air transportation must be first and foremost a major part of any economic model. Because the Government of the day is urging Air Canada to get out of those smaller runs which do not generate the same profit as the big runs, for example, from Halifax to Toronto, or Halifax to Montreal, it is being given out to new airlines to pick up those routes.

A very good example of that has happened. A new company called Air Bras-d'Or, funded by the Government of Canada, opened its doors and advertised that it was going to transfer people from Sydney to Halifax to Port Hawkesbury. What happened to Air Bras-d'Or? There is no longer an Air Bras-d'Or company servicing that particular area, because it could not generate sustainable profits over a period of time to stay in existence. However, with a national airline reaping the profits from the major routes, it then had the ability and cash flow to service smaller communities.

I guess that the Government is only concerned with that corridor of Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver. I would have thought that representatives from Charlottetown would have been so concerned that they would have stood up for the people of Charlottetown after a Liberal Government put in place one of the nicest airports in all of Atlantic Canada. We will find within the next fiscal year that there will be lay-offs of employees at the Charlottetown airport, and we will find that the service will decrease substantially. We will also find that the economic benefits and opportunities will decrease accordingly because the Government has failed to keep a national airline serving all of Canada, not only the plush corridors of this country.

Mr. McMillan: Charlottetown is a plush corridor.

Mr. Hawkes: I am motivated to make a few comments. This debate is *déjà vu*. This is the thirteenth privatization of this Government, and I hear the same predictions about lay-offs from the same speakers. I hear the same predictions about drop in service from the same speakers. I challenge the Hon. Member to stand in his place and name one of our privatizations that has produced lay-offs rather than increased jobs, increased service, and increased customers. That is the characteristic of each and every privatization undertaken by the Government.

• (1630)

The same thing will happen with the privatization of Air Canada. The deregulation which this Government has accomplished has produced association between feeder airlines and the larger companies. Employees are better paid, more satisfied. There are more services to more communities through more flights. The safety record is outstanding.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hawkes: The reason is really quite simple. No company makes a profit without customers who pay the bills. In the airline business it is service, schedules, equipment that attract customers. The airplanes are better. It is people happy in their jobs, who satisfy customers when they come in. In the airline business it is the safety record.

Some Canadians are still afraid to fly. The safety record is an important aspect in attracting those customers and producing those thoughts. This privatization will serve consumers and employees well and customers very well, indeed.

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, responding briefly to the challenge of the Hon. Member—and I take the challenge seriously—he has asked what Crown corporation or what agency of the Government of Canada has been privatized where job loss has occurred. The Hon. Member must be living in a dream world. The fact of the matter is, CN Route was privatized to become Route Canada. It has closed its terminal in many communities across this country, in particular in Sydney, Nova Scotia. It has closed its entire operation, throwing 22 people out of employment. That is what it has done. So do not tell me that these privatization matters that you people are engaged with, along with the Air Canada privatization, will not result in job loss. We have ample evidence to suggest, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that that will occur.

The Hon. Member is smirking over there, but he knows only too well that places like Charlottetown, Sydney, Moncton, Fredericton, Stephenville and Corner Brook will have major lay-offs within the next fiscal year. If he does not have the guts to stand up in the House of Commons to—

Mr. Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): And de Havilland fired hundreds of people.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments are now terminated. Resuming debate with the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan (Mr. Angus).

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, I want to participate in the third reading debate on Bill C-129, an Act to sell out Air Canada.

I want to deal with a couple of matters, some of which my colleague who spoke just before me has touched on, in particular, the interrelationship between the privatization plans of this Government and its deregulation plans. It is acting in concert, and one is the natural extension of the other. We started with the Liberals before the last election floating the concept of deregulation in the air industry. Changes were put in place to ease the restrictions to allow carriers to get in and out of the business much more readily and to get in and out of routes much more readily, in and out in the sense of providing services to it.

When we speak of the evolving hub-and-spoke system that has been developed in Canada, much as it did in the United

States and much as we predicted, we are finding less competition, not more, as a result of deregulation.

We now have the two major airlines, Air Canada and Canadian Airlines, owning, directly or indirectly, small feeder services that will service the hub airports of Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal, Vancouver, Thunder Bay, Winnipeg and what have you, and then transferring on to the major carriers.

My colleague made reference to the problems in his area about individuals who have to fly in order to obtain medical services. One of the things that we found during our hearings into deregulation, particularly when we talked to people in the smaller communities or in the communities that were in such a geographical location that they had to fly to hospital, was that you could not get the same kind of service on an Air Canada DC-9 as you could on a Canadian partner that seats 19 people. You are unable to get a wheelchair or a stretcher in to transport an ill individual to those communities.

Although it is not directly related to the privatization of Air Canada, it certainly is part and parcel of the approach and the end result of the privatization deregulation push in this Government.

Let me deal with the Act itself.

An Hon. Member: How come Canadian Airlines would prefer to take smoking off their flights?

Mr. Angus: They saw the writing on the wall. This Government did not have the guts at that point in time to send a directive to Air Canada saying that that is what they would like them to do.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Don't be silly.

Mr. Angus: It took a New Democratic Member of Parliament, who had the courage for years to plant the seeds about that issue and was able to get legislation passed in this House, and in the other House, to ban smoking on domestic flights. That is what it took. It was not the Government that moved; it was a New Democratic Member that moved.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Don't be silly.

Mr. Angus: Now that I have their attention, let me go into the suggestions that my colleagues have put forward in terms of changes to the Bill, suggestions which unfortunately were not accepted by this House, by this Government in particular, which would have made what we think is a very bad Bill, a very flawed Bill, a little bit better, at least in providing some protection to the taxpayers.

The one that I was most interested in was the limiting of foreign ownership in Air Canada. The Bill currently follows international trends or conditions that maximize by 25 per cent the ownership of any airline in Canada. That is similar to a provision in the United States.

I gather that during committee hearings the committee was warned that the American Government is now moving to increase the allowable percentage and, because of the trade deal, which calls for harmonization between our two countries, that in fact Canada would have to follow suit. So if the Americans go to 40 per cent ownership allowable for foreigners, Canada would have to do the same thing. It would apply directly to Air Canada.

We tried to change that. We were worried that we might have a situation where one of our two airlines, whether it is Canadian or Air Canada, becomes acquired in large part by an American carrier and we develop into a hub and spoke system that is based not in our Canadian cities, where the hubs are, but in some of the major U.S. cities, and we find Canadians having to travel south to Minneapolis or Washington or New York before they could move back into Canada to another point. This is something that Sir John A. Macdonald made sure would not happen to the rail system when he arranged for the financing and development of the CPR to keep this country together. He was concerned about the north-south movement when what he really wanted was an east-west movement to keep this country whole. I would encourage his descendants in the Tory Party to rethink perhaps what they are doing in that regard.

The other amendment was to try to put into fact what the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski), in tabling the Bill, suggested was there, and that is to limit the actual share offering. As we know, the legislation is open-ended. It could allow—and in fact the Minister has stated that at some point it will allow—100 per cent of Air Canada's shares to be sold to the private sector, to private individuals.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Angus: I hear "hear, hear". I am not surprised that some of the Conservative government Members want to see the whole airline sold. Given the way the legislation has been written and the directive given by the Government to Air Canada to vote its majority 55 per cent share with whatever the wishes of that minority group are, maybe it is just as well that they went the whole route. It is a half-baked pie that we have here. We tried to put in the legislation the restriction that only 45 per cent of the shares be offered to the public.

• (1640)

Let me deal with the philosophical aspect of this matter. Why do New Democrats oppose the sale of this Crown corporation? Is it because we like to own things as governments? Some people think that that is how we operate. Or is it because there is a need in a country like Canada to give the elected representatives of the people a chance to influence trade and travel patterns within the country? Yes, we have regulations that provide some level of control on transportation companies, airlines, railway and trucking companies. But if you give up the other element in the equation that government policy initiatives be directed through a Crown corporation to

provide services to the far North or to ensure there is a cross subsidization between the very lucrative Montreal-Ottawa-Toronto triangle and some of the smaller outlying region, there is a need to say to the Board of Directors of Air Canada that the bottom line cannot be their only consideration. Service has to be there not only to the major centres, to which many business people travel, but also to the Thunder Bays, the Sault Ste. Maries, the Sudburys of Ontario and elsewhere. The test of public convenience and necessity, which was there prior to deregulation, required an airline by regulation to provide a certain level of service. Perhaps it is a service beyond the economic capabilities of the community. We have seen in northwestern Ontario Dryden which has lost its jet service, a service it had for a number of years, a service very important to the economy of that part of northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Orlikow: Brandon too.

Mr. Angus: It was a symbol of being part of the mainstream. It is down to NorOntAir, Air Ontario and a Canadian partner, the very small lines. Dryden does not feel the same kind of attachment it had before. My colleague reminds me that Brandon used to be on a route connecting through Thunder Bay which provided jet service which has been taken away.

There are some economic impacts that go beyond whether or not a company makes a profit. While obviously we do not want to see government corporations losing money, we think it makes sense to force them to make it their mandate to provide those kinds of services. Through deregulation and privatization we have lost the tools we once had to ensure there is that kind of service.

There is another area we were concerned about. Under a policy direction, Air Canada has certain responsibilities with respect to the Official Languages Act to ensure the appropriate mix of our two official languages across the country. There is concern that as a private sector company there would not be the same pressure or controls. We want to ensure that the Commissioner of Official Languages is able to continue the monitoring process and what is still our national airline will provide service in both languages that we have come to accept as appropriate.

My Party and those we represent are concerned about privatization. We see it being done not for sound economic reasons, but more to satisfy a certain philosophical approach that is represented by the Conservative Party.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Which is sound.

Mr. Angus: We have seen Air Canada allowed to operate more and more as a private sector company without the benefit of legislation. We have not as taxpayers had to provide any money to Air Canada for many, many years. It has been self-sufficient, which is the goal of any Crown corporation, as long as it continued to provide services. We know from the documents available that the share assets of Air Canada provided by the Government of Canada have not been drawn upon. Money is available allowing Air Canada to refurbish its fleet. There are all sorts of exciting and innovative ways of acquiring equipment that are not capital intensive and could have been utilized to ensure that Air Canada was able to grow appropriately. Yes, it would have cost money, but it would have cost a lot less than eight or ten nuclear submarines.

It is important as a symbol that we have an airline that is ours, not some small group or an individual or two. Air Canada belongs to all of us, every taxpayer today, and those yet to be born. We are the owners. This great movement to privatize Air Canada is not giving it or selling it to the people, it is selling Air Canada to a select few, taking it out of the control of the many through their elected representatives and giving it to a small section of our population and to people outside of our country. I do not think that is right, Mr. Speaker. I do not think that is an appropriate policy direction for the Government of Canada to take. That is why I and my colleagues will be voting against this Bill as we did at second reading.

We attempted to make the changes in committee and at report stage to make the Bill a little better. None of the amendments were accepted, even though I think they were appropriate safeguards that even the government Members should have considered more seriously. I think, because changes were coming from the NDP, Tory Members say, "Whatever the NDP wants is wrong and we will ram the Bill through in any case". That is not the appropriate way to do things.

There are no guarantees for the workers, no collective agreement job security clause. The guarantee for maintenance bases is weak, and other employees such as ticket agents and aircrew are not included. Flight attendants, who traditionally have had a number of bases in Canada from which to work, are not protected. Air Canada is being privatized with an eye on the bottom line. Air Canada could easily say to those people who live in western and Atlantic Canada, "Sorry we are not making as much money this year as we would like to. We will have to centralize and you will have to locate in Toronto and Montreal. You will have to leave your home in Winnipeg or Vancouver because it is more cost efficient to have you coming out of the major hub". Then there is the possibility of greater and greater foreign control. You have a situation developing of a privately operated airport terminal in Toronto. What happens if the company involved in that becomes attached to one of the American companies? What are the ramifications?

It would be nice if the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) would phone us and tell us he has been elsewhere in his community, has spoken to the Governor General and will call an election so we can kill this Bill as well as the trade Bill. Then we can get rid of the Government that should not have been elected in the first place.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): You are history.

Mr. Angus: I am not history. I am here for a long time. I want to thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, in listening to my comments. I am sure there will be some interesting questions or comments from my colleagues across the way.

• (1650)

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, the doom and gloom, the spreading of fear, the attempt to make Canadians nervous about unreal situations is incredible. It goes on and on and it has no basis in knowledge and no basis in honesty.

The Hon. Member should know that to get an airline licence in Canada, a company must be Canadian-controlled. He is saying that all these foreigners will take over our airline. If he had read the Bill itself, the subject matter of this debate, he would know that those who are non-Canadians who own shares can never, no matter how many shares they own, control more than 25 per cent of Air Canada at any meeting and for any purpose. All of their shares have to be prorated in terms of voting power so that collectively they do not exceed 25 per cent. Seventy-five per cent of the votes, in perpetuity, remain in Canadian hands. That is what the Bill says.

How can the Hon. Member bring that bogyman out in this Chamber if he has read the Bill? I challenged the previous speaker to name a privatization that had led to job losses, and he came back with something called CN Route. I did not have time to respond.

CN Route was a subsidiary of a Crown corporation. The board of directors had to make a difficult decision: should it wind the company down and throw 3,000 people out on the street, or should it seek a buyer who can make it viable, who can provide work opportunities, instead of throwing 3,000 people out of work. That is what that was all about, it was about protecting Canadian jobs by finding a viable ownership to keep the company alive and healthy and to make it work.

Does this Hon. Member have any evidence of previous privatizations of this Government and this Parliament that have not led to better working conditions for employees and more employees, even hundreds more employees in the case of de Havilland, more customers, better service, better products and better situations for the free trade environment? That environment will produce hundreds of thousands of jobs for Canadians, and members of his Party keep filibustering it.

Every reputable economist in Canada, not the lackeys of a few labour union bosses, tells us that it is time to join the modern age. It is time to be productive. Canadians can and will compete, and given the opportunity of a market, there will be more jobs, there will be better jobs and there will be a higher standard of living for Canadians.

Canadians have watched this filibuster. They have seen the 19 dilatory motions occur in the month of June, 1988, and they know about the half a million dollars a day it costs to operate this Chamber, which is going down the drain on the basis of this filibuster. The Opposition's popularity is dropping like a rock because they do not represent the aspirations of the Canadian people. They listen to half a dozen labour leaders, not labour union membership, of a few rich unions. Those labour union leaders drive Cadillacs and have a different view of the world.

It is time to get back to the grassroots and listen to the people on the street. They want a healthy Air Canada. They see an opportunity to participate in ownership. They see a healthier company down the road, and regarding this filibuster on this Bill, the nation would be better served if the debate would end and we could get on to other government business.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, filibuster? Give me a break. We have had three speakers on this very important Bill. I would not call that a filibuster. Certainly I do not have the impression that we dragged out report stage last week. We certainly did not drag out second reading debate.

Let us face it. It was the Government that did a one-day wonder in committee. Is that consultation with the Canadian public to find out whether the Canadian public is in support of or against this legislation? Transport 2000 was not given an opportunity to appear, nor were other groups.

The Government knows that it cannot sell this to the Canadian people, so it wants to ram it through. It has forgotten about the tradition of this place that provides that matters of major consequence should have public and parliamentary review.

The Hon. Member talked about de Havilland. That was a company which the Government of Canada had to take over years ago. It had to pour millions into it, and as soon as it started to make a profit, the Tory logic told the Government to sell it so that someone else could get the gravy. That is incredible.

The Hon. Member goes on about the trade deal and all of these reputable economists who say how great we will do. Let me remind the Hon. Member that those studies were based on a 75-cent dollar. Where is that dollar now? Where are those jobs now? How can we turn over our country to an economic situation which has already been changed and over which we have no further control? Once again, the Government is not prepared to take the necessary steps to ensure that Canada can compete properly.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I believe there is a point of order on the part of the Hon. Member for Leeds—Grenville (Mrs. Cossitt) to table a committee report, and I think there is unanimous consent to allow the Hon. Member for Leeds—Grenville to do so.

Committee Reports

HERITAGE RAILWAY STATION PROTECTION ACT

PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Mrs. Jennifer Cossitt (Leeds—Grenville): Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the legislative committee on Bill C-205, an Act to protect heritage railway stations, I have the honour to present Bill C-205 to the House with amendments. We had an opportunity to hear from all witnesses concerned who made a valid contribution to this Bill. Those interested were, of course, Heritage Canada, VIA Rail Canada, Canadian National Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, on the same matter, I would like to tell the House that, on behalf of my Party, we are prepared to give unanimous consent tomorrow at any time for the conclusion of report stage and third reading of this very important piece of legislation which all Parties support.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is that so agreed?

Mr. MacLellan: Mr. Speaker, we are certainly agreed to the tabling of the report.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It is tabled, and that is the extent of it right now.

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being five o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—MOTIONS

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SUGGESTED DELAY IN ACQUISITION OF NUCLEAR POWERED SUBMARINES

Ms. Pauline Jewett (New Westminster—Coquitlam) moved:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider delaying its decision to purchase a fleet of nuclear powered attack submarines until the Canadian people have judged the proposal in the forthcoming election.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to introduce my motion calling on the Government to delay its misguided decision to purchase a fleet of nuclear powered attack submarines until the Canadian people have debated and judged the proposal in the forthcoming election. The Government, I suggest, has no mandate to proceed with what it boasts is the single most expensive military expenditure in Canadian post-war history. Just like the Mulroney-Reagan trade deal, this foolhardy proposal was not even raised during the last election campaign.

Furthermore, most Canadians want to express their profound opposition to it at the ballot box. A recent public opinion poll commissioned by the Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament found that by a margin of two to one Canadians disapprove of the Government's plan. Any Government, even a Conservative Government that claims to be sensitive to the needs and wants of Canadians must acknowledge one simple and telling fact: Canadians do not want these submarines.

I want to explore the many reasons underlying Canadians' opposition to this proposal because, fundamentally, this plan raises questions about how Canadians see the world, how we see Canada in the world, what kind of threats we feel, and how best to respond to those threats. I want to begin with what is perhaps the most critical question arising under the proposal, namely its implications for Canada's maritime strategy and Canadian sovereignty.

The Government claims these nuclear submarines are needed to defend our sovereignty in the Arctic. That argument is patently bogus. So much so that even the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Beatty) is using it less and less these days. In fact, the Minister recently revised the subs' main mission to "patrolling on Canada's east and west coasts".

Mr. Crofton: That is what it has always been.

Ms. Jewett: However, the Minister, only last Sunday evening on *The Nation's Business*, returned to his original premise, namely that they were to protect Arctic sovereignty.

Naval analysts on both sides of the Atlantic have exposed the ludicrousness of the Government's bravado in saying these subs are intended to assert and defend Canadian sovereignty in the North. The Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament, for example, recently declared:

> To assert Arctic sovereignty with submarines that will seldom be in the Arctic is like being represented diplomatically by the invisible man.

Veterans Against Nuclear Arms added that:

> Canadian submarines are not going to be wheeling around under ice like police cars picking up vagrants.

Invisible men in police cars roaming under the Arctic ice picking up vagrants, is that the Government's concept of asserting sovereignty in the North? Like many Canadians, Ross Campbell, a former Canadian ambassador to NATO and former Chairman of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, is not deluded by the Government's claim that the submarines are designed to defend Canadian sovereignty:

> It is not at all clear why nuclear powered submarines are needed to do a surveillance job equally well done by a combination of fixed sensors and conventional subs.

Canadians are demanding to know why the Government is planning to spend billions and billions of dollars to monitor the presence of foreign submarines in or near our Arctic waters when other means of protection, as alluded to by Mr. Campbell, would better serve our sovereignty needs. Tom Pullen, a

Canadian authority on Arctic navigation, rightly points out that ice-breakers, which are visible, would be more effective than nuclear subs in asserting our sovereignty by making our presence known.

The real irony is that Canadian submarines would have to communicate with DND headquarters through a communications network which includes the U.S. and other Allied navies because only very low frequency signals can reach a submerged submarine, and the Canadian Navy lacks this capacity. It is difficult to understand how a fleet linked so closely to U.S. communications networks and operationally co-ordinated with other NATO navies can expect to assert our sovereignty in the Arctic unless our claims to those waters have already been recognized by other nations.

In other words, nuclear powered attack submarines will not solve our outstanding territorial dispute with the U.S. if diplomatic efforts do not. For that reason, the Government's proposal has been dismissed by Donald Kerr of the International Institute for Strategic Studies in England and British naval analyst Anthony Preston as not a military program at all, but simply political posturing, and very expensive posturing to boot.

Canadians are also very concerned that the decision to Buy nuclear-powered submarines will fundamentally alter Canada's traditional defensive maritime strategy. As *The Globe and Mail* columnist Jeffrey Simpson aptly put it:

> Make no mistake: the possession of these subs would represent a quantum change in Canada's strategic posture.

The Canadian Government has not given sufficient attention to the strategic implications of this plan, specifically as to how the fleet will be co-ordinated and, undoubtedly, integrated with the U.S. maritime strategy. Writing in the U.S. Naval Institute *Proceedings*, Ronald O'Rouke describes the U.S. maritime strategy as being characterized by "forward operation". According to Mr. O'Rouke, this involves:

> —bottling up the Soviet Navy in its home waters—using one's forces offensively—particularly one's nuclear powered attack submarines.

He goes on to suggest that:

> Only by operating in forward positions can the U.S. SSNs simultaneously perform these missions: help bottle up Soviet forces, threaten Soviet nuclear powered ballistic missile submarines and pose a tomahawk land-attack cruise missile threat.

Vice-Admiral John Anderson of the Canadian Armed Forces told members of the Standing Committee on National Defence on February 3 that in periods of tension, Canadian nuclear submarines could be sent to attack Soviet strategic subs. This admission confirmed the fears of many Canadians that these subs would be participating in the U.S. forward maritime strategy, including bottling up Soviet naval forces in their own waters. The acquisition of nuclear powered submarines will mean that Canada's maritime forces will be more, not less, subordinate to U.S. authority.

Mr. Crofton: False.

Ms. Jewett: Admiral Robert Falls, ex-Chief of Defence Staff, has warned that any Canadian participation in the U.S. forward maritime strategy would be destabilizing inasmuch as it threatens Soviet missile carrying submarines directly and creates an incentive, as it were, for the missiles to be released before they are lost. Furthermore, it is important to remember that all of this would be taking place in waters far from Canada since no Soviet subs have actually been observed operating in or near Canadian waters.

Mr. Crofton: False.

Ms. Jewett: I am deliberately quoting reputable experts and authorities in order to have my friends in the Conservative Party understand what they have been saying. Deputy Chief of Defence Staff, Vice-Admiral Brodeur, acknowledged this recently, namely that no Soviet subs have actually been observed operating in or near Canadian waters, when he said:

> At the current time we do not have evidence that Soviet submarines are entering into the Canadian Arctic.

Given that there is no evidence of Soviet incursions, no proof that Soviet long-range cruise deployments are contemplated, and minimal probability of a pre-emptive attack, a nuclear submarine fleet seems an irresponsible and wholly unnecessary proposal.

Some of the best wisdom on this subject comes from an unlikely source, the Conservative Member for Nanaimo—Alberni (Mr. Schellenberg). In a letter to his constituents last year, the Hon. Member wrote, and I quote:

> But if the subs are really meant to scare anyone, the threat is surely half-hearted. What would one of our new subs do if they came across a Russian or American sub in our waters? We are not going to risk confrontation with a superpower over an incident like that . . . Canada is not a superpower. The use of submarines as a policy instrument for the attainment of sovereignty simply commits us to playing the game by superpower rules . . . and that may be the worst of both worlds. For we certainly don't have the muscle to make foreign policy with a big stick, and if we try to do so, we may well lose our influential voice as a moderate and sensible member of the international community.

Most Canadians, including some Conservative MPs, do not want membership in the nuclear submarine club. They do not want to see this country drawn into a provocative and hostile maritime strategy which membership in this exclusive club represents.

• (1710)

The Canadian people never gave the Government a mandate to adopt such a military posture so at variance with Canadian traditions, a posture which would serve only to deepen tension and suspicion between nations at a time when the world has witnessed a welcome thaw in East-West relations. Canadians do want to give an emphatic no to this proposal, and that is what this motion, when passed by this House, will enable them to do.

The Canadian Centre for Arms Control also points out that in every one of the three traditional tasks of Canadian maritime command, including sovereignty protection and the

defence of North America, other options, quite apart from nuclear submarines, would be better suited to these specific needs.

The much touted under-ice capacity of nuclear submarines is unnecessary in peacetime since detection and reporting of incursions can be done at far less cost. It is unnecessary in wartime when the enemy threat would not come in the Arctic, as we all know, but in passages to the Atlantic which would be monitored at so-called "choke points".

Perhaps retired naval officer Douglas Maginley passed the definitive judgment on nuclear subs when he wrote in *Policy Options* earlier this year:

> The nuclear-powered attack submarine has limited uses. It is, in fact, the mechanical equivalent of the great white shark. Its only function is to kill; to sink ships and other submarines. It cannot make use of the sea, only deny its use to others.

Canadians are also profoundly concerned about the threat these subs pose to our good international reputation and how their acquisition will undermine the nuclear non-proliferation regime.

Canada plans to declare that weapons-grade enriched uranium will be used for military purposes for these subs and then returned to civilian use. However, Canada would bar UN inspectors on the grounds that classified information might be obtained by Eastern bloc inspectors. Each submarine reactor will need between 150 and 200 kilograms of weapons-grade enriched uranium. This is a lot of material which is effectively being removed from international scrutiny.

While Canada is within its legal rights, as a signatory of the NPT, to take advantage of a loophole in the treaty, no other country in Canada's category has ever tried to exempt atomic fuels from international safeguards so as to use them for military purposes. In other words, Canada is the first non-nuclear weapons power to consider the use of nuclear materials for military purposes. In the eyes of many observers this would set a very disturbing precedent.

David Fischer, a councillor at the International Atomic Energy Agency, has said that Canada is imperiling its international reputation as a champion of non-proliferation by taking advantage of a loophole in the treaty.

It would also undermine the International Atomic Energy Agency's ability to reassure other countries that no uranium is being diverted which has, until now, been the foundation of the global strategy for curbing the spread of nuclear weapons.

Other signatories to the NPT could cite Canada as a precedent and also withdraw stockpiles of enriched uranium from public scrutiny. Perhaps more ominously, non-signatories to the treaty, on whom diplomatic pressure is continually brought to adhere to the treaty and the International Atomic Energy Agency's verification regime, including Brazil, India, Pakistan, and South Africa, could point to Canada as itself undermining both the treaty and the verification regime.

The Canadian Centre for Arms Control has condemned this aspect of the submarine purchase as a "major departure for Canadian policy and practice" which is "gutting an important arms control treaty".

The cost of compromising Canada's 40-year commitment to the peaceful use of nuclear materials could be immeasurable both in terms of our international reputation and global efforts to curb the spread of nuclear weapons.

Canadians are also profoundly concerned about the risks these nuclear subs pose to our delicate and precious environment. It is curious that the Department of National Defence, in answer to a written question of mine a few days ago, has just now initiated an environmental impact assessment on the proposed purchase. Who has been contracted to undertake the initial environment screening? Why, it is Atomic Energy of Canada Limited. I know a lot of environmentalists from across the country who would question the objectivity of an agency whose business is, in part, to promote atomic energy.

Canadians have reason to be concerned about the safety record of nuclear submarines. First, it is doubtful that Canada's claim to meet its exemplary standard for civilian reactor safety in the submarine project is even possible with the stingy budget proposed by National Defence to meet safety standards. More important, the past record of American and Soviet nuclear powered submarines is not a reassuring one, despite American claims that no accidents have been related to the power plant.

In fact, the loss of a U.S. submarine in 1963 was reactor-related according to the chief of the U.S. Navy's Bureau of Ships. Nuclear propelled submarines have run aground, sunk, and collided with warships, tankers, other subs, and even whales. A 1986 survey done by the Centre for Investigative Reporting in San Francisco revealed 99 incidents, 46 of which involved the nuclear power plant. At present, two U.S. and four Soviet subs lie abandoned on the ocean floor complete with nuclear reactors, certainly not very reassuring to all of us.

Also, the Department of National Defence has failed to outline procedures for decommissioning these nuclear submarines, particularly with regard to retrieval and disposal of all radioactive material and waste.

Perhaps it is appropriate to give the last word on safety to the father of the U.S. nuclear navy, Admiral Rickover. Late in life the Admiral became a vocal critic of both nuclear weapons and nuclear power. Before a U.S. congressional committee in 1982 he said:

> I do not believe nuclear power is worth it if it creates radiation. Then you might ask me what I would do with these nuclear-powered ships—I would sink them all.

Finally I want to address briefly the incredible and still undetermined cost of this proposal. The Minister of National Defence says that Canadians can afford to foot the bill for this batch of nuclear subs. However, what he will not tell them is the precise cost of these subs. The Minister of Finance (Mr.

Wilson) recently said that although the Government has some "general parameters" as to costs—whatever that means—it will likely be two years before an exact figure is available. What is clear, however, from all naval experts is that the basic cost of buying just the subs will far exceed the $8 billion figure the Government offers up as gospel.

The Canadian Business Council on National Issues has said $12 billion, Captain John Moore of *Jane's Fighting Ships* says $11.25 billion plus 50 per cent over 10 years for refitting, refueling and training, and the Canadian Centre for Arms Control says $14.8 billion.

A Conservative Member from Toronto is quoted in *Maclean's* as saying that "the cost of these things boggles the mind". Another Conservative Member from Québec said in *Maclean's* this week that he is having a great deal of trouble explaining to his constituents why the Government is planning to spend all these billions of dollars on useless, provocative, unnecessary nuclear subs when the money could be spent elsewhere, as we all well know.

Surely Canadian taxpayers have a right to know the exact cost of this program before any decision is made to purchase this fleet. Finally, surely all Canadians have the right to debate and judge this proposal in the forthcoming election.

• (1720)

Mr. Patrick Crofton (Esquimalt—Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to make some comments on the motion of the Member for New Westminster—Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett) who proposes that we should defer action on the acquisition of nuclear powered submarines until after an election-type referendum. She is a little late. This decision was taken last year.

In the 1984 election, my Party made a particular issue of the sorry state of our military forces' equipment and our resolve, when elected, to implement corrective action. The unprecedented mandate we received in the 1984 election was, in part, an expression of approval for these military proposals. The people have already spoken.

Why nuclear powered attack submarines? The NDP is scandalized because these SSN's are attack submarines. There are no other kinds of submarines. Our Oberon submarines, those aging diesel electric boats, are categorized as SSKs, conventional attack submarines. There are no other kinds of submarines.

The NDP would appear to be oblivious that we have destroyers in our fleet and fighters in our air force. No doubt we will soon get an NDP motion to erase those naughty words from our vocabulary.

Ms. Jewett: Why do you not talk about the U.S. forward maritime strategy?

Mr. Crofton: Why submarines at all? I think it is worth spending a few moments reflecting on Canada's circumstances and Canada's needs.

The Hon. Member talks about the United States naval forward plan. We have no connection with that. It is not NATO policy. We belong to NATO, not the United States Navy.

We are a major trading nation. We depend heavily on the safe and timely delivery, by ship, of much of our trade. Our economic well-being, and consequently our social well-being depends on this secure sea trade. We front on three major oceans. We have the longest seacoast of any nation. Thus we have a vested interest, indeed vital interest in the safe and unimpeded use of the oceans, especially those that lap at our shores.

How do we achieve this? One way is in friendly and co-operative participation with other like-minded nations who share our views. Hence, we belong to various U.N. agencies and to NATO. We have a commitment, an obligation to those with whom we have made these commitments.

We have another obligation. That is an obligation to the nation of Canada and her people, our constituents. That obligation is to maintain those facilities and those forces necessary to patrol, protect, and exercise appropriate authority over these areas of land, air and water we call our own. No amount of weaseling around excuses any government for neglecting these basic obligations of office.

It would be very nice if we could declare the world burglar-free. Unhappily it is not. My own neighbourhood back home is not burglar-free. We find it necessary to maintain a police force and to encourage other organizations such as Neighbourhood Watch. Our oceans also have a variety of challenges awaiting us, from bogus refugees, to fish thieves, to drug runners, to potentially unfriendly naval forces camped on our doorstep.

We need in our inventory the capacity to deal effectively with all of these potential problems.

The NDP and Liberal defence critics have both publicly acknowledged that we require a Navy. So far, so good. They also agree with us that the Navy should be a mix of vehicles which include submarines. They also publicly acknowledge that nuclear powered submarines are the most useful and most cost-effective submarines we could have.

Having come this far on fact, evidence and logic, both opposition Parties now depart into the Land of Oz with all sorts of convolutions, contortions and distortions about cost, need and safety.

No doubt my Government colleagues will address the cost and safety issues. I limit my remarks to the need factor.

The NDP defence critic has suggested that the NDP, instead of building SSN's, would buy additional patrol frigates

and up to 12 conventional submarines at a price some $2 billion more than our proposed expenditures.

Acquisition of conventional submarines would be a colossal waste of money. Even worse, it would be a dangerous and fraudulent waste of money. Such expenditure would try to delude the Canadian people that our defence needs are satisfied, and even worse would expose our submariners to a disastrously uneven contest in any conflict.

Given the military capacity of our potential adversary, we would be emulating the unhappy Polish cavalry who tried to halt the German Panzer divisions with horses and swords in 1939. That is the reality of the utility of conventional submarines.

The Canadian taxpayer, and certainly our long-suffering sailors, deserve capable equipment. The issue really is not should we or should we not have nuclear powered submarines. The real question is: Do we still need a Navy? The answer clearly is a resounding yes. Even the opposition defence critics agree.

We cannot afford quantity, even though our huge ocean expanses, our lengthy seashore, and our heavy dependence on ocean trade suggests we do indeed need quantity. The obvious route, the only sensible route, is to seek cost-effectiveness for what we do acquire. That means the SSN's.

The acquisition program upon which we have embarked calls for delivery of boat No. 1 in 1996, boat No. 2 in 1998, and one boat every 18 months thereafter until program completion in about the year 2010, which is 22 years from now.

There is an urgency to get on with the contract process because of the lengthy lead times required. We already face the prospect of a gap between the time when our three conventional submarines are scrapped for safety reasons and the time when the new boats come into service.

Thus we must get on with the task of replacement. The pending decision of country of source is still to be made, and we will need another two years of contract definition and contract allocation before commencing construction. We have lots of time between now and 1996 to change, amend, even cancel the program. What we do not have is time now to procrastinate. It may be the NDP's favourite policy on most subjects, but not ours. We see action as essential.

I look for an early decision and early action on this vital question of which submarine to buy. Whether to buy is long since decided.

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound—Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to participate in this debate brought forward by the New Democratic Party. The Canadian Government's intention to acquire nuclear-powered submarines, commonly known as SSN's, is entirely consistent with Canada's long-standing renunciation of both nuclear weapons for Canada and nuclear roles for the Canadian Armed Forces. These vessels utilize nuclear power for the purposes of propulsion only. They will not carry nuclear weapons or nuclear explosive devices of any sort.

The principle of using nuclear power for propulsion is much the same as using nuclear power to generate hydro-electricity energy which is a common practice throughout Canada and the industrialized world. It is fully compatible with our commitment not to acquire nuclear weapons.

• (1730)

Because of its size, Canada has some unique problems and some unique responsibilities. We must keep certain vital sea lanes open in our three-ocean perspective. We must accept our role in defending sea lanes which are vital to western Europe and no one can deny the importance the Pacific Rim will play in the near future to our way of life. Even the New Democratic Party accepts the concept of the three-ocean perspective.

The submarines will not only be used in the Arctic, they will serve our entire territory, the Arctic, the Pacific and the Atlantic. During the previous Government, our entire Armed Forces were allowed to deteriorate to a level never seen. After World War II, we had the third largest Navy and proud officers and sailors serving our country. This Government has been able to give back some of the needed improvements.

The nuclear powered submarines will be the cornerstone of the new Navy. The SSN has unlimited underwater endurance when compared to the conventional submarine, which must spend at least 15 per cent of its time recharging on the surface. That alone should prove the necessity of the nuclear submarine. If one of our submarines was going from Halifax to Vancouver using the North West Passage, which is normally a two-week trip, an intruder would have to assume that he could come in contact with a Canadian submarine anywhere in our territory. One week a submarine could be in the Atlantic and two weeks later, having travelled under our Arctic water, could find itself on our Pacific coast. As for showing the flag, once in port, like any other submarine, they surface but once they leave port they again become invisible.

We have heard so much about the need to protect our own territory instead of letting other countries do so. I am quite sure that everyone is aware that Canada has the longest coastline in the world. I believe it is estimated at some 37,000 miles, so we can see the great advantage of the nuclear powered submarines. We must be able to control our waters in the three oceans, and the nuclear-powered submarine will do this.

Another benefit of the nuclear-powered submarine is that it will be less polluting. The cost of owning these submarines, as has been pointed out, is $300 million a year spread over 27 years. Its all very well to have a sign put up in the North West Passage saying, "Keep out. Canadian territory", but it is even better to have a big watchdog on a leash. There was an interesting letter published in the *Citizen* yesterday with respect to nuclear subs. It reads:

> In today's navy, where speed, endurance and reliability are of the utmost importance, a diesel-electric boat does not meet the needs of our navy. They are slow, have low underwater endurance, cannot proceed through the North West Passage in summer even under ideal conditions and their diesels pollute the atmosphere with carbon dioxide, adding to the global warming.
>
> Moreover, should an accident occur, the batteries containing in excess of 13,000 litres of sulphuric acid could spill into the sea, adding to the pollution already in our oceans. The salt water, when mixed with sulphuric acid, will produce the deadly phosegene gas which could kill the ship's crew.
>
> Conversely, a nuclear submarine can operate in all three of our oceans and, for the first time, exercise our sovereignty anywhere along our lengthy coastline without limitations, with speed and efficiency. this would be done without the pollution of our seas or air above.
>
> The U.S.S.R. has 400 submarines and commissions one every five weeks.
>
> Canada does require nuclear boats. To quote commander of the Marine Command, Vice-Admiral Charles Thomas, "The issue is not the cost of owning nuclear submarines—it's the cost of owning a navy."

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have an opportunity to speak on this issue today and I congratulate my colleague, the Hon. Member for New Westminster—Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett), for raising this issue in the House. It is certainly important that the House of Commons have an opportunity to debate this issue prior to an adjournment and possibly an election.

When the issue of nuclear submarines was first raised, it was raised in the context of protecting our Arctic sovereignty. I think most Canadians now have enough information to believe that that is not going to happen. Even Conservative Members of Parliament are beginning to address their constituents and the media by saying they cannot justify those costs. The Hon. Member for Nanaimo—Alberni (Mr. Schellenberg), in his direct mail correspondence to his constituents said he could not justify that use, that it did not make sense to use it in the Arctic, that the costs were just beyond the comprehension of most Canadians and even himself. Today in the House two other Members claimed they were misquoted by the media and not fully quoted by others, but this opportunity to suck and blow by two other Members of this House is not what is happening. What in truth is happening is that government Members are falling quickly on this issue because it is so irrational.

There is no doubt, I think, in a lot of people's minds that this issue will be dropped.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claudy Mailly (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Mailly), on a point of order.

Mrs. Mailly: Mr. Speaker, I protest. The Hon. Member just mentioned a question of privilege raised earlier in the House today. I don't think it is appropriate for the Hon. Member to make these references in his speech, especially when the Speaker has yet to rule on my question of privilege.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): This is debate, and I would hope the Hon. Member would carry on with his speech, but I would bring to his attention that there is a ruling coming down from the Speaker, so I hope he will keep that in mind when he does mention anyone in this *Maclean's* article.

Mr. Skelly: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think what I was commenting on more than anything else was the difficulty people are having explaining to their elected constituents the enormous costs and the changing use of this particular instrument. It is now recognized by many individuals who are experts in this field that we will not be able to enhance our Arctic sovereignty with nuclear-powered submarines. In all likelihood, as my colleague, the Hon. Member for New Westminster—Coquitlam, mentioned these submarines will in fact be used in the Greenland-Iceland-Norway Gap along with other NATO forces to contain the Soviet fleet in the North and will also be used by the U.S. in the Northwest Pacific in its forward maritime strategy. It is a strategy designed to destabilize the balance of power and it is a strategy that is going to create an additional incentive or momentum in the arms race. It goes absolutely counter to the peace initiatives that have come about lately and to the traditional approach of Canada. The costs of this program are enormous and Canada would be well advised to stay far, far away from it by ending this program.

The cost of the submarines are enormous in terms of destabilizing the balance of power, undermining the arms and peace negotiations going on and undermining the non-proliferation treaty. One of the other interesting things we do not hear about from the other side of the House is the skewing of the national defence budget. There are many, many other branches in the Armed Forces which serve this country well, which have earned an international reputation, and over the next 25 years they are going to find their budgets very short. They are not going to wind up with the promotions, the additional staff and resources.

If I were involved in search and rescue and wanted an adequate number of flying hours, new equipment, new techniques and additional personnel to serve the people of this country, I would be very worried that my entire budget was going to be skewed by the submarine program. The peacekeeping forces, the anti-submarine warfare programs already in place, have been proven and tested over a period of time. This budget is going to harm the personnel in the Armed Forces, their families and the programs wherein they work hard to serve the people of Canada. Mark my words, the cost of this will cause an enormous amount of problems for those people.

• (1740)

In addition, it will erode Canadian sovereignty. The participation is clear. We are not going to attack the Americans under the Arctic ice in which their presence is clearly known. According to Armed Forces NDHQ, there is no

information that there are Soviet submarines operating under there.

We do not have a communications system to communicate with those submarines. We will have to use the American very low frequency communications system. That speaks in an interesting way for a national armed forces whose primary problem with sovereignty in the Arctic is the American's attitude toward the Arctic archipelago.

With respect to the fuel supply, the Americans are uncertain that they will give a long-term enriched uranium fuel supply. We are now dependent for that fleet on the United States. There is no agreement in place for that to happen. We will either have to buy our fuel supply from the United States or manufacture our own, which will cost several hundreds of millions of dollars.

Not only will we be dependent upon the United States for the fuel to operate our ships, we will be dependent upon it to use its communications system to maintain contact with it. We will likely be operating in a subordinate position in its forward maritime strategy.

The political costs to the Conservatives are interesting. There is a clear understanding in the minds of Canadians that this program is irrational. The two issues which are likely to loom largest in the next election are nuclear submarines and free trade. I admit that free trade is grey for some people. They are not sure about the conflicting stories that they are hearing. However, when they are asked about the nuclear submarines, they are absolutely clear that it is a crazy undertaking. They know that there will be an erosion of other programs. Not just the National Defence budget will be skewed. The people in the Armed Forces today will be harmed by it. They know that programs such as old age pensions and health care as well as others will be competing with funds that are already earmarked for the submarine program.

There is talk of this program exceeding a cost of $16 billion, and that that $16 billion represents an enormous cost in lost opportunities in the country. It represents things that we could do.

This is a very unfortunate program. It is ill-conceived by a Government which has not done its homework. It is gradually coming to the realization, as statements by a number of Members of Parliament in written form to their constituents now acknowledge, that the Government cannot justify those costs. It cannot justify the program. It is not related to Arctic sovereignty.

There are many other ways to address the question of Arctic sovereignty, and addressing them more effectively and cost-effectively than by using nuclear submarines.

It is interesting to note that we cannot assess where those costs will come from. One individual, the Commander of Canada's Army, Lieutenant-General James Fox, delivered through members of his staff a curious comment of the Department's plans to acquire the 12 nuclear-powered submarines at a cost of $8 billion. The General's staff argued, first, that the submarine acquisition will not have any effect on other defence expenditures. Then in a conflicting statement it was argued that Canada will be able to afford the subs because $6 billion of the $8 billion have already been identified in existing defence expenditures.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whose salary will be cut? Whose promotions will not take place? Whose resources will be cut? I am surprised that my colleague from the Esquimalt—Saanich area can stand in this House as a former member of the Armed Forces and watch his brothers and sisters in the rest of the Armed Forces be cut to the bone financially. I am convinced that the Government will be forced by the people to see the light and that it will drop this crazy program before the next election, or certainly suffer defeat.

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, before I get into my presentation I want to convey some intelligence from the Hon. Member for Scarborough West (Mr. Stackhouse) in respect to the *Maclean's* magazine article which was referred to before. He tells me, Sir, that he was interviewed by the magazine and his point of view was, like mine and that of most Members on this side of the House, very positive. We believe that the Government is doing what is right in this acquisition program. But, for some reason or other, anything in a positive light, a positive vein, was neglected to be printed in the *Maclean's* article. Perhaps that gives Hon. Members some idea of the objectivity of that particular publication.

The motion before us today asks that the Government delay its submarine acquisition program until after the next election. It is my view that this matter was decided at the previous election. I remember standing on the shores of the Arctic Ocean in 1984 handing out leaflets which provided a description of the PC defence policy. The fact that I was elected, along with 210 of my colleagues on this side of the House, would seem to indicate to me that the PC defence policy found favour with the electorate of Canada.

At that time we promised to guard Canadian sovereignty on the land, in Canadian waters and in Canadian air space. We wanted to give our military the tools with which to do that job. We wanted to defend the northern parts of Canada which hitherto had been neglected. There was overwhelming support for this policy.

The NDP ideas of getting out of NATO and NORAD were rejected. The Liberal policy of allowing our military forces and military equipment to decay were rejected by the people of Canada. Not only at the time of the election but also about a year ago, at the time of the publication of the White Paper on national defence, that overwhelming support was again there.

If we ask ourselves the question, do we need a Navy, and answer that question in the affirmative, as just about everyone here would, then the next question becomes this: what should become the make-up of that Navy? What can do the best job for the money available?

The Liberals allowed over a period of years for our Navy to deteriorate. Virtually what we have left is a bunch of rust buckets. Really what we are doing is starting from scratch. We are in the process of acquiring a number of new vessels. We did not have one minesweeper in Canada. We are in the process of acquiring 12 new frigates. I guess, to give the Liberals credit, that acquisition program started under them. It is our proposal to buy some 10 to 12 nuclear propelled—not nuclear armed but nuclear propelled—submarines over about a 25-year period.

The Liberal plans, when we came in to office, although they had not been put into the process of implementation, were to acquire some 18 frigates, about six more than we are going to get. These things cost about half a billion dollars apiece. Frigates do not come cheap. They do not come in boxes of corn flakes.

The Liberals were also going to acquire a fleet of conventional submarines. The price-tag over the 25-year period would have been about $2 billion in excess of what we plan to spend. It would not have done anywhere near as good a job.

The former Liberal Defence Minister, the Hon. J. J. Blais, as quoted in a newspaper article yesterday, admitted that he was a supporter of the Conservative acquisition program, that nuclear-powered submarines were three times as effective as a destroyer, or three times as effective as a conventional diesel electric submarine.

The Oberon submarines that we have are old. They have to be replaced. They are dangerous and we cannot use them any more. We have to buy a new model.

Who in their right mind would go out in 1988 and buy a brand new Model T automobile? One would not do it. If one is going to buy a new automobile, then one is going to go and buy the latest model available, the most fuel efficient, et cetera. Diesel electric submarines when submerged have to use batteries. We have had described to us the environmental hazards of diesel electric and battery-operated submarines. They can only go for two hours at maximum speed while submerged. What chance is there of a diesel electric submarine catching a nuclear submarine or getting away from a nuclear submarine? There is no chance at all. We would be submitting submariners to inappropriate and great risks by putting them out to sea in times of potential hazards in Model-T submarines.

• (1750)

The nuclear-powered submarine's range under water, under the ice, is virtually unlimited. These days no other country buys diesel electric submarines. The United States has several hundred submarines and it has three diesel electrics left. They use them for target practice because the Soviet Union still has a few diesel electric submarines.

The U.S.S.R. has a much more ambitious nuclear submarine acquisition program than ourselves. One of the Members earlier pointed out that it is acquiring submarines at a rate of one every five weeks.

If we buy these submarines, as the Government proposes to do, we can have a three-ocean Navy instead of a two-ocean Navy. For most of the year our Arctic Ocean is covered with ice, and conventional submarines cannot be used under the ice. A conventional submarine has to surface to recharge its batteries.

Furthermore, we would be unable to move submarines from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean without going through the Panama Canal. "Please, Mr. Noriega, can we use the canal? We want to get a submarine from Halifax to Vancouver". Whereas, nuclear powered submarines can be moved through the North West Passage in our own territorial waters without having to ask any one's permission.

In the Arctic the nuclear-powered submarine is the only one capable of operating there. That is my backyard. My constituents as Canadian citizens want to be as well defended as Canadians who happen to live in Vancouver or Halifax on the Pacific or the Atlantic. I feel that they have a right to be properly defended. The first responsibility of Government is to provide for the collective defence. I cannot accept any policy where the first response to any invasion would be to abandon northern Canadians to the enemy.

If we do not have submarines, we will not stop nuclear submarines from being present in the Arctic. There will be nuclear submarines there. The question we have to ask ourselves is, do we only want American ones there, do we only want Soviet ones there, or do we also want Canadian submarines in the Arctic?

If we do not have them we are abandoning our defence. We are abandoning our sovereignty to the Americans. That is the policy of the NDP and the Liberals. They want to abandon the defence of northern Canada to the Americans and let them do what they want, and let us have no say in how that defence is to be conducted. That is not our position. Our position is that we are quite prepared to take on the responsibility that goes with an Arctic power of some measure.

The proposed acquisition program of the Government makes eminent sense to me. With it we will be able to protect Canadian sovereignty. We will be pulling our own weight in the defence of North America. The acquisitions will be cost effective. On an annual basis they will amount to 2 or 3 per cent of the defence budget. It will not disrupt in any way other military programs, as the NDP have stated. These vessels are the most effective available. The acquisition is in keeping with the wish of the Canadian public as expressed in the last election, and as I am sure will be confirmed at the next election.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, my special thanks to the Hon. Member for New Westminster—Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett) who raised the point. To me, it is so

obvious that a decision of this kind which involves enormous costs and is probably one of the biggest Government expenditures ever ... and then all of a sudden, they tell us: That's our decision. It's based on the White Paper on National Defence and that is our policy. I can't deny that the Hon. Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson) gave us some excellent arguments.

[*English*]

My esteemed colleague, the Hon. Member for Parry Sound—Muskoka (Mr. Darling) who has sat on the Committee of National Defence with me, and the Hon. Member who introduced the motion, made some points, but so did the member of the New Democratic Party.

[*Translation*]

The important thing is, and it must be said here in the House, that we cannot go on believing that a country like Canada, whose mission in the world is to set an example ... Does joining the big nuclear club set an example to the rest of the world, considering Canada's well-established reputation? We have a right to think about it. We have a right to consider very carefully and very attentively all the points made by the Hon. Member from Vancouver. What I fail to understand is the rush to make a decision on a matter of such vital importance, a matter that can make or break Canada's reputation. She said, as others have said in the past and will say in the future, that we are entitled to ask ourselves whether it is Canada's mission to do this.

Is it good for Canada to believe that we should spend between eight and sixteen billion dollars on what many in the United States see as a great adventure? A retired admiral of the U.S. fleet—I am not quoting pacifists—said that as far as he was concerned, he would sink them all if he had the impression that, and so forth. You can read what he said. Personally, I think Canada is on the wrong track. We are just as sincere as the Hon. Members who spoke earlier, but we fail to understand why a decision of this magnitude should not be debated at length in the House of Commons and put before the Canadian people when the Prime Minister, in his wisdom, decides to call the next election. This is an important decision. It is a decision that is vital to the future of Canada's youth. Does it always have to be bigger and better? That is what I keep wondering about national defence.

In concluding, I want to say that my Party is clearly committed to NATO. We believe in that institution, which does not prevent us from wondering how we could improve it. My Party believes in our membership in NORAD, which does not prevent us from thinking about it, just as my Party believed in the cruise missiles, and after thinking about it, we decided that enough was enough, and that is why we are now against the cruise missiles. Mr. Speaker—this will be my last comment, and I want to thank you for your patience—embarking on this great adventure would make Canada a different country from what it is now. Canada has a reputation that is known throughout the world. We know that is not how Canada is perceived. Canadian men and women have a right to ask themselves whether that is the kind of national defence they want. Make no mistake: We firmly believe that we need the army, we firmly believe that we need the navy, but we don't believe ... I think we are at least as honest as all these people who would have us rush almost blindly into a decision of this magnitude.

Finally, I would like to thank the Hon. Member who raised the subject for this debate, because it is probably the only debate we will have.

• (1800)

[*English*]

It is probably the only time Parliament at the end of a term of government has had the chance to say: "Be careful. Is it really what you want?"

I conclude by thanking you for your patience, Speaker. If it is impossible to delay and if the House continues to sit, I wonder if my colleague and I should look into the possibility of having an urgent debate on this matter, so that more Members could participate and we can obtain more information from the Minister. The Minister is very confused. He was talking about security and sovereignty; now he is talking about the Atlantic and the Pacific. The sovereignty issue seems to be flying away and I think we should discuss it intelligently.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would like to listen to the Hon. Member, but we have given him an extra three or four minutes.

[*Translation*]

The time provided for consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 42(1), the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

AIR CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. de Cotret that Bill C-129, an Act to provide for the continuance of Air Canada under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares thereof to the public, be read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): There were two or three minutes left for questions and comments on the speech of the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan. I will allow the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North to ask one question and a rebuttal.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I have heard from the government Members on a number of occasions that as a result of

Air Canada getting rid of many of its feeder routes—and the planes are not jets but prop planes—smaller communities obtain more frequent and better service.

Is it not a fact that Air Canada could have made those changes if they were really better? The real reason for getting rid of those routes and creating the smaller companies is that they operate without unions and, certainly even with unions, they do not pay the same kind of wages or benefits as Canadian Airlines does?

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for the question. What happens in this kind of an environment is that other companies are set up, and companies that tend to pay less have no unions involved in the workplace. We saw a situation this past winter where Air Ontario, which was formed out of Austin Airways and Air Ontario, had one group of pilots with a collective agreement and another group that was going for its first collective agreement, and where there were very severe problems of morale and imbalance in the treatment of employees.

We must remember what has been happening in the whole area of deregulation. In effect major companies have been allowed to buy up the small competition and to create a situation wherein we have a duopoly. There are really only two owners in the country, and at the very least one of those owners should remain in the public sector so that we could have a window on the operation to ensure that public policies are adhered to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments are now terminated. Is the House ready the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the Members.

And the division bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 13(4)(a), I have been requested by the Chief Government Whip to defer the division until a later time.

Accordingly, pursuant to Standing Order 13(5), the division on the question now before the House stands deferred until Monday at 6 p.m., at which time the bells to call in the Members will be sounded for not more than 15 minutes.

* * *

ELDORADO NUCLEAR LIMITED REORGANIZATION AND DIVESTITURE ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council) moved that Bill C-121, an Act to authorize the reorganization and divestiture of Eldorado Nuclear Limited and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, be read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

An Hon. Member: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Perhaps Hon. Members could take their seats. I would like to know who is seeking the floor. The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise on this third reading debate and to follow up on the committee hearings in which I played a part. I do so in the name of the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski), the Hon. Member for Vegreville, Alberta. This Bill primarily affects Ontario and Saskatchewan, so it has a central Canadian element to it and a western Canadian element to it.

After third reading the Bill will give the federal Government the authority it requires to proceed with the agreement made with the Province of Saskatchewan and announced on the February 22 of this year. It really has two parts. The first part allows the assets of Eldorado Nuclear Limited and a provincial Crown corporation, Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation, to be merged. The second part of the Bill deals with the privatization of the merged company over a period of seven years.

Bill C-121 provides for the transfer of the assets of Eldorado Nuclear Limited to a new company in return for securities. The articles of the new company, which will be incorporated under the Canada Business Corporations Act, will specify certain conditions the new company will be required to honour.

[*Translation*]

First of all, certain provisions will be included to allow a large number of investors to purchase shares, while ensuring that the new company will remain in Canadian hands and under Canadian control.

Thus, non-resident shareholders or affiliated groups may not own more than 5 per cent of voting shares. At any meeting of shareholders, votes cast by non-residents may not exceed 20 per cent of voting rights. Similarly, no Canadian may own more than 25 per cent of the shares issued. Furthermore, the new company may not issue non-voting shares.

The articles of the new company will provide that the head office shall be located in Saskatoon. We feel it is important for senior management of the company to be close to the primary mining facilities.

• (1810)

[*English*]

The proceeds of the sale of the securities of the new company will be used by Eldorado to discharge its obligations, including the debt which is an obligation of the Government of Canada. It makes a contribution to reducing the debt load borne by the Government of Canada. The two-stage plan, the merger and the privatization of Eldorado and SMDC, was recommended by Eldorado's parent organization, the Canada Development Investment Corporation, as the best privatization opportunity for Eldorado. This recommendation followed three years of detailed and complex negotiations and preparations.

Those of us who served on the committee heard a lot of testimony about the various efforts made to sell the company and privatize it. On the basis of testimony before the committee clearly this was the preferred option in terms of Canadian taxpayers. Both CDIC and its financial advisers, Burns Fry Limited, have stated that the transaction was equitable and provided fair value for Eldorado's assets. Having listened to that testimony, Mr. Speaker, it was clear that it was not an easy situation to assess, and I think they deserve some credit for a job well done.

The best guarantee of jobs and job security for any company is for it to be a healthy, viable operation with financial stability, competitive advantages, and a secure market for its products. All these conditions apply with regard to this merger and privatization effort. There will be positive benefits in terms of better and more secure jobs similar to those which followed other privatization initiatives of this Government.

I bring to the attention of the House the success of de Havilland where hundreds more Canadians have jobs because we were able to sell the company to a much larger entity with a better marketing system. Our capacity to manufacture the Canadian product, the airplane itself, has produced increased market opportunities and increased opportunities for Canadians.

One issue that all Members accept as a serious and important responsibility is that the employees of any privatized corporation and the public at large be protected adequately. In April, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Masse) announced new uranium mining regulations. These new regulations reflect this Government's commitment to the health and safety of workers and to the protection of the environment. In testimony before the legislative committee, the Atomic Energy Control Board made clear that the privatization of Eldorado would not affect the board's authority under the Atomic Energy Control Act. The new company will be subject to the same regulations concerning the health and safety of workers and the protection of the environment as any other private or public corporation. That is true of all privatization initiatives. They apply before the privatization and after the privatization.

It is clear that the transaction we are proposing through this legislation will not affect the regulatory framework that oversees the uranium industry. Exports of uranium and nuclear materials will continue to be controlled and monitored by the AECB and the Department of External Affairs in accordance with Canada's nuclear non-proliferation policy. Other Acts and regulations such as the Canada Labour Code will also continue to apply to the new company.

[*Translation*]

The new company will operate existing dump sites under the statutory supervision of the Atomic Energy Control Board.

The federal Government remains committed to developing and contributing to a solution to the problem of management of existing waste. To this end, the declaration of intent provides for a shared-cost formula. Management and the full cost of management of new waste will be the responsibility of the new company, within the existing regulatory framework.

Furthermore, the Government will ensure that Eldorado, in addition to all its commitments to local communities, will meet its other obligations as well.

[*English*]

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I hope other Members will speak briefly to this legislation which opens up new opportunities for Eldorado. The merger with SMDC will create a significantly stronger company with the resources, technology, and personnel to compete effectively in the global market. The free trade agreement with the United States opens markets to us. Increased efficiency and productivity will take us into global markets with more effectiveness. History tells us that every nation since the Second World War which has entered into agreements, small nations with large nations, has broken the dependency upon the larger nation. Through increased markets we will get increased productivity, increased competitiveness, and a better sense of being able to compete in global markets.

The wide distribution of shares and restrictions on the ownership of shares will give Canadians and employees of the

company a real and direct interest in the future of the company. That too follows through with previous privatizations. Employees are among the first and the fastest to take a share ownership position because they have believed in a company and had faith in it. I am sure it will be the same in this case as well.

These safeguards will also ensure that control will always remain firmly in Canadian hands. At the same time the operation of the current regulatory regimes will ensure that vital public interests such as health, safety, and environmental protection will continue unabated.

This agreement will benefit Canada and it will benefit Saskatchewan. It adds strength to Canada's uranium industry in a manner that will enable it to contribute more to the national economy and to Saskatchewan's economy and to maintain its world leadership in uranium production and technology. As with all the privatization efforts which the Government has undertaken since 1984, this legislation encompasses a pragmatic and sensitive approach to the public interest as well as the continuing interest of employees and the communities concerned.

I hope the House will move expeditiously this evening to complete third reading debate so that we can proceed to other important legislation.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, we do not want to move too expeditiously to other legislation because this one is important as well. We have to spend a little time on it, but I can appreciate the sentiment of my friend, the Parliamentary Secretary. Certainly we are going to move very quickly on this Bill.

I appreciate having this opportunity to speak at third reading on the reorganization of Eldorado Nuclear Limited. While I find there are some problems with this privatization and the amalgamation with the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation, we feel that generally the Bill should be approved. In light of that, I would like to outline a few of my concerns, that I have and I hope the Government will be addressing them.

On reviewing this Bill the legislative committee was very fortunate to hear witnesses who highlighted concerns on Eldorado's activities in the past and the possible consequences of this proposed merger with Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation.

• (1820)

We also discussed problems which could occur as a result of the privatization of these two companies. This will not necessarily be a smooth merger, but if both parties act in the best interests of their intentions, then I think it can work.

While the Liberals continue to support Bill C-121, I would like to comment on specific problems incurred in the production and marketing of uranium. That is where the basic problems lie. While they have been allowed to fester for some time, there seems to be an acknowledgement by all parties to the merger that these problems exist. It seems that it has at least been stated that there is a willingness to deal with these problems.

My argument is that if privatization is to be the solution for the debt problems incurred by Eldorado, then Canadians must be assured of several things. First, they must be assured that there is an adequate regulatory framework to monitor this unique commodity, uranium. Second, they must be assured that there is a vigorous environmental assessment of any new projects undertaken by this merged company. Third, they must have the assurance that we have in place a time frame, financing, and competent management which will be accountable to the federal Government so that it will clean up disposal sites. Fourth, they must be assured that no municipalities will be left in limbo as a result of the termination of ongoing grants in lieu of taxes by this merger. While we want to help the uranium industry and these two companies, we have to be sure that we are not leaving problems with municipalities as a result of this merger and privatization. I will explain further what I mean by that later in my remarks.

I would like to elaborate on each of the four issues I have mentioned. With respect to the regulatory framework, it is the Atomic Energy Control Board which has been and will be responsible for ensuring that the activities of the new company are undertaken in a manner consistent with public safety, particularly with respect to protecting the environment from the release of radioactive material into the atmosphere.

Testimony of Dr. Terrence Downey, who did his Ph.D. dissertation on the uranium industry in Canada, emphasized by historical evidence the safety, environmental, health, and social problems which resulted from inadequate government supervision during the war years when Canada virtually lost control of its supply of uranium as a result of contracts with the United States. Furthermore, supplies of this radioactive material were bootlegged out of the company confines. The long-term ramifications of this activity is still evident today in the Malvern subdivision of Scarborough, Ontario. Soil in this area is still suffering from radioactive contamination. We have before us a precedent of what inattentiveness, bad business practices, and no consideration for the environment can mean. Even 40 years later, the City of Scarborough is still suffering from these ramifications.

It was not until full government ownership of Eldorado was in place that discipline was imposed on the production and marketing of uranium. Even so, the committee was informed of a whole host of environmental problems resulting from uranium mining and refining. In Port Hope, Ontario, the cost of cleaning up the low-level radioactive site was estimated to be from $265 million up to $735 million. That is a tremendous amount of money to clean up a site which has been like that for a considerable period of time, much to the chagrin of the people living in the immediate area. Yet it is still there, though it has not been there for as long as the polluted site in Scarborough, Ontario.

There is an alarming aspect to the obvious need for supervision and monitoring of a company which deals with this resource. In testimony from two sources, officials of the Atomic Energy Control Board and Dr. Hare who headed a thorough study of nuclear safety in Ontario, concern was expressed about the capability of this regulatory agency to carry out its responsibilities. The Atomic Energy Control Board is responsible for the regulation of atomic energy in Canada. Yet, we heard from Dr. Hare who headed a study on nuclear safety in Ontario and from the agency itself that there were doubts about this very agency's ability to carry out its responsibilities. To me, that is tremendously alarming, and I think it is alarming to all Canadians who know about this very grave problem.

In discussing the need for a 50 per cent increase in resources, the President of the Atomic Energy Control Board noted in testimony before the Standing Committee on Energy, Mines and Resources on May 11 of this year the following:

> I have a feeling we are crippled. It takes longer to do the work, but we also cannot do it as much in depth as we would like to do it.

The President of the Atomic Energy Control Board is saying that his own organization is crippled by a lack of funds. He is saying that it takes much longer to do the work and that when they do the work, they cannot do it adequately because they are not properly financed. This is the agency that is supervising, monitoring, and controlling the nuclear industry in Canada. To hear a statement like that from its President is alarming, to say the least.

In testimony to the same committee, Dr. Hare responded to the suggestion of increasing the size of the board by saying:

> Yes. I think perhaps my most crucial feeling about regulation in this whole business is that the Atomic Energy Control Board is too small. When I compare it with the regulatory bodies in other countries, I am amazed with what they do, but at the same time I do not think this can continue.

In addition to the testimony of the President of the Atomic Energy Control Board, the chairman of a committee investigating the nuclear industry in Ontario is saying that the Atomic Energy Control Board is too small and that he is amazed that it is doing as well as it is. These are two tremendous sources of information, both condemning the inattention to and ineffectiveness of this board because of the Government's lack of action and support.

Dr. Hare went on to tell committee members that out of five board members, two were *ex officio*. What is relevant to this debate on privatizing a uranium company was his suggestion that the Atomic Energy Control Board did not have the scope to make proper decisions.

This board which oversees our industry, in addition to everything else, does not have the scope to make proper decisions. Dr. Hare stated:

> It is quite clear to me that in making its decisions the board ought to take into account far more broadly than it can do at the present time socio-economic, radiological and environmental questions for which the board members themselves have very little skill. So in my report I recommend that the size of the board be increased so as to make such broader representation possible.

That is a very valid recommendation. If the Government is trying to cut costs, then the Atomic Energy Control Board which supervises our very vital and controversial nuclear industry is not one of the areas in which the Government should be cutting costs.

• (1830)

Doctor Hare also noted that the Board should remain a technical regulator. He said:

> What I am saying is that those technical regulations should have been made by a board that is competent around the table to consider more deeply the socio-economic, health and environmental questions which are the real stuff of this business. The technical questions are not usually in doubt; it is the non-technical matters that really have to be discussed in depth, and they have been inhibited from doing this. Moreover, it has been their policy to avoid this.

That is alarming. We have placed our complete confidence and faith in the Atomic Energy Control Board. It has been a very good agency, but it is under financed and does not have enough members. The members it has cannot deal with a lot of the questions with which they should be dealing. They are only dealing with technical matters and not with socio-economic, health and environmental questions as they should be, and as Dr. Hare's study stated.

We need some definite attention to these matters. While we are agreeing to the passage of this Bill, we want to set out that we are doing so mainly as a business framework. We agree that the AECB can have as much jurisdiction over a private company as we can, but we must point out that the AECB has not had control over the public company. With government support it has to zero in more on the concerns of the citizens of Canada with respect to nuclear energy.

With respect to some of the environmental matters, representatives from Newcastle, Ontario, gave us a very enlightening presentation on the problems which occur when a regulatory agency does not or cannot adequately control the disposal of low-level radioactive waste from a uranium mine. They told us, because they are in the Port Hope area, about the problems they have with the waste site in their area.

Eldorado Nuclear placed its waste management facility near Newcastle on a site of approximately 30 acres of land adjacent to Lake Ontario. In this area, which includes not only Newcastle, but Port Granby, Port Hope, and Welcome, Ontario, there is a total of 880,000 cubic metres of low-level radioactive waste.

As I mentioned earlier, the cost of cleaning up this dump site is estimated at up to $735 million. One cannot help but question why the AECB has not been successful in stabilizing and decommissioning this environmentally sensitive dump site. Why has this been allowed to continue on the banks of Lake Ontario? Of course that waste is going to spread. If erosion takes place on the banks of Lake Ontario, as it very well could, seepage and leeching into Lake Ontario is going to occur that

much sooner. It is expensive to correct, but the problem exists and the price is not too great when we consider the safety of citizens of this country, in particular those in the Province of Ontario.

Bill C-121 establishes financing for cleaning up existing waste. The first $2 million will be provided by the new company. The next $98 million will be split, with the new company providing twenty-three ninety-eighths and the Government of Canada providing the other seventy-five ninety-eights. Canada will pay any amount over $100 million. Use of the waste disposal site at Port Granby has been terminated as of June 30. Fortunately the AECB and the Government got the message, got together and decided that they were not going to use at least this dump site any more. That is long overdue.

What is alarming about all this is the fact that the Government has condoned this situation for four years. It has not recognized the seriousness of having a dump site like this one in a residential area so close to Lake Ontario.

With respect to this merger, while the financing agreement is in place, I am concerned that there is no time frame in place to complete the decommissioning of this low-level radioactive waste site. The Government is saying that it is going to leave it in a state of limbo, that it is not cleaning it up, and that it is not helping the residents of the area. We want action from the Government. It has to tell us when it is going to start decommissioning this site. Furthermore, responsibility for cleaning up the site will be in the hands of the federal Government. Speculating on the estimated cost of $75 million for stabilizing the dump site, the President of the AECB raised a serious problem. Once again I want to quote from his testimony in the legislative committee:

> According to the agreement, Eldorado would have to pay 25 per cent of that $75 million up to a maximum of $25 million, with the remainder to be paid by the federal Government. According to the Atomic Energy Control Act, we can tell Eldorado to make changes or stabilize a site, but we cannot force the federal Government to pay its share.

That is the difficulty. The federal Government is delaying the cleaning up of this dump site, but it has to decide. It has to act now to clean up and decommission the site. He went on to say that he wondered whether this might not lead to outright refusal. Obviously the agency is very concerned about whether the Government is acting in good faith with respect to this dump site. The President of AECB went on to say:

> From a legal standpoint, I do not think we have any problem with the company; I think that the problem would be between the company and the federal Government. That is one of the questions we are asking ourselves. Will there be problems of this nature every time we want to impose measures that might be very costly?

It is in the open and the Government has to respond. It has to lead the way, take the initiative, and clean up the dump site. Yet it has been silent, even in the face of testimony from its own agency.

• (1840)

We heard similar concerns about the delay in the clean-up process expressed by representatives of Newcastle and Port Granby. I urge the Government to give the Atomic Energy Control Board a specific time frame in which to stabilize and decommission this site. Furthermore, I would hope that there will be vigorous environmental assessments of future projects by the new company. It may also be necessary to have a field office with Atomic Energy Control Board staff located in Saskatchewan where a substantial amount of the uranium mining will be undertaken.

With respect to the previous obligations between Eldorado Nuclear and Blind River, Ontario, one of the communities which I said I hoped would not be jeopardized or left in an indefinite position as a result of the privatization, it is my understanding that the new company will honour the commitments made by Eldorado.

The Town of Blind River will be assured of the continuation of the $85,000 a year grant that Eldorado made in lieu of school taxes with which Blind River is paying off a mortgage on a community centre. In addition, there will be a continuation of the town's right to lease the golf course for $1 a year from Eldorado. The new company will also agree to assume responsibility for the erosion of the river which runs through the Eldorado property and affects the golf course.

I want to say how pleased I am that the Town of Blind River has been given these assurances. I would like to thank my colleague, the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster), who worked very hard on behalf of his constituents in Blind River to attain this assurance. He sat with me on the legislative committee and questioned the witnesses. I believe that the success which has been achieved was largely through the Member for Algoma. I think he deserves congratulations for his work. Without this Member's persistence and true loyalty to his constituents, the new company may not have assumed the previous contractual obligations of Eldorado Nuclear.

The new company will be made up mainly of Canadian shareholders. The Act says that non-Canadian shareholders can own a maximum of 20 per cent of the shares. However, I read something very alarming in the Saskatoon *Star Pheonix* on July 8. It reported the statements of the new chairman of the new company. The article read:

> A 20 per cent restriction on foreign ownership could be lifted if there is too much difficulty in selling enough shares to Canadians in what will be the world's largest uranium producer, says the newly-appointed chairman.

If that is starting already, Mr. Speaker, the Government's legislation will not mean anything. Many of us are giving our approval to this legislation on the basis that non-resident ownership in the new company dealing with our uranium resource, which is of tremendous concern to Canadians not only from an economic point of view but from a safety point of view, will be limited to 20 per cent and absolutely no more. The Bill is not yet even passed, and the chairman is saying that

non-resident ownership may increase beyond 20 per cent if they cannot sell enough shares to Canadians. That is terrible.

I know the chairman and find him to be a very serious and capable individual. I do not think he would say this unless he has spoken to the Government about this possibility. If the Government is playing games with this issue—and I have no reason to believe it is other than that from what I am reading—it is acting in bad faith. I hope the Government is not acting in bad faith and is not seriously considering increasing the level of non-resident ownership in this company.

To emphasize this, the chairman said:

> This restriction can always be changed, and those levels will be looked at as we go into the future... careful consideration would be given to increasing the 20 per cent restriction currently in place on foreign investment.

I think it is awful for that even to be mentioned at this particular time. Through you, Mr. Speaker, and through this House I want to serve the Government with warning that if it or any Government attempts to increase the percentage of non-ownership above 20 per cent in this new company, our Party will fight it as hard as we possibly can with every means at our disposal.

In the interim, there are problems yet to be solved with respect to low-level radioactive nuclear waste. There are uncertainties about what the actual financing picture was. I doubt very much whether the values placed on Eldorado Nuclear and the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation are accurate. I think this was a political compromise between two Governments. However, that is for the future to tell us. I honestly do not think the figures were accurate but, on the other hand, at least the head office will be in Saskatoon. I wish the people of Saskatchewan well and I hope that this company will be successful.

I ask the Government to maintain all due diligence in monitoring this opposition and to strengthen the Atomic Energy Control Board, not only for the sake of this new company but for the whole of the nuclear industry in Canada.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, members of the New Democratic Party opposed this Bill to privatize Eldorado Nuclear when it was brought forward in the House; we opposed it in the House. We attended the committee meetings, listened to the witnesses, and questioned the witnesses. Everything we heard from them confirmed for us even more clearly than when we first opposed the Bill how correct we were in opposing it.

I will deal briefly with some of the reasons for our opposition, beginning with the financial ones. Atomic Energy Control Board officials told us that as a result of the operations of this company there are, in the area of the Towns of Newcastle and Port Hope, hundreds of thousands of tonnes of low- level radioactive waste very near Lake Ontario. Unless major steps are taken to contain the waste and eventually remove it, it will gradually move into Lake Ontario and pollute the water which is used by millions of people.

This happened when Eldorado was a Crown corporation owned by the people of Canada. We are now turning it over to private investors whose main purpose, quite understandably, will be to make a profit. We are turning it over to them without adequate control of their future operations, and the Government of Canada has committed the people of Canada to undertake almost entirely the cost of cleaning up that waste.

• (1850)

Let us look at the record of Denison Mines, a privately owned company in the nuclear business, owned by Stephen Roman. I recommend an interesting excerpt from a book being written about Stephen Roman and Denison Mines. It shows how that company deliberately and consistently breached the most elementary rules for protecting the environment and the workers in order to make greater profits.

Those are the kinds of concerns we have about privatizing this company. First, we believe that it is financially a bad deal for the people of Canada and a good deal for the new owners, particularly because of the environmental aspect.

The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan) related the concerns expressed by the head of the Atomic Energy Control Board. I want to summarize the concerns of people living in the Towns of Newcastle and Port Hope and surrounding areas. They have not been reassured by this Bill. They have been expressing their concerns for years, which were essentially ignored by the former Government and the present Government.

They came to the committee with some specific requests, none of which were dealt with. They want a clean-up of the Port Granby dump and the continued presence of the federal Government in the disposition of the surrounding 650 acres where this low-level radio-active waste exists. They want an indication that a clean-up will proceed and that there will be sufficient funds to undertake it. Is there anything in the Bill that would give them that assurance? No.

Given the cost of between $250 million and $650 million to clean up this mess, there is nothing in the Bill nor in anything said by any government spokesperson to indicate that there are the resources or the will needed to finance the clean-up from the sale of shares, while the new company escapes with a very limited burden of some $25 million.

There is still no clean-up set for the Port Granby dump and other low-level radiation sites. This is not for good. This area has been campaigning locally on this issue at least since 1970. In 1984, when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) was Leader of the Opposition he promised a great deal more. Let me quote from the letter which the Prime Minister, then Leader of the Opposition, wrote to Mr. James Sculthorpe of Port Hope, Ontario, on August 21, 1984. He said, referring to the

activities of the Hon. Member for Durham—Northumberland (Mr. Lawrence):

> As Mr. Lawrence stated recently, there is ample evidence that neither of the current proposals by Eldorado Nuclear Limited for establishing a permanent radioactive waste disposal dump either near Port Granby or near Wesleyville are acceptable to the people of those communities or to their elected representatives. All such waste should be removed from major population areas and kept well away from any major water resource such as Lake Ontario.
>
> While this would involve greater expense, the federal government, as owner of the Eldorado Nuclear Limited, must accept at least partial responsibility and provide the leadership.
>
> For several years federal authorities have been exploring where and how to store permanently Canada's growing accumulation of nuclear and radio active waste. The waste from Eldorado Nuclear Limited must be considered part of that problem and its solution.

That was stated when the Prime Minister was Leader of the Opposition. All that was forgotten when he became Prime Minister. What we see is privatization, with no guarantees at all that the Government will do very much about the waste.

Let me deal with another concern expressed by the employees through their union. It is the question of pensions, which have become an issue in almost every privatization we have seen, including Teleglobe, Canadian Arsenals, and now Eldorado.

The Eldorado situation is supposed to be a very happy one, with a surplus of over $54 million in the pension fund. Many promises were made by the former Minister responsible for privatization, the present Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mrs. McDougall), and the President of Eldorado Nuclear, George Currie, that the surplus would be used to improve indexing and distribute other benefits to plan members. There was a statement by the then Minister in which she said that existing pension and benefit plans would be adopted by the new company. She went on to say: "I can confirm that pensions are protected by this agreement".

The President of Eldorado Nuclear gave the same assurances. Now we see that the Eldorado pension plan will be changed from a defined benefit to a money purchase plan and that such disbursements as indexing will be dropped. The current defined benefit plan, which could easily accommodate post retirement inflation protection for both current and future retirees will be dropped. Under the new money purchase plan, post retirement inflation protection for future retirees cannot be provided.

The surplus may be distributed by a contribution holiday which will reduce the surplus from $54 million to $12 million. Clearly United Steelworkers of America, representing the union members, was upset by this development as was made clear by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy), in a statement which he made on July 7, 1988. He said, as reported at page 17236 of *Hansard*:

> When the Government announced that it would be privatizing Eldorado Nuclear the Minister then in charge of privatization said in a press release that "existing pension and benefit plans will be adopted by the new company". In a statement and a letter sent to employees she repeated that promise. The company itself repeated that promise before a committee of the House of Commons.
>
> Now in a proposal made public to the workers yesterday it becomes apparent for existing workers who continue to work for this firm that they will lose the protection of their present pension plans. The protection will only exist for those people who have already retired.

We see what the promises of the Conservative Government and the officials of the company mean.

Let me deal with another matter of tremendous importance. It is the question of job guarantees. We moved an amendment which was rejected by government Members, of course. It dealt with job guarantees due to the fears that the merger between Eldorado and the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation would mean that jobs in the upgrading plants at Port Hope and Blind River would be in jeopardy. They are especially in jeopardy because of the free trade agreement which, according to Annex 902.5, exempts the U.S. from the Canadian uranium upgrading policy of 1985. Let me put that section of the agreement on record:

> Export Measures
>
> 2. Canada shall exempt the United States of America from the Canadian Uranium Upgrading Policy as announced by the Minister of State for Mines on October 18, 1985.
>
> 3. The United States of America shall exempt Canada from the prohibition on the exportation of Alaskan oil under section 7(d) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, up to a maximum volume of 50,000 barrels per day on an average basis, subject to the condition that such oil be transported to Canada from a suitable location within the lower 48 states.

• (1900)

There you have, Mr. Speaker, another illustration of the serious adverse effects Canada will experience as a result of this free trade agreement. The testimony heard by the committee indicated just how the free trade agreement was part of a reshaping of the uranium market in North American which gives the United States access to our low-cost, high-grade uranium in northern Saskatchewan without the uranium having to be upgraded in Canada. This was confirmed by Professor Douglas McArthur, Professor of Economics at the University of Saskatchewan. He was questioned by the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) about this matter and he said:

> I think we are seeing an integration of particularly North American markets taking place, with free trade and other developments, the removal or virtual withdrawal from the further processing policy and so on. I am not very hopeful or optimistic for fuel processing in Canada under those conditions. Others will perhaps come back and tell you they are optimistic. I would challenge them to provide substantial evidence of this.

The Hon. Member for Algoma then asked:

> Do you see the trade-off with the Americans and the free trade, where we are giving up our further processing, and they are doing away with the limitation on enrichment of Canadian uranium? It seems to me the administration has been fighting this, day in and year out, in the courts, and so on, to make sure they can buy $17-a-pound uranium from Saskatchewan anyway. If there were no free trade deal, are they not just going to pass a law that they can get access to this cheap uranium anyway? Did they just give us the sleeves out of their vest?

Professor McArthur answered:

> I do not think there is a lot in that arrangement that is going to advance the interests of the Canadian uranium industry, I think it is going to have the result of making the various stages more competitive, which at one level is attractive. But it raises some serious questions, as I said, about the the future of Blind River and Port Hope. These are some of the consequences of moving into arrangements of this sort that one has to be aware of. This strikes me as being one place where we can expect to see some implications in terms of industry and cities and towns and people and workers in our country.

Those views expressed by Professor McArthur were never answered. They were ignored completely because, again, the Conservative Party has this blind belief that the private sector can do anything better than the public sector.

I would like to raise one other matter about which Professor McArthur spoke. He talked about how the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation, a Crown corporation, made it a major tenet, a major reason for having a Crown corporation, that that corporation make every effort to provide employment for the people of northern Saskatchewan who are, in the main, native people. I do not have to tell Members of this House how disadvantaged, how poor and how sick native people are in many parts of Canada because there have been no jobs. The then New Democratic Government of Saskatchewan determined it would try to change that in northern Saskatchewan by using its Crown mining corporations to do everything they could to provide jobs for native people. They succeeded in that, and now what we see through the privatization of Eldorado and the privatization of Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation, is a private corporation which will naturally have as its major objective, the making of profits. You can be certain, Mr. Speaker, that if it will be cheaper to employ people from southern parts of Canada, who are not native, then that is precisely what will happen. For these and other reasons with which I think my colleague, the Member from Regina, will deal, we intend to continue to oppose this Bill as we have from the day it was brought forward.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments? Debate.

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I too wish to join in the debate on Bill C-121, a Bill the Government has placed before us which creates a new corporation by combining the assets of Eldorado Nuclear with the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation. When future historians look back at this particular period in the evolution of our society, I think they will view the action taken by the Government with Bill C-121 as one of the great and unfortunate mistakes of this particular period.

In the evolution of social societies, certain laws, which I cannot quite figure out yet, prevail and it becomes necessary at certain times to have right wing governments to correct mistakes from a previous period of evolution. The mistakes that right wing government makes in turn leads to its own defeat, and then society moves onward. Some people compare it to the swing of a pendulum. It swings to the left and it swings to the right and somehow this produces social change and progress.

Bill C-121, I believe, will historically prove to be a tremendous excess of right wing philosophy. It is, as many Members have pointed out, an ideology defeating common sense. I would like to deal with this topic in terms of some of the sub topics. I would like to talk about the environmental impacts, the effects on the whole nuclear industry, and I would like to discuss some of the history of Eldorado. I would also like to discuss the business reasons behind this.

Let me take the last point first. Even from a business point of view, what the Government is doing today does not make business sense. It continues to astound me how a right wing Government that espouses business philosophy does at times make very stupid decisions. To put the assets of Eldorado Nuclear and the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation on the market now just does not make any sense. The industry is in a slump. There is a surplus of uranium that has been stockpiled. It is not a good time now from a business point of view to dispose of the assets. It makes no sense whatsoever. Of course, the really dumb people are the Tories in Saskatchewan, the Government of Saskatchewan, because the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation, from a business point of view, has indeed been a very successful corporation, bringing in revenues and royalties to the coffers of the Province of Saskatchewan on a very consistent basis.

I would like to quote from the paper presented to the committee by Professor Douglas McArthur of the University of Regina. He stated that over the four-year period since the company commenced production, and he was referring to the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation, it has returned close to 50 per cent of the province equity excluding taxes and royalties. In its most recent year, 1987, the return on equity was 20 per cent, placing it well ahead of similar firms in the mining industry. Even though there is a slump in the uranium industry on a world-wide basis, the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation was able to show a return of 20 per cent on equity. That is certainly not the case when it comes to Eldorado. Eldorado had total cumulative losses by the end of 1986 of $155.9 million. Its cumulative return on shareholder equity over the period amounted to a negative 50 per cent.

• (1910)

Eldorado has some major and serious obligations, many of which in fact appear that with this legislation the Government will retain. For example, Professor McArthur in the paper he presented to the committee stated:

> A second matter of concern has to deal with the handling of wastes and other potential liabilities contracted by the companies up to the time of the formation of the new firm.
>
> The Government of Canada has indicated that there will be an effort to transfer to government (i.e. socialize) a considerable part of the responsibility for these to some degree unspecified liabilities. This suggests a curious ambivalence about the principle of privatization. Private ownership

> generally implies obtaining the rights to the benefits of an undertaking, while at the same taking the responsibility for associated business obligations. In this case, the government intends to transfer the benefits to a select group of people with the ability to pay for shares, while imposing the burden of a major part of the obligations onto taxpayers in general. This is without doubt being done to enhance the marketability of the shares. But legislator and the public should be aware of the degree to which this compromises the principle of privatization, and the extent to which taxpayers are potentially burdened in order to meet a purely political, need with significant potential benefits for a select group of shareholders. Some have called this practice socialism for the few, which is a fairly apt description.

We see that this means does not make much business sense. I suggest that in Bill C-121 the Government shows that it is made up of lousy business people when it comes to conducting business for the public interest.

Let me reiterate. It is not a good time to put these assets on the market. There is a slump in the uranium industry. The Saskatchewan Government is made up of a bunch of damn fools for taking a very profitable operation and selling it off. It appears as though from a public point of view it is the public and the taxpayers of Canada who will be inheriting many of the liabilities from Eldorado. The new owners, the new shareholders, will not be acquiring those liabilities, which means the clean-up of soil that contains uranium wastes.

I would like to go back into the history of Eldorado to see why it was created in the first place as a public company. First, it was not due to a great amount of zeal for socialism by C. D. Howe that Eldorado was created as a public company. It became obvious that in the early 1940s during the war years the British Government was anxious to secure a reliable supply of uranium for its own joint effort with Canada to produce nuclear weapons. So, very quietly the federal Government of the day, a Liberal Government, started to acquire interests in this uranium mining company, Eldorado.

It thought that it had control over Eldorado. What it did is that it left the management of the company with a group that was initially there, a private group. By the end of 1943 the Government had acquired a controlling interest in the company, yet not a majority interest. However, in the spring of 1943 the British Government discovered to its dismay that Eldorado had contracted to sell to the United States all the uranium it could produce over the next two years. Despite the fact that the intention of the Canadian Government was to obtain a controlling interest in Eldorado so that it could meet its obligations to Great Britain, it left the management of the company in private hands.

These private managers did what good private managers do all over the world, managers who are mainly motivated by profit. They took the best bidder. The best bidder was the United States. All at once Canada was not able to fulfil its obligations to Great Britain.

When Eldorado was totally nationalized Mr. Grant Glasgow, a member of the firm of Clarkson Gordon, did a thorough review of Eldorado and its practices under private management. It was found that, first, some of the top managers in Eldorado had sold uranium secretly. Second, it was discovered that there was some $2.6 million in cash and materials that had been extracted from the company. Third, it was discovered as well that practices that were detrimental both to the environment and to the health and safety of the workers were being undertaken. Those are the reasons why Eldorado became a public corporation.

Uranium is not just something that is dealt with like a commodity that can be bought at a cornerstore. What we are talking about is a substance whose negative effects will be felt for thousands and thousands of years. The effects of radiation, low-level radiation or high-level radiation, will be with us for generations to come. If you think, Mr. Speaker, of the time between now and the time of the construction of the pyramids, that time span is but just a twinkle in the time that the negative effects of radiation will be felt.

There are no social organizations, whether public or private, that I feel are responsible enough to deal with a substance whose effects will be felt for generations and generations to come. If I had my way, only a group of monks and nuns totally dedicated to the welfare and the well-being of the human race would be responsible for the uranium industry if we are going to have one at all. To hand it over into private hands is the ultimate of follies, the ultimate of stupidities, the ultimate of where ideology is master over the concern and the well-being of generations to come.

That is why at the beginning of my remarks I stated that Bill C-121, historically, will show to be the most stupid and inept act of this particular Government and the right-wing swing.

Let me put it on record that if I ever have in my power and am in a position of influence when this Government will be chucked out, as it will one day, then I suggest to all those who have invested in this new company that there will be many of us who will insist that this company be expropriated and brought back under public control without the type of compensation that they might otherwise expect. The uranium industry should not ever be in the hands of private industry. It is not an industry that works in a normal way. The effects are too long-term. It requires a sense of social responsibility to present and future generations that I suspect even publicly-owned corporations have a great difficulty demonstrating. To put it in the hands of the private sector that must show a profit on a yearly basis, and which is driven by market forces, is to invite disaster. It is irresponsible. The Government should be thoroughly ashamed of itself.

• (1920)

The Government states that there is nothing to worry about, and that it is going to put in place some regulations. In fact, it does not state that it will put into place some regulations. It states that the existing regulations will take care of the

environmental concerns, and the concerns for the health and safety of the workers.

First, let us recognize that the present regulatory régime was brought down under the assumption that there was a public Crown corporation in the uranium industry. I would suggest that the regulations need changing and updating to reflect this new reality.

This was definitely presented by Dr. Terrence J. Downey, Chairman, Department of Political Science, University of Waterloo, in a letter he wrote to the Clerk of the Legislative Committee on Bill C-121. He noted that the Hon. Member for Burlington (Mr. Kempling) had invited him to send some of his observations to the committee dealing with the regulatory régime under privatization. In part, Dr. Downey's letter states:

> In view of these considerations, I suggest that an enhanced regulatory regime must be put in place to correct current weaknesses and, of utmost importance, to bridge the major supervisory gap which will be created by a privatization which removes a key element of the regulatory framework.

In his letter Dr. Downey states that he has serious reservations that the existing regulatory régime is sufficient to ensure that this new corporation will be prevented from doing environmental damage and injury to the health of its workers.

Some very important work has been done on the effects of low-level radiation. We know from statistics that there was a tremendous increase in deaths from leukaemia throughout the world in the late 1940s and early 1950s as a result of the nuclear testing that the superpowers had been doing above ground. In fact, the statistics became so alarming that one of the first agreements on nuclear weaponry between the Soviet Union and the United States was to continue the testing underground because of the effect that low-level radiation was having on a global scale.

Some of the work now being done on low levels of radiation has shown a marked increase in deaths of those people born in the late 1940s and early 1950s in a period of time when there were high levels of low level radiation throughout the globe, and that there has been a marked increase in death and illness among that group of the population in the period of the Chernobyl disaster. The statistics now show that those people who were placed at risk because they were born in a time when there was a large amount of low-level radiation on a global scale were much more susceptible when the globe was in another period of massive low-level radiation because of the Chernobyl disaster. We see the effects of something that occurred 20 or 30 years ago later on down the road.

When we deal with uranium we must surely deal with it with a tremendous sense of responsibility and awe. By privatizing our uranium industry, I am afraid that we take a step away from responsibility. We allow it to be in the hands of people who are purely and totally motivated by market forces.

It is understandable when people invest in something that they expect a profit. They do not expect it in 10 or 20 years from now, they expect it at the end of the year. There is no doubt that decisions will be made that are primarily based on the need to satisfy investors. That puts at risk the health and safety not only of the workers, but also of the environment, and generations to come. It puts at risk the health and well-being of the globe, the planet, and the children yet to be born, all in the name of some idiotic ideology of the Government and its insistence on privatizing, and that before the election it must have a good record of privatization. That is its motivation. Indeed, it is the height of irresponsibility. It shows and proves my contention that, at present, human institutions, whether they are government or private institutions, do not have the maturity and the responsibility of dealing with substances whose effects will be felt generations into the future.

Therefore, I must be opposed to this motion.

Mr. Benjamin: I thank my colleague from the other half of our Queen city for his remarks. I fully agree with and support what he said. By way of comment I wish to say that, as far as I am concerned, and I have some confidence as far as hundreds of thousands of people in this country are concerned, it is time now to serve notice on those who would be inclined to buy shares privately in the uranium industry that as and when the Government is defeated those shareholders should be happy to just get their money back. There is no time or place for private ownership for profit in the nuclear industry in this modern world. That is my comment, and that is my view.

I want to ask my colleague if he would care to comment on that view, and whether he agrees or disagrees. I welcome his opinion, and I also welcome his comments as to the feelings of most Canadians on this issue.

Mr. de Jong: I share the views of the Hon. Member, as I also mentioned in my remarks. When the Government changes, whichever future Government replaces it, one of the things that that Government will have to do is to correct the excesses of this particular Government, and on top of that list will be correcting the tremendous mistake that Bill C-121 is committing. It is a terrible mistake and a terrible blunder that must be corrected, not only for business reasons, but for environmental and health reasons, and for the safety of Canadian citizens yet to come.

Mr. Hawkes: I want to thank Members opposite for their co-operation on this Bill. It is my understanding that there is a predisposition to move it through the House, and I very much appreciate that, as does the House.

It is interesting that we can have such differences of opinion, and I believe that those differences of opinion are healthy. One of the things that speeches of Members opposite have triggered in me is a thought pattern that I have felt for quite a while. There is a considerable danger when a group of people set the rules, and a group of people control the policemen, and the same group of people are the owners. I recognize the genuine concern for health and safety, but the nation might experience less conflict of interest, and it might be a safer world, if elected people set the rules and were responsible for policing the rules

and did not complicate the situation through ownership. There is a normal, natural tendency among things that are closely interrelated to be influenced by other parts of that relationship.

I put this out generally as a difference of opinion, but I think that Government should restrict itself to setting down what the rules should be, making sure that there are adequate ways of policing the rules, and not complicating that any more than necessary with ownership, because the desire to please the ownership part of it might indeed complicate and make the world a little less safe.

• (1930)

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, I have some trouble with that argument, particularly coming from this Conservative Member. We have heard from the Government over and over again that we must get government off its back and that we must rid of all these regulations. The mining industry hates government regulations. It is always at war with government because of mining regulations.

Now we hear a government Member justifying privatization of this industry. He obviously recognizes the need for a tremendous amount of social responsibility when dealing with nuclear substances and uranium substances. He says: "Oh, well, regulations will take care of that". I can see what will happen: "We will privatize it. We will have the regulations three or four years down the road. Well, there is another slump in the market. We will have to lay off workers. There are a few short cuts that we can make", and there go the regulations. We are getting government off its back, all right; I do not buy that argument!

I think he makes a valid point when he says that quite often public ownership and the regulators begin to come too close to each other. Yes, that is a danger and that is why we must have Parliament being ever vigilant to make certain that that does not occur. That is why we must always make certain that the representatives of the people—Parliament—has indeed the final say and that the wishes of Crown corporation become subservient to the wishes of Parliament.

To correct the possible danger of the regulators being too close to the Crown corporation, the solution is not to privatize. The solution is to make certain that the Ministry and Parliament are on top of the situation and ensure that that close relationship does not exist.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments are now terminated. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the Members.

And the division bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 13(4)(a), I have been requested by the assistant to the Chief Government Whip to defer the division until a later time.

Accordingly, pursuant to Standing Order 13(5), the division on the question now before the House stands deferred until Monday at 6 p.m., at which time the bells to call in the Members will be sounded for not more than 15 minutes.

* * *

CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL TRADE TRIBUNAL ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)) moved that Bill C-110, an Act to establish the Canadian International Trade Tribunal and to amend or repeal other Acts in consequence thereof, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Members of the House for the interest they have shown in the Bill over time. It is an important Bill. It will streamline and rationalize the activities of the Canadian import institutions. In addition, it extends the right of direct access for safeguard inquiries to all Canadian industries.

Members will know that this particular Bill has undergone a great deal of scrutiny, as evidenced by a number of amendments proposed both in committee and later in the House. Some of them have been adopted. They were good ideas. Most notable was the one changing the majority requirement for initiation to a major proportion requirement and eliminating a clause which was alleged to cause a conflict of interest situation for members of existing tribunals.

Clearly after this process the Bill is a fair and balanced one, and its passage is eagerly awaited by a broad spectrum of Canadian industry. Jobs indeed will be enhanced, jobs indeed will result. I hope that the Senate will deal with Bill C-110 in an expeditious manner in order that this new tribunal can begin functioning as soon as possible.

I would point out that as of this morning the Senate had 15 Bills before it. If we complete our work as scheduled this evening, they are likely to have 19 Bills before it. It would be very helpful to the nation and to the House if it were to move expeditiously on most if not all the matters before it.

I thank Hon. Members for their attention. I hope that the particular Bill will receive a minimum of debate and relatively swift passage at third reading stage. I am optimistic in that regard.

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I intend to be very brief in taking part in this debate. Our critic, our spokesperson for this Bill, the Hon. Member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson) has done an excellent job in putting forward the point of view of Liberals on this Bill and in putting forward possible amendments to improve the Bill. I cannot say that all our ideas were accepted, but I think one should recognize the excellent work done by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Trinity, in the study of this Bill.

Certainly there is a point to be made for Bill C-110, since it rationalizes and combines three separate pieces of trade legislation into one. The rationalization and improvement of Canadian trade legislation is a central component of Liberal trade policy. This policy has been set out in the reports that we have put forward to the public. For example, the Liberal report entitled *Reaching Out*.

More precisely, we have said that in order to communicate effectively and to deliver federal trade policy it is necessary to have transparent omnibus trade legislation which addresses all possible trade issues.

I did want to put on record some problems that we see with the Government's approach. The Government has gone ahead and negotiated a trade deal with the United States. We have told the House and Canadian people how in our view the trade deal undermines Canadian sovereignty, puts at risk hundreds of thousands of Canadian jobs, and limits the ability of present and future Canadian Governments, federal and provincial, to make decisions which Canadian people may consider in their interest and in the interest of their country in future years. I am talking about limiting the ability to make decisions in areas like energy, investment, financial institutions, agriculture, and cultural industries.

We now have a situation where the Government is trying to put us in a position where we will have two sets of trade legislation or rules. One set for our dealings with the United States and one set for everybody else. Ultimately I do not think that it will help Canadians or those who want to deal with Canadians, who want to understand and make the best use of Canadian trade legislation.

We have already made many comments about the flaws in the Government's trade deal with the United States when it comes to the rules set out in that deal on our trading relationship with that country. We pointed out that although the Government has set as its primary objective in a trade deal with the United States the freeing of Canada from any possibility of harassment by American trade through penalty legislation.

• (1940)

It is very clear that we have not been freed from the threat of American trade legislation. Even if the trade deal becomes law, we will continue as before. The only difference will be that added to it will be another stage of bureaucracy, the so-called machinery which the Government says it has negotiated with the United States for a dispute settlement. However, this dispute settlement mechanism will do nothing other than decide whether or not the American law has been applied correctly according to its own terms. Also, there will be a very complicated set of rules arising out of the trade deal, if it ever becomes law, for determining whether goods can flow on a duty-free basis between Canada and the United States. Many Canadians had hoped that a comprehensive trade deal with the United States would mean that they could go to the U.S., buy anything they wanted and bring it back here duty-free. They are in for a big surprise, Mr. Speaker, if this deal goes through.

The rules provided in the Government's trade deal with the United States indicate that people who purchase goods in that country will still have to pay Canadian federal-provincial sales taxes. They will be able to bring in products duty-free, only if they can prove that those goods are essentially of an American origin. We know today that many of the things we want to buy when we go to a country such as the United States do not come from there at all but from countries like Japan, Korea, Singapore, and Taiwan. If that is the case, those purchases will be subject to duty as before. If the deal with the United States goes through, we will have one set of rules no less cumbersome than the rules that may exist at present dealing with our relations in trading matters with the United States, and another set of rules and a tribunal to examine the rules which will be set up under this Bill in respect of trade with all other parts of the world.

There is a second concern that I have to express about Bill C-110. It could well be argued that Bill C-110 does not cover a very essential area. The kind of trade legislation proposed by Liberals in the trade policy we have put forward would specify how complaints are to be processed and administered. However, this legislation will make it possible to deal with the issue of whether there should be federal assistance available to help Canadian industry that would be affected by any ruling of the tribunal to adjust to import competition. If so, what type and amount of assistance should be put into effect to bring about this kind of adjustment?

Bill C-110 does not do this. It basically prescribes how complaints and investigations are to be handled. An essential corollary of any ruling being made by the tribunal proposed under Bill C-110 is what effect it will have. If there are effects that will be evident because of a ruling, even though that ruling is said by the tribunal to be in the over-all Canadian

public interest, more attention has to be paid to the fact that this Bill is ready to allow the tribunal to help the affected industry adopt the machinery and technology to meet increased import competition effectively, or to enable the affected industry to move into other lines of production. It should also help the workers involved to get the skills and training which will enable them to keep their jobs in an industry which may be a very different kind of industry as a result of a ruling of the tribunal, or in some cases to help them go on to work in a totally different industry.

This key aspect of dealing with import competition has been virtually ignored by the Government's proposal. I hope that we will have the opportunity, and I predict another Liberal Government will have that opportunity, to do a better job than this Conservative Government has done until now, especially through Bill C-110 in addressing the vital issue of adjustment.

By way of conclusion I want to say that although I have brought forth some concerns about the Bill—and these concerns and others I have not mentioned have been expressed with a great deal of eloquence and insight by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Trinity—I do want to say that our general position is that there is much desirable about Bill C-110 in so far as it rationalizes three separate pieces of trade legislation into one piece of trade legislation. As I have said, this kind of rationalization and the over-all improvement of our Canadian trade legislation are essential components of our Liberal trade policy.

I am glad to have put on record some comments on Bill C-110. I think we have reached the stage where this debate can be concluded, and for that reason I am happy to conclude my own remarks.

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak for a few moments in the debate on Bill C-110, an Act to establish the Canadian International Trade Tribunal. I am tempted to say at the outset that this debate, brief as it will be, is a nice demonstration of why the House should not be sitting into July as it is doing now. This evening we are having a very brief third reading debate on a Bill that may be of enormous importance to Canadian industry, the manufacturing industry generally. It deserves to be treated with all the seriousness which that involves. Quite simply we have had persons from the Government, the Official Opposition, and my caucus speaking to the Bill who are not directly involved with it. The Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Hockin) is not here. I do not mean to violate the rules or cast any reflections at all, because his Parliamentary Secretary is standing in for him, but the Liberal House Leader and myself are here doing yeoman service for persons who know the Bill intimately, who are aware of its strengths and its weaknesses, and who would want, I am sure, to say more about it on third reading.

As the Liberal House Leader has done, I want to recognize the hard work of my colleague and friend, the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon), who worked very hard in the House and in the legislative committee on Bill C-110. In fact, he had the satisfaction at report stage of having the Minister of State for Finance recognize the close attention that he had paid to this Bill and the work he had done trying to ensure that the Bill to establish the Canadian International Trade Tribunal would be an effective piece of legislation. May I say on his behalf, Mr. Speaker, in focusing my comments more particularly on the Bill, that in principle the proposal to roll together three different tribunals into one can be seen as a good thing. The Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor would want to give his support in principle to putting these several bodies—The Tariff Board, the Textile and Clothing Board, and the Special Import Tribunal—together, to reorganizing them as the new Canadian International Trade Tribunal. That ought to be a good thing, but the question is whether in fact the Bill as it stands is a good thing, and whether the kinds of powers that have been assigned to this new tribunal, the composition of the tribunal, and the procedures that it is expected to follow in their individuality and totality would make an effective board. On behalf of my colleague and our caucus I want to say that we do not think it will be effective. We have very serious concerns about several aspects of the Bill and about the tribunal that it will create, if the Bill is finally passed, given Royal Assent, and proclaimed.

In my own observation one concern raised is the matter of easy access. The tribunal dealing with the textile and clothing board has been noted for its easy access. The textile and clothing board has existed to ensure that agreements dating back to the early 1960s in the clothing trade, which take the form these days of multi-fibre agreements with various Third World producing countries, and their impact on Canadian manufacturers are properly administered and that those industries are safe. The ease of access to the board has been one of its most important features.

• (1950)

Both textiles and apparel producers of Canada and the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, which speaks for far more of Canada's manufacturers, have expressed concern that the new tribunal will not provide this ease of access. One can see on the very face of it that with three tribunals and 15 members, even now the procedures are all too slow. If we move to a new structure with only nine members with far more responsibilities than the three different boards now existing have, there will be grave concerns about whether the new International Trade Tribunal will be able to work effectively and to respond to the concerns of industry as surely we would want that tribunal to do.

What makes this particularly ironic is that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) himself, in a press release in Sherbrooke, Eastern Townships, the heart of some of Canada's most important textile and clothing producing areas, promised a greater role to the industry in shaping textile and apparel policy. Yet the legislation, Bill C-110, does away with a board which has played such an important part in studying the

situation and making recommendations to government in the past.

Another serious problem that gives us cause to criticize and oppose the Bill is the matter of the discretionary power to conduct inquiries which the Textile and Clothing Board in particular has under Article 9 of the Textile and Clothing Board Act. That discretionary power is done away with in Bill C-110. In addition, the new reality is that the International Trade Tribunal will be prevented from making recommendations and reports on injury inquiries which would follow from the concerns of various industries affected by trade.

Given the particular fact that under the Act only producers who produce the majority of specified goods can petition for an injury inquiry, we feel grave concern for the small producers who are in a certain marginal position in an industry and who may manage in some industries, given the kind of price leadership which some are able to execute, to have a reasonably good life. Others may find themselves in boom time doing reasonably well, but when business is slow, they may find it very difficult to survive. In those circumstances particularly, will the small and marginal producers have any kind of recourse at all, given the way in which the International Trade Tribunal will be constituted under Bill C-110?

There is a third concern which relates to the question of an arm's length relationship which the tribunal is supposed to have with the Government. This is actually thrown into question by the fact that it cannot initiate its own inquiries. Does the fact that the large producers producing the majority of the products will have access to this tribunal make up for the fact that the tribunal is not able to initiate inquiries? The legislation is not very clear on this matter, but we can certainly imagine a situation in which the new tribunal will have a very close relationship with government and with large producers. What then is the situation of the smaller producers to whom I have already referred?

Since the purpose of this new International Trade Tribunal is supposed to be to deal with international trade and economic issues, it should surely have a much larger and more independent role in considering what is happening in the various industries, in initiating inquiries, and in recommending the kinds of adjustment assistance measures that may be necessary.

We are concerned that this Bill is surely part of the reorganization of Canada's trading system which this Conservative Government is carrying out. This is just one more example of the kind of bending over backward to U.S. interests which has characterized the Conservative Government in negotiating the trade deal that is being pursued these days in the legislative committee on Bill C-130, and in other areas as well.

This is a Ministry which all too often has been ready to sell out to American interests, to forget what American industries do to Canadian industries, particularly through the use of American trade tribunals. In northwestern Ontario we have had to live for months with that 15 per cent export tax which was imposed on Canadian softwood producers and continues to be imposed on Ontario softwood producers because this Government buckled under to American pressure. It was so stricken with fear that it would not be able to win before the American trade tribunal that it accepted an export tax on our lumber, though we in Ontario are convinced that there has never been any subsidization of the industry through stumpage prices for our timber.

If the Socred Government in British Columbia did not have the strength and courage to charge the proper amount for stumpage, then let British Columbia Governments go ahead and deal with the matter properly. We do not need American Governments under U.S. industry pressure forcing the B.C. Government to do the right thing. However, that should not be imposed on the people of Ontario, the workers in the forest and sawmills of Ontario, as it has been to the detriment of the industry and the loss of hundreds of jobs in northern Ontario already. In the context of what U.S. law allows and what U.S. tribunals make possible for U.S. industry, we see in this Bill just one more example of an inability of the Conservative Government to defend Canadian interests.

I note in glancing over the material my colleague, the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor, has provided that he focused at report stage on a number of amendments which were designed to take care of some of these shortcomings in the Bill. Having read the record of that debate, I note that the Minister of State for Finance argued time after time that this would be some sort of a violation of our GATT obligations. He provided all kinds of assurances that all was well in the Bill.

We are not convinced of that. We are not impressed that this Bill will do things right. Because the amendments we put forward to try to make the Bill what it should be were not accepted, I state clearly now that the New Democratic caucus does not support Bill C-110, and when you put the question in a moment, Mr. Speaker, of course we will follow through on the statement I have just made.

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a few concerns about this legislation that I want to put on the record. I know that most Hon. Members would rather be at home than here this evening, so I will not take too long to say what I have to say.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Keeper: I am sure that my remarks will be welcomed in the same enthusiastic fashion.

When it comes to the textile industry, there are theories of international trade, theories of free trade, and theories of prosperity coming as a result of greater liberalization of trade. When I put the theories of the economists on the one hand and the reality of the workers in the textile industry on the other hand, I find that my heart is with those in the textile industry. My heart is with those in the textile industry. I say that before we open our doors to greater competition in the textile industry, we ought to take care to see that the people presently

working in that industry will still have their jobs after these changes in legislation.

• (2000)

It is fine for a Prime Minister seeking an issue to run on in an election to hype free trade. It is well and good for economists who live in university ivory towers to promote the theory of free trade. However, when it comes down to the bread and butter issues for the people who work in the textile industry, they would like an orderly transition. They want their interests taken into account before legislation is changed.

We are afraid this legislation will weaken the instruments in the hands of the textile industry which ensure its survival. We in this Party have pointed out weaknesses in the legislation which ought to be corrected before it is passed. My colleague from Windsor introduced specific amendments because we want the people who work in the industry to feel secure and know that tomorrow morning, when they get up, their jobs will be there and that they will not be guinea pigs for some academic theory of free trade. Let us plan where we are going in an orderly fashion. Let us proceed with some care and caution. I urge the Government to accept the amendments we put forward so that the dangers contained in the legislation for the textile industry are not there when the legislation is passed.

It is well known that there are countries that produce textile products with labour which is paid at a much lower rate than is possible in Canada, even though the people who work in the industry in Canada earn low wages by our standards. Therefore, if we just throw open the doors to international competition, then we put the jobs of those presently in the industry at risk. If we are marching down the road to more liberalized trade, if we are going to bring down trade barriers, let us do it cautiously. Let us amend the legislation before it passes so the people in the industry will know that we have taken their interests into account and that we are not just following the theory of some academic economist or some political leader seeking an issue for a general election.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the Members.

And the division bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 13(4)(a), I have been requested by the assistant to the Chief Government Whip to defer the division until a later time.

Accordingly, pursuant to Standing Order 13(5), the division on the question now before the House stands deferred until Monday at 6 p.m., at which time the bells to call in the Members will be sounded for not more than 15 minutes.

* * *

BRETTON WOODS AND RELATED AGREEMENTS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-126, an Act to amend the Bretton Woods and Related Agreements Act, as reported (without amendments) from a legislative committee.

Hon. Gerald. S. Merrithew (for the Minister of State (Finance)) moved that the Bill be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Merrithew (for the Minister of State (Finance)) moved that the Bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I see that I have unlimited time. This is the first and may be the last time I will have that opportunity.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Merrithew: We are adjourning at ten o'clock.

Mr. Manly: Well, I can carry on tomorrow and Monday.

Seriously, this is not the routine Bill that its treatment by the House would appear to indicate. It deals with Canada's relationship with the debt-ridden, poverty-stricken nations and peoples of the Third World. The Bill gives the Government authority to provide funds to the International Monetary Fund, through loans and grants, for a trust or any other body established by the IMF. The Government has explained that these moneys are for enhanced structural adjustment facilities, or ESAF. It provides highly concessional terms to the poorest countries faced with the problems of debt repayment and

structural adjustment. Part of the money coming from Canada will be in the form of a loan and part in the form of a grant.

The purpose of the funds in the form of a grant are to allow very concessional terms to the recipient countries. In other words, the grant funds coming from Canada enable the borrowing countries to borrow the money at very low interest rates. At the same time, the IMF will be paying the regular commercial interest rates to the lending countries such as Canada. The grant portion of the money comes from our official development assistance, ODA.

I am concerned about some of the specifics in the Bill. First, while the Government explained that the purpose of these moneys was for the ESAF, the Bill does not say that. It says "any trust or body established by the IMF". The committee rejected an amendment that would have tightened that up. In the same way, the Bill specifies certain specific sums of money but then goes on to say that any other funds that the Government wants can also be given. In effect, the Bill gives a blank cheque, and again the committee rejected amendments that would have tightened that up.

I am concerned that this Bill has the grant portion of the funds coming from ODA at a time when that assistance as a percentage of our GNP is dropping.

• (2010)

A June 22 *Globe and Mail* report pointed out that foreign development aid from western countries fell by 2 per cent in real terms last year. According to figures released by the OECD, Canadian overseas aid spending fell as a proportion of Gross National Product from 0.48 per cent in 1986 to 0.46 per cent in 1987. That is a very small percentage drop, but we must compare that with the commitment the Government made when first elected.

At that time the Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) went to the United Nations and promised that Canada would meet its commitment of reaching 0.7 per cent of its funding for ODA by 1990. Since then we have seen one cut-back after another rather than the fulfilment of that commitment. Now, rather than increasing the percentage of our GNP which goes to development assistance, we are decreasing it. In this connection we are concerned that the grant portion which goes to ESAF is being taken from Official Development Assistance.

Roy Culpeper who studied this matter appeared before the committee and said:

> In its recent report, the UN Secretary General's advisory group on financial flows to Africa concluded that $5 billion in additional flows annually would be necessary to secure some economic growth, increased imports, and reduce the debt servicing ratio in sub-Saharan Africa. If the ESAF and other recent initiatives, notably those by the World Bank, are factored in, then the net additional requirement falls to $2 billion annually, still a sizeable amount that we are nowhere close to meeting. However, it is important to realize that the positive effect of the ESAF itself requires additionality; that is, it should mean that new money is flowing into Africa and not simply being taken from existing aid funds.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that is what is happening. Nevertheless, he and our Party see the ESAF as an advancement on traditional international monetary fund policies. The traditional IMF imposed form of structural adjustment with which we are all familiar involves currency devaluation, cutbacks in social programs, elimination of subsidies on basic food stuffs, cutting back on the public sector, privatization, and forcing Third World nations to spend more and more of their energy in exports and opening up their economies to external investment and control.

Very often this kind of structural adjustment, while being very hard on the poor people in these developing countries, helps local elites to become even more rich because it provides them with a pool of cheap labour, enables them to pick up bargains in terms of privatized parastatals, and so on.

ESAF will continue to impose this kind of conditionality, along the same lines as IMF traditional conditionality, but the funds will go to ease the impact on the poorest of the poor. In other words, there will not be a change in the basic kinds of conditionality that are imposed.

The head of UNICEF pointed out a couple of weeks ago that 40,000 children die every day from hunger and hunger related causes. We do not pay any attention to that because it happens in a quiet way and is far removed from the reality which we in Canada experience. He went on to point out that a good deal of that hunger and those hunger related causes are directly related to the kinds of conditionality that have been imposed upon these nations by forces such as the International Monetary Fund. Canada, as one of the nations which has a significant voice in the IMF, shares some of the guilt and responsibility for the death of those children.

I would like to suggest that there are different kinds of conditionality. In a report entitled "Adjustment with a Human Face", a group of people working with UNICEF suggested that instead of the traditional IMF conditionality we should be working for different kinds of structural adjustment. They make six suggestions.

First, there should be more expansionary macro-economic policies aiming at sustaining levels of output, investment, and human need satisfaction over the adjustment period. In other words, instead of retrenchment and cut-backs there should be expansion.

Second, there should be the use of meso policies to reinforce the more expansionary macro approach and to secure the priority use of resources to fulfil the needs of the vulnerable.

Third, there should be sectoral policies aiming at restructuring within the productive sector to strengthen employment and income generating activities and raise productivity in low-income activities, focusing in particular on small farmers and informal sector producers in industry and services.

Fourth, there should be improvement in the equity and efficiency of the social sector by restructuring public expenditure both between and within sectors by improving the targeting of interventions and their cost effectiveness.

Fifth, there should be compensatory programs to protect basic health and nutrition during the low-income adjustment. Two major elements of such policies are public works employment schemes and nutrition interventions encompassing targeted food subsidies and direct feeding for the most vulnerable.

Sixth, and perhaps the most important, is monitoring of the human situation, especially of living standards, health, and nutrition of low-income groups during the adjustment process so that needs may be identified and the effectiveness of adjustment programs assessed and modified accordingly. Monitoring of human conditions, especially the health and nutritional status of the population, particularly that of vulnerable groups, should be given as much weight in monitoring adjustment as monetary variables have in the conventional approach.

In other words, when there is need for some kind of international intervention in the economy of one of these struggling nations, instead of imposing the kind of cut-backs and decimation of the local economy that the IMF has done traditionally, there should be a kind of structural adjustment that places the priority on human needs.

There has been a number of suggestions made in the last few weeks and months for debt forgiveness. When I think of debt forgiveness I think of a story which we studied in Grade 10 called *The Revolution at Satan's Trap* by Norman Duncan. The story was about a small outport in Newfoundland where the local people were indebted to the trader. No matter how many fish they caught they were always indebted to John Woll, the trader. By a combination of circumstances it so happened that they finally had him in a situation where he had to agree to a form of debt forgiveness and had to restore to the people what was rightfully theirs. However the story ended as follows:

> And within three years John Woll possessed again all that he had yielded, and the world of Satan's Trap wagged on as in the days before the revolution.

In other words, debt relief without changing the system does not really change anything. Debt relief by itself is not going to help unless something is done about commodity prices.

The IMF, acting as international monetary policemen, has forced low commodity prices on the Third World which keep them in debt. Then it keeps dribbling these nations small amounts of money, sometimes just enough to keep them from defaulting but never enough to enable them to get out of debt. I mentioned earlier that the UN committee which considered this issue said that there was need for $5 billion a year. We are falling far short of the amount which is desperately needed if Africa is ever to get out of the deep pit into which we have helped to put it as a result of the ecological destruction it is facing right now.

We must realize the basis of debt. Often democratically elected Governments are now faced with having to repay debts which were contracted by dictators. It is interesting to note that three-quarters of the debt of Nicaragua was contracted by Somoza. Twenty per cent of Third World debt is for the purchase of military goods. A great deal of it ends up financing elite consumption and megaprojects which often have very little developmental impact upon the great mass of the people. Sometimes these debts were contracted and in fact forced upon Third World countries by banks in Europe and North America simply because they wanted to make quick bucks.

• (2020)

In the September 1983 issue of *Harpers*, a Mr. S. C. Gwynne wrote an article entitled "Adventures in the Loan Trade". He told how as a young loans officer 25 years of age he had visited some 28 different countries in a period of six months, flogging money for a medium-sized bank in the mid-western United States. He described how he knew that when he made those loans they would simply not be repaid adequately, but in order to make them one only needed to get the guarantee of the government or the local national bank. By the time they defaulted on the loans, he and the other people who had been involved in making the loans had passed on to some other job.

The entire loans business that took place in the middle 1970s was simply a way in which the western banks became very greedy. They pushed money without adequate investigation into the ways in which loans would be repaid.

Susan George, in an excellent book entitled *A Fate Worse Than Death* made an excellent analysis from the perspective of someone concerned with development itself. She pointed to the impossibility of ever having debts, which amounted to over a trillion dollars for the Third World as a whole, paid in full, in hard currency. At the same time she opposed a policy of total debt forgiveness. As she pointed out, this often simply kept local elites and local dictators in place.

Instead, Susan George calls for a new type of restructuring, a new type of approach to the whole debt problem. It was radical in the sense of going to the root of the problem. She tied debt to the whole issue of development and democracy.

The repayment of debt should be tied to the development and democracy issues as well. For example, a country's bilateral debt could be dedicated to a development fund to which each debtor country would make regular interest payments. The development fund would have broadly based management from that country, including people from the rural area, proper representation for women and for different ethnic groups. Susan George said:

> The development fund would finance projects and programmes determined by consultation and consensus, focusing primarily on rural areas. Various groups (village councils, associations of young people, women, artisans,

> peasants, etc.) could apply to the fund for seed money to undertake their own self-managed projects.
>
> The fund would also provide money for revolving credit schemes to make modest loans directly to farmers and other small-scale rural entrepreneurs (with priority here given to the landless and to women.)
>
> Each payment made by a government into its own national development fund would trigger a corresponding reduction . . . of its external debt in hard currency by the IMF, the multilateral development banks and the official bilateral creditors.
>
> Rigid, IMF-type conditionality would give way to a more flexible system. Whereas adjustment has always meant increasing agricultural exports, no matter how grim the internal food situation, and drastic curtailment of basic services in health, education, staple-food subsidies, creative conditionality would take the form of contracts.
>
> These negotiated contracts would concern equitable, democratic management of national development funds and the terms for matching, in hard currency, each step towards improved performance.

She was suggesting that instead of nations like Canada and others that control the IMF just dribbling out bits of money to these nations to enable them to keep from defaulting, and at the same time imposing a kind of conditionality on them which put them on the rack, we should be developing a new approach. Rather than these countries paying money back to the First World, they should be paying money into their own development funds, which should be tied to genuine democracy and a genuine approach to development.

I urge the Government to consider this kind of radical policy. I urge it to recommend this policy to the IMF and the World Bank. It is a better policy than we practised last fall when there was a lot of criticism of the Government for its forgiveness of debts to Anglophone and Francophone nations in Africa that often had very bad human rights records.

Some of us felt some queasy about that. On the one hand, we did not want to criticize the Government for a generous gesture to the nations of Africa, but on the other hand we looked at some of the nations which did not have good human rights records and we wondered what was the real value of forgiving those debts. Instead, if we worked to establish this kind of internal development fund and insisted that local elites paid into the development fund to help their own people, perhaps we would have been doing a whole lot more for genuine development in our world.

The ESAF is a small step forward. One of my concerns, which is shared by other members of our Party, is that it is under the direction of the International Monetary Fund. We know that the one nation which cracks the whip for the IMF is the United States of America. Yet the United States is not putting any money into ESAF. We are contributing to a fund that will be controlled by the United States, which is not making any contribution to it.

ESAF is a small step forward, and I think we should be taking the much larger step recommended by Susan George. I regret that Bill C-126 does not have the kind of checks and balances that I think parliamentarians should have insisted upon. I would urge the Government to consider a radically new approach to the whole question of Third World debt.

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in this debate on third reading of Bill C-126. I do so because our very distinguished critic, the Hon. Member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson), is not able to be here this evening. She has done an excellent job in taking part in the study of this Bill and putting forward our points of view.

This Bill will authorize the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) to contribute to the new initiative of the International Monetary Fund known as the Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility, or ESAF. This fund will assist the poorest developing countries with the provision of balance of payments support. Most of these countries are in sub-Saharan Africa and include: Zambia, Zaire, Uganda, Tanzania, Somalia, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Rwanda, Niger, Mozambique, Malawi, Madagascar, Liberia, Lesotho, Kenya, and Ethiopia. The average per capita income of these countries is 300 Canadian dollars per year. The ESAF is a trust fund that will make resources available to these countries at concessional interest rates so as to minimize the impact on their debt servicing burdens.

• (2030)

The two main features of the program are long-term lending and concessional interest rates. This program is designed to allow these countries to make the economic adjustments required to reach a stage of development which will eventually lead to healthy economic growth, rising living standards, and a sustainable balance of payments position. I will talk more about this key provision in a moment.

This initiative arose at the annual summit of industrialized countries in Venice, Italy, last year. I understand the plan was endorsed at the meeting of the group of 24 developing countries that met in April of this year. The ESAF will operate on the basis of two accounts, a loan account and a subsidy account. This Bill authorizes Canada to lend approximately $550 million to the IMF fund. It also authorizes Canada to provide grants of approximately $250 million to subsidize the interest on these loans. This grant will bring the interest rate on Canada's contribution down to 0.5 per cent and will come out of Canada's aid envelope over a period of 12 years.

In a speech given on May 20, 1988, the Hon. Member for Trinity emphasized that the key component in facilitating conditional aid was effectively to implement change co-operatively and to monitor it closely. I must re-emphasize this evening the need for co-operation and acceptance by the recipient country. Imposing harsh and unwanted conditions on the recipient country will only yield resentment and a lack of co-operation. The Hon. Member for Trinity asked the Minister in committee what assurances we had that Canada would assist in monitoring such things as how the money was spent, the performance requirements, and the timetables for implementation. The Minister responded that the initiative was an experiment.

Of course, we cannot ask for guarantees. We are not asking for that, but to refer to this initiative as an experiment is not apt. Conditional aid is not new and the failures in implementing this aid are not new. Canada must ensure that these errors are not repeated. Our representatives on the International Monetary Fund should be involved in the monitoring of the program.

As the Hon. Member for Trinity said during her speech at second reading that our Party supported the Bill in principle. The ESAF, as one expert witness told the legislative committee, will provide a window through which richer countries can channel resources to poorer countries. It changes the structure of the IMF from that of a revolving fund. Mr. Michel Camdessus, the new managing director of the IMF, has shown great interest and sensitivity to the concept of adjustment with a human face. I hope this sensitivity will be reflected in the important evaluation, implementation, and monitoring of conditional aid about which the Hon. Member for Trinity spoke previously.

However, while we support this Bill and while the ESAF is necessary, I must point out that it is not a sufficient vehicle for alleviating the debt crisis in the poorest countries. According to a recent United Nation's report, $5 billion in additional flows are required to secure adequately economic growth, to increase imports, and to reduce the debt service ratio in sub-Saharan Africa. The commitments by Canada and other countries to the ESAF reduces this $5 billion figure to about $2 billion annually, so it is a help. It is also important to note that Canada's contribution to the grant component is not new money but is allocated from our development aid envelope.

Much remains to be done. The poverty in these countries is crushing. Evidence of assistance and aid that address the quality of life, employment needs and social programs in developing countries has been meagre to date. In order to improve the economies of these countries and to set them on the road to economic independence, programs like the ESAF are important. We also need to see evidence of the human face of adjustment that will ensure sensitivity to each country's needs. This means mutual co-operation between assisting and assisted countries when it comes to conditional aid in the future.

I offer these comments as a contribution to the debate on third reading of this Bill. In so doing again I want to pay tribute to the important work of my colleague, the associate critic of finance for the Liberal Party, the Hon. Member for Trinity, for the excellent work she did in studying this Bill and putting forward the point of view of the Liberal Party.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will recognize the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre and let the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary be the clean-up batter.

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, once again I will assure the House that I will not take too much time this evening, but I have a fundamental point I want to make. I will start by indicating that we will not be opposing this legislation.

I understand that the legislation makes some money available at low interest rates to developing countries, and this is not to be sneezed at or condemned, yet important questions have to be faced in this debate with respect to debt and international development.

The simple point I want to make is that this issue is not a question of whether we have done our share or whether we have done a little more. There are fundamental questions of direction involved, of conception about what is the problem, and what it is we are trying to do on the international development arena with regard to debt.

Over the last few days I focused my attention on a headline in the newspaper. A gentleman who was involved in an international development agency had done a study and said uncategorically that international debt owed by developing countries, which were being forced to pay back, was causing the deaths of children. What we are faced with here is a question of life and death. It is a critical question.

When I hear of international debts, what I understand as a lay person is that the big western banks, including Canadian banks, went on a binge in the last couple of decades lending out money to the poorest nations of this world. Now that they are faced with the hangover and now that the western banks themselves are shaking, they are asking these poor countries to pay up. But, at what price? It is at the price of life and death; that is the implication for those communities. These banks, which want to preserve their efficiency as institutions of capital, are doing it at the cost of the lives of people in developing countries.

If that was the only thing that was possible, then I guess we could close our books and our mouths, go home and watch television and forget about it. I saw something else in the newspaper over the last few days. It was an article about a man who lived in Bangladesh. He started a bank with a difference. It was a bank that lent money to the poorest of the poor in the poorest country. When the man went to a conventional bank to help borrow money for a local family, a local entrepreneur but a poor person, he found that poor people could not borrow money. The poor people did not have access to the capital necessary for development. He stood good for that person. He used his own name as a guarantee in order for the loan to go through.

• (2040)

That was the start of this bank with a difference. What was different about it was that it lent money to poor people who had no collateral. Western banks, as we generally know them, demand collateral before one can borrow money. He changed that. What he did was that he got together a dozen people, each of whom needed money. They all stood for each other in terms of their loans. Thus, if one person in the group was not

to pay back his loan, then that would affect the creditworthiness of the whole group. They all worked together and they paid back their loans. This man found a new way to run a bank. It was very significant. It said to me that there was another approach. He put the highest value on human development, on the development of the human community, and on the rescue of those people who live in poverty, not by doing something for them but by arranging things in a way that capital could be put at their disposal to do the kinds of development they wanted, which was very small-scale development.

The question before us today is about values, about what we think is most important. Do we agree with the large western banks which seem by their behaviour to put the highest value on the dollar? Or, do we agree with this person from Bangladesh who started a bank that could operate in the poorest corners of the globe and who put the highest priority on the human person? That is what I think is essential to the question of international debt today. What is required is a spiritual reawakening in the sense that the human person will be treated as sacred, as the highest value, and that capital be used to serve human development, the development of the community and of shared responsibility.

I want to say that while we do not oppose this legislation since it makes some money available for poorer countries and communities, there is a greater challenge. The challenge is to make some fundamental shifts in direction.

One of the things this gentleman who started the bank in Bangladesh said was that we need a commitment. We need to renew the commitment or make a commitment to eradicate the pollution of poverty from this planet. It is enough of a surprise actually to find a person who is doing something that makes a difference for poor people, someone who can actually change their situation while at the same time allow for their development and give them control over what is happening to them. That is enough. Then this person challenged us to say that poverty on this planet is a pollution. In other words, it is something that threatens our survival.

I think there is a greater challenge than that which has been faced up to in this legislation. While I will not vote against it, it is about time that we in the western world in particular take up the challenge to change the direction of how we approach the use of capital and make a real difference in regard to poverty on this planet.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I would like to begin by thanking members of the Opposition and government Members for the co-operation that we have had since supper hour. I think you will find, Mr. Speaker, a predisposition to vote as soon as I am through my remarks and then we might see the clock as ten o'clock. It is a kind of reward for the co-operation that we have had this evening.

I was lucky enough to be asked by the Government in the fall of 1984 to attend the General Assembly of the United Nations for 11 weeks as the Canadian representative to the Third Committee where we dealt with issues of poverty, health and so on. I came away convinced that what we as western and so-called rich nations could do most effectively is co-operate with other nations, and to be a moral conscience at times, as well as to be a prodder and developer, in order to get international co-operation in place. A great many people live in poverty. A great many people could use and benefit from our help.

If someone reads our *Hansard* and hears about the Bretton Woods Agreement, they will see that it is not a very descriptive title. It does not say much about what it is we are engaged in as the House of Commons and as a country. This initiative, these few paragraphs, spell out what we are intending to do. At this point we are really carrying out the consequence of the June 1987 Summit where western industrialized nations, and Canada as represented by our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), agreed that the International Monetary Fund should increase its resources significantly, for the specific purpose of helping low-income countries by establishing what is referred to in English as the Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility, which are very complex words. The essence of it is that western industrialized nations would provide more resources to the International Monetary Fund so that it could make them available to eligible countries once they have a program in place designed to promote structural adjustment and economic growth over the medium term.

I think it is self-evident to nations such as ours that if the structure in place which has produced the poverty is not changed it is not likely to change.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, through the Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility, the IMF will be able to make loans to the poorest debtor countries on very favourable terms, by means of contributions made to two accounts. The loan account will facilitate the transfer of funds that will earn interest at market rates. The subsidy account will allow the IMF to lend loan account funds to eligible developing countries at one-half per cent interest per year.

Mr. Speaker, many countries have reacted favourably by transferring substantial amounts to the facility. Canada will give $550 million in loans and $250 million in grants.

[*English*]

France has pledged some 800 million in special drawing rights in loans. West Germany has committed special drawing rights of 700 million to the loan account and 300 million Deutschmarks to the subsidy account. Italy has contributed special drawing rights of 370 million to the loan account and a corresponding subsidy. In total these western nations I have mentioned pledged special drawing rights of 5.7 billion in loans and special drawing rights of 2.2 billion in subsidies.

Mr. Manly: None from the United States?

Mr. Hawkes: I mentioned that to indicate that it is working. I hear a friend from the NDP, and I say the word "friend" with some mixed feelings. He asks whether or not the United States has contributed anything. On the Third Committee we dealt with refugees, and this Chamber has dealt with refugee legislation. I would like the Hon. Member opposite just to remember that the United States of America provides about 65 per cent of the resources that go to refugees through UN agencies. It is somewhat disturbing when we hear from time to time in the House such a good friend, ally, and generous country to so many people in the world treated with such disdain. I am sure the United States of America more than pulls its weight.

• (2050)

The Central Agencies of the United Nations are dependent upon the United States for approximately one-quarter of their income. There are many countries, particularly iron curtain countries, that do not produce a dime for refugees.

In any event I thank Members for their co-operation. I hope there is unanimous consent to pass the Bill and to help get the money where it belongs to start helping those poor nations.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I believe there is unanimous consent to call it ten o'clock.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being 10 p.m., pursuant to Order made June 20, 1988, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 8.51 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, July 15, 1988

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Perrin Beatty (for the Minister of State (Grains and Oilseeds)) moved that Bill C-92, an Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, as you know, the amendments before us today regarding Bill C-92 are designed to improve the efficiency of the Wheat Board. They are amendments which are suggested to the Government both by the Board itself and by producers. There are six amendments in total. They have been discussed in considerable detail in committee and in the House at various stages. Thus I will spend only a few moments on them this morning. I believe they have the support of the House in general.

The first amendment would ensure that quota and other delivery provisions under the Canadian Wheat Board's marketing system would fairly apply to deliveries of grain to railway cars as well as to those who are delivering to the primary elevator system. That is designed to ensure that there are no special provisions given to users of producer cars that are not intended.

The second amendment would enable the Canadian Wheat Board to take advantage of a broader range of financial markets for borrowing and investment purposes. Up to this point in time the Wheat Board, which is a major borrower, has been borrowing almost exclusively from chartered banks. We believe it would be to its advantage to give the Wheat Board the prerogative to borrow in a wider range of markets if it so desires.

The third amendment would add Canola to the definition of grain for the purposes of this Act. This is simply a reflection of showing the importance of Canola within the world community and, of course, is of extreme importance to producers in western Canada.

The fourth amendment, which is the amendment that has received some considerable attention throughout the country, would permit the Canadian Wheat Board, subject to Governor in Council approval, to adjust payments to producers who deliver grain to a railway car instead of to a primary elevator to reflect reduced carrying costs incurred in the handling of this grain. At the moment the situation is that users of producer cars or railway cars are paying for services which they do not receive, that is, storage costs and interest costs that are applied, assuming that the grain would be going to the country elevator system when in fact it is not. It is bypassing the country elevator system and going directly into the railway car.

• (1010)

The fourth amendment would permit the Government, upon the advice of the Wheat Board, with the concurrence of the Minister through Order in Council, to reduce a portion of those costs currently paid by producers for services they do not receive. In times where we are trying to reduce the operating costs of the farm community, we think that it is only logical to do everything we can to assist to make this amendment possible to permit the Governor in Council to pass on a share of those savings to the users of producer cars.

The fifth amendment would permit the board to pay advisory committee members a per diem, a relatively minor sum, one would assume, for the role that they play in advising the Wheat Board.

The sixth and last amendment would provide that the Act or any of its provisions would come into force on a day or days to be fixed by proclamation. Essentially that is a housekeeping item.

The committee held hearings on Bill C-92. A number of witnesses appeared. There is general support for the amendments. Certainly the users of producer cars who represent a small percentage of the population on the prairies, but an important one, are happy with the amendments. Barley growers in western Canada are happy with the amendments. Western Canadian wheat growers are very supportive of the amendments.

Mr. Benjamin: Fifteen hundred farmers. They don't amount to many.

Mr. Clark (Brandon—Souris): I see that the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) who is anxious to become the agriculture critic for his Party is present and making his usual interventions.

Mr. Benjamin: I have been around that business longer than you have.

Mr. Clark (Brandon—Souris): The key thing in the amendments is that up until this point in time farmers have been charged for services which they have not received. We simply do not feel that that is a philosophically sound position. We feel that it is appropriate that those who use the services should pay for them. If we establish in the future that users of producer cars are receiving services for which they do not at present pay, then it would only be appropriate at that time to pass those charges on to them. At the moment it is very clear that the users of producer cars or railway cars are paying for services that they would use if they used the country system. Therefore, it is only appropriate that they should not pay the total cost currently charged to them. I would point out that under the amendments they will continue to pay a certain portion of the costs which would be incurred if they were to use the service. In that sense, we feel that they are paying for a share of the line elevator company expenses, and we think that it is just.

On behalf of the Government we are happy to bring Bill C-92 to third reading. We believe that it has had an extensive debate and we hope that it receives the concurrence of the House.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-92 contains a number of provisions, most of which are technical and not controversial. The provision to allow the Canadian Wheat Board to borrow in foreign markets, from provincial governments, and a whole variety of agencies, provides additional flexibility. I would caution the Wheat Board that other Crown corporations have found themselves in serious difficulty. For instance, Eldorado Nuclear borrowed some $500 or $600 million in Swiss francs. It has borrowed United States dollars in overseas markets. It has lost something like $190 million on foreign exchange trading. The Wheat Board deals with much larger amounts of money than Eldorado Nuclear, but it is still a Crown corporation, and great caution should be exercised in this regard. Obviously we want to see the Wheat Board borrow its money as cheaply as possible, but great caution has to be observed by Crown corporations when borrowing in foreign exchange markets, particularly when the Canadian dollar and the United States dollar have lost ground in foreign exchange trading. That caution should be put in place in passing Bill C-92.

The most controversial part of this legislation is the producer car provision contained in Clause 8 which provides for the Canadian Wheat Board to pay a sum to the users of producer cars to cover those services they do not use, that is, storage charges, interest and carrying charges because they load their own cars. This issue has been very hotly debated. The Prairie Pools Incorporated are opposing it.

In committee, the concern of most people was what impact that will have on the maintenance of the country delivery points if producer cars were to assume a very large percentage of the shipments, because there are certain costs involved which are not storage or carrying charges relating to the costs of country delivery points, for example, the maintenance of infrastructure, and so on. This Bill simply deals with the Canadian Wheat Board Act. It does not deal with the Western Grain Transportation Act which is covered.

I thought that the Government made a mess of things because it would not provide the documentation and the information. We wrote to the railway companies and their response was that they did not know what it cost to maintain a rural delivery point, and they could not give us those figures. We could not put forward amendments relating to the Western Grain Transportation Act because Bill C-92 only relates to the Canadian Wheat Board Act.

I put forward an amendment which was promptly voted down. If the Government is defeated in the next election, it will be because of its overwhelming majority and its assumption that everything that the Opposition puts forward is wrong and does not deserve any consideration. The government Members vote by rote. They automatically vote it down.

My amendment simply stated that the sum refunded to those who use producer cars shall reflect an equitable allocation of the costs incurred by the board to maintain the country delivery points. The wheat pools are not saying that there should not be some reduction related to the storage and handling charges. Obviously, those people are not using the storage and handling charges. They are saying that the maintenance of those rural delivery points is something that comes under another Act and cannot be amended in this Bill.

That is why I put forward an amendment which would have relieved some concern. We do not know, but perhaps those storage, handling, and elevator charges are identical. If the Government had come forward and stated that the cost for charges which are not used is much more than the cost of maintaining the rail sidings and the country delivery points, there would have been some balancing. But the Government did not do that and, of course, it did not accept the amendment. I do not understand why the Government did not accept the amendment. I hope that the Senate will consider it. Apart from striking the whole clause which is proposed, it seems to me that it strikes a balance that we tried to reach, that people who use producer cars pay their fair share of the country delivery points and still may be eligible for some reduction in those costs which they do not use, but the Government did not accept it.

• (1020)

I would like to read a most urgent and telling communication which members of the Standing Committee on Agriculture have received, signed by Bill Strath, the President of the Manitoba Pool Elevators, who acts as the person responsible for Prairie Pools Inc. As well, it is signed by Garth Stevenson, the President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, and by Mr. D. E. Livingstone, the President of the Alberta Wheat Pool. This came from an urgent message on July 8, the day that we dealt with report stage and concurrence. It was addressed to all Members of Parliament, and it said:

> The Board of Directors of Prairie Pools Inc., meeting in Calgary today, reiterates its strong opposition to inclusion of Clause 8 of Bill C-92, amending the Canadian Wheat Board Act.
>
> Prairie Pools Inc. is a western based farm organization with a membership of 130,000 farmers in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.
>
> Clause 8 would allow the Canadian Wheat Board to waive interest and storage charges on grain shipped in producer cars.
>
> The farmers' right to use a producer car must be maintained. However, the only savings that should be deducted are elevation and handling costs. Any further deduction of storage will likely add to the costs of those farmers using the country elevator system. The infrastructure costs of western Canada's grain handling system are not charged to the users of producer cars.

That is the point I have been making here this morning. The whole section of the infrastructure relating to the country delivery points is not covered in this Bill and cannot be covered because the Bill does not provide amendments to the Western Grain Transportation Act. The letter continues:

> There is clear evidence of extra costs associated with the producer car since these costs are attributed to the railways and are paid for by all producers in the costing process.
>
> You are aware of direct expressions of concern from large numbers of grain producers in the Prairie area. We urge you to take all possible steps to remove Clause 8 from Bill C-92.

That is the nub of the problem. They are not arguing about elevating charges; they are arguing about the storage and interest of carrying charges.

I think that this issue was really brought forward by the Prairie Pools Inc. It is opposed strongly by them because they see a number of straws in the wind against the whole idea of the Canadian Wheat Board. They know that its powers and prerogatives will be reduced by the Canada-U.S. trade deal, that there will be provision for grain to come in from the United States, and they will not be issuing end-use certificates. They know that feed grain will come in and be denatured, which will cost an extra $7 or $8 a tonne, I am told, and that that grain in the end can be used illegally for planting. Many producers in western Canada see the powers and prerogatives of the Wheat Board and the whole system of marketing run down by the Mulroney-Reagan trade deal. They see the whole country elevator system being destroyed or weakened by this, because the producers using producer cars will not be paying for their fair share of the infrastructure for country-delivered points.

I think that these matters should be taken into consideration by the Government. It did not come forward with a Bill with the whole range of western grain transportation aspects of it. It did not come clean with the exact information. If it had come forward with the data, proving that the storage and interest charges and carrying charges were much higher than the infrastructure cost of maintaining those country delivery points, I think that it would have had a much more telling argument before the committee and before the House, but it did not bother.

Those are the issues which are still with us in this Bill and on which the Government is really missing the point. I hope that when this matter is before the other place it will get more thorough study because, although there was some concern when it went through the agriculture committee several months ago, the intensity of the concern in the prairie regions is much stronger now. At that time we asked for information from the two railway companies. I believe we asked for information as well from the National Transportation Agency as to the exact costs, so that when dealing with this at report stage we would be able to compare. We do not have that information. The situation is no better now than it was at report stage when the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) and I put forward amendments to Bill C-92.

I hope that more information can be garnered, if not here at least in the Senate, so that they can deal with this in an effective way. Clearly, there is a lot of concern in the prairie region with this legislation, partly because of the other overriding concerns with the trade deal, and also that the Government has not come clean and has not provided the information. The railway companies have not provided the information. We have a situation where we do not know how much the Government is going to be giving back, whether there will be a tremendous incentive for the people who use producer cars. If we see that, then we know that the Government will be hell-bent on destroying the whole pooling system and the Canadian Wheat Board. There are certainly a lot of straws in the wind in that regard already. These are the concerns as we move to third reading of Bill C-92.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, I have to rise again on the whole matter of orderly marketing, particularly the Canadian Wheat Board. This is probably the tenth or twelfth occasion in the last 20 years when there has been a further erosion and the whittling away at the whole principle of orderly marketing, single-desk selling, for all western grain producers through the Canadian Wheat Board and the marketing system which it entails.

The whole purpose and reason for the existence of that system of grain handling and marketing in Canada is to allow the grain producers to co-operatively pool, share the cost of moving the grain and share the benefits from that system. That has worked very well in practice as well as in principle since 1935, particularly since the start of the Second World

War when the Canadian Wheat Board legislation was fully implemented and enforced.

• (1030)

This legislation has three items in it. One has to do with enlarged financial arrangements for the Canadian Wheat Board so that it can make more investments or whatever to benefit grain producers. Another has to do with some minor changes to allow for improvement in the very, very low expenses allowed for the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee. We have no problem with those two provisions. They are relatively minor. But the fly in the ointment, the bug in the soup, is Clause 8.

Nobody is objecting to the producer having the right to have a producer car should he so choose. That has always been available. Even in years when I was on the railroad and we implemented the car order book, from time to time individual producers would come and order their own cars.

The principle of all of the producers sharing in the costs of the system cannot be and should not be departed from. I listened to the Parliamentary Secretary saying how this makes the western wheat growers happy. I think maybe they have 1,000 or 1,500 members at best. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has over 70,000 members. The three prairie pools plus the United Grain Growers, all four farmer owned co-operatives, oppose this and represent something in the order of 150,000 grain producers. They do not want this clause. But it is there to pacify the right wing Tory minority, an extremely small minority on the Prairies and is pandering to those who have always opposed orderly marketing. It is pandering to the private grain companies and the Winnipeg commodity exchange as well.

In a letter to the Minister of State in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board of June 9, the three pools in a joint letter and in separate letters from each of the prairie pools made it as plain as the nose on your face that they were opposed to the Bill because of Clause 8. They asked the Government to reconsider. When they last met with the Minister—they were happy about the consultation that went on and everything else—they waited for the Minister to raise the subject of Clause 8. When he did not report to them about any reconsideration—obviously there wasn't any—the pools raised it as the last item on the agenda, and then followed it up with their letter of June 9 in which they outlined their reasons for the opposition. The item was discussed at every single meeting of every local and sub-district of the three pools in the three prairie provinces. It was discussed thoroughly by the farmers. There would be in total tens of thousands attending those local and sub-district meetings and there was overwhelming opposition to this measure.

I think it is logical that a farmer who ships a producer car is not charged the elevation and handling charges normally assessed at a country elevator since it did not go through that country elevator. That is fair ball. But to relieve that producer from paying his share of all the other costs means that a smaller number of most of the producers have to pick up all the costs, which means higher costs for the larger number of producers. Surely that is unfair. There are costs that are not being accounted for in the handling of producer cars. The Canadian Wheat Board charges a nominal fee for producer cars mainly to cover the extra administration costs entailed. There are costs such as capital, maintenance, taxes, et cetera on many of the rail sidings in western Canada which are being used exclusively for producer cars. The three pools believe that is a substantial figure and they asked the Minister of State to demand that the railroads provide those figures. There is the extra switching costs involved in the spotting of producers cars at those sites.

One of the economic benefits of elevator rationalization is the least number of stops that freight trains have to make to spot and pick up grain cars. That benefit is lost when you have to stop a 60, an 80 or a 100 car train and switch off one car and then a few days later stop another train and pick it up. Those costs are additional. If there is a siding and no country elevator the costs are even higher. The benefit, of course, is lost and the rail costs are not reduced. They may even increase on a per tonne basis if the spot is for a single car or two, three or four. The railways have told the pools that if producer cars are not loaded in the allocated time the they must be picked up on the next train run. That adds to car turnaround time. A lot of fuss was made over the past several years about reducing turnaround time. At one time I think it was up to 27 days. Now I think we have it down to 17 or 18. When producers do not load their cars on time, it lengthens the turnaround time.

The grain companies, which are 80 per cent farmer owned, have spent tens of millions of dollars not only in rationalizing and modernizing their country elevator system but have spent many, many millions in addition by remodelling and putting the latest technology into their country elevators to provide for higher speed legs, longer car spots to accommodate a faster system for loading railway cars. By the way, this legislation will increase even more the number of producer cars and that increased use of producer cars will negate the investment, 80 per cent of it by the grain producers themselves.

A majority of producer cars conform to the shipments called for but there have been too darn many which are purposely or accidentally misshipped. The Canadian Wheat Board may call for a specific grade. If a country elevator manager ships No. 2 wheat as No. 1 wheat he is penalized two, three or four cars in the next round of car orders. But producers who ship the wrong grade, even if they do it innocently—there have been too many times when this was not done innocently—receive no penalty at all. Sure, there is the authority if they misship their grain for the whole carload to be returned to the shipper, but it is rarely done. In fact, I have never heard of it ever being done.

• (1040)

When the Canadian Wheat Board embargoed tough and damp grain in the fall of 1985, producer after producer

bypassed the country elevator system and the Canadian Wheat Board embargo and shipped grain that had a moisture content as high as 20 per cent in producer cars to Thunder Bay or Vancouver. Those are the kind of people who like this legislation. Those are the kind of people the Parliamentary Secretary says are satisfied. I guess they are satisfied.

All these extra costs that are incurred by producer-loaded cars are averaged into railway costs and are paid by all grain shippers in the freight rate. It would be grossly unfair to relieve producer-car shipments of their share of carrying the costs of the country elevator system and not charge them the extra costs that producer cars incur. I do not think anyone can argue with any kind of logic or facts and figures that producer cars do not produce extra costs.

The three wheat pools, the UGG and the National Farmers' Union, five of the major farm organizations in Canada, all oppose the Bill and they all say that the proposed change in Clause 8 is an increased incentive to the use of producer-loaded cars and a much larger percentage of them will be used. This will increase pressure on the rationalization of the country system and an over-all slowdown of the ability to service the export grain market. It would also increase the concerns of producers regarding undue shrinkage of the grain handling and transportation system. The culprit, as those five major farm organizations see it, is Clause 8.

These organizations say, and we agree, that because of the inclusion of Clause 8 in the Bill, and because of the narrow stubbornness of the Government, the Minister and the Parliamentary Secretary, Bill C-92 is bad legislation. On those grounds, they say that they will continue to oppose it. It is contrary to the interests of the vast majority of prairie farmers and, as well, it jeopardizes the orderly marketing system.

I find it incredible—I should not find it incredible. It is not unusual. I have heard the Tories say that they are in favour of the co-operative movement and the wheat pools and they support them and are in favour of orderly marketing. They say they are in favour of the Canadian Wheat Board and that they want to strengthen it. Yet every time they have made a move, they have weakened the Canadian Wheat Board and the orderly marketing system.

Clause 8 flies in the face of the whole principle of orderly marketing and of the existence of the Canadian Wheat Board. That underlying principle is the sharing by all producers, co-operatively, in the benefits and the costs of shipping their grain to market, 80 per cent of which is the export market.

The Tories talk one way and act the other. Over the years, I have heard Tories say what great supporters they are of orderly marketing and the Canadian Wheat Board. Then every year I find that the Tories are criticizing, complaining and legislating to weaken the system that they claim to be such great supporters of.

The fact is that the Tories are pandering to, at best, 3,000 or 4,000 grain producers who belong to the barley, flax and western wheat growers' associations and a couple or three other little outfits. They are pandering to them out of their narrow market forces, bottom line, private enterprise ideology at the expense of probably 90 per cent of the grain producers of western Canada.

We will be calling on all the farmers we can after this Bill passes, if it does. We will be going to see them by the thousands to show them once again how the struggle by the co-operative movement and by western grain producers through various economic and political actions to get the Canadian Wheat Board strengthened and orderly marketing from being undermined. We can win all the economic battles we like, but they can be done away with or weakened with the stroke of a pen by an unfriendly Government which does not believe in or support what obviously 90 per cent of the grain producers of western Canada want and demand.

This is just an attack on the Canadian Wheat Board and the whole concept of orderly marketing. I for one, and members of my Party as well, will not hold still for it. I know that tens of thousands of grain producers in western Canada will not hold still for it either.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 13(5), the recorded division stands deferred until six o'clock on Monday,

* * *

LOBBYISTS REGISTRATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-82, an Act respecting the registration of lobbyists, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

Lobbyists Registration Act

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to draw to your attention, Sir, that I understand that it could be that the Chair may have some difficulty with the admissibility of some of the amendments I have proposed. As a matter of fact, in the unlikely event that you would rule that some of these amendments may be slightly out of order, I would like to take a moment to make a point to the Chair, particularly as it pertains to Motion No. 3 which would amend Bill C-82 to refine the definition of a public office holder. I would respectfully submit that this amendment would be in order.

We know, of course, that on page 555 of the latest edition of Erskine May, there are a number of examples set out to describe when an amendment is and is not admissible. I simply want to remind you of the parliamentary debates of the House of Commons of Great Britain in 1912 at page 2859. I am sure you are familiar with the decision that was taken by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole at that time. Nevertheless, I think I should refresh the memory of other Hon. Members who may not be as familiar as you are with this issue.

It had been ruled at that time that an amendment to a tax Bill would be inadmissible because it changed the scope of the Bill. What happens is that amendment described at page 2859 of the *House of Commons Debates* of Great Britain in 1912 says that the particular tax was to be applied only to male persons. It was quite obvious that was introducing something to the Bill which went beyond the scope of the legislation the Minister had in mind. The chairman very ably recognized that and said the amendment was inadmissible.

• (1050)

I also want to refresh your memory about a decision taken at page 311 of the 1905 parliamentary debates of Great Britain which had a similar provision in it. Again it was ruled that a tax which was to apply to a particular class of person was foreign to the Bill because no class of persons had been identified in the original legislation.

I bring those two examples to your attention, and I have other similar examples which I could raise, to demonstrate that in my respectful opinion all the amendments that I propose are in order, in particular Motion No. 3 which says in part:

> "public office holder in an attempt either to influence or to obtain information for the use of a client who attempts to influence"

My amendment further refines the definition of when lobbying is lobbying. In other words, when a lobbying activity exists. It does not create a further charge upon the Government. It does not introduce a new class of person that is to be taken care of in this particular legislation, and of course it does not attempt to introduce something foreign to what was in the Bill to start with. One could even argue that the amendment I have proposed could narrow down, as opposed to expanding, the scope of the Bill already.

What we are merely trying to do with Motion No. 3 is to ensure that those who lobby government are required to register when they are lobbying for a change in legislation or, with my amendment, when they are attempting to obtain information to provide it to a client who will then attempt to lobby the Government. I know you have been giving my representations your undivided attention, as you always do, and I trust that the Speaker will allow my amendments, in particular amendment No. 3, to be dealt with and voted on.

In the National Insurance Bill of Great Britain of November 22, 1960, there was an issue which also created a precedent setting case. Because it was so precedent setting I am sure you are familiar with it as well. What happened there, of course, was that an amendment was introduced by a Member with regard to the National Insurance Act, or the National Insurance No. 2 Bill as it was referred to. The purpose of the amendment was to amend another Act, in other words, an Act different from the one that was originally being amended in the original Bill. Therefore, if my amendment was attempting to make a change to another piece of legislation, the Speaker would be quite correct in saying that amendment would be out of order. Of course, the Chair knows that is the last thing that I intend to do with any of my amendments, more particularly amendment No. 3.

Therefore, I ask that you consider very carefully the representations I have just made in order to ensure that this Bill is as good as possible. In my opinion, with the further refinement of Motion No. 3 the Bill will be better and will make better legislation. From the procedural standpoint as well it will better clarify the definition of when someone is in fact engaging in a lobbying activity. As such I submit that particular motion is entirely in order.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): On the same point, Mr. Speaker. I have listened with care and attention to the representations of the Hon. Member opposite. Having had a chance to review Motion No. 3, I think we must always be careful about amendments which run against the principle of the Bill as approved by the House at second reading. In the case of this particular motion, I think you might indeed find it out of order. I think it is the insertion of the words "or to obtain information for the use of a client" which would be particularly hazardous for the House. With a little imagination that would include, for instance, all journalists—

Mr. Boudria: No.

Mr. Hawkes: —who come to us seeking information.

Mr. Boudria: That is a point of debate.

Mr. Hawkes: If I review my recent meetings in my constituency office, a great many involved people in someone's employ in some way, shape or fashion, who come to me for information may indeed use it in a way designed to try and

influence the Government. I had someone come to my office recently on behalf of organizations concerned about the abortion issue, as one example. Therefore, I suggest that you use your usual good offices to make sure that any of the amendments that would indeed change the principle of the Bill would be found out of order.

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I want to draw attention in particular to Motion No. 2 which stands on the *Order Paper* in my name. Your Honour has indicated it would be out of order because it attempts to introduce a further element into Clause 5 of the Bill. That clause states in part:

> Every individual who for payment undertakes to arrange a meeting or to communicate with the public office holder shall file—

And so on. In fact, Motion No. 2 includes mass mailings and advertising. All of those are attempts to communicate with a public office holder with a view to influencing—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will take into consideration the representations made by the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria), the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary, and the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) and make a decision immediately after Question Period. I did not mean to cut off the Hon. Member. If he has further representations to make, he can make them after Question Period.

• (1100)

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—WATER RESOURCES

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, if one examines the Government's position on water exports and diversions the picture is far from reassuring. First, the Government decided not to exclude water from the trade agreement. Second, almost three years after receiving the Pearse Report commissioned by the Liberal Government, legislation is not ready to be introduced in this House. The federal water policy has no teeth without legislation.

Third, by contrast, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. MacMillan) recently claimed he did not need legislation, that a policy was sufficient to protect Canadian water. Fourth, the Minister of the Environment declared in this House that greater outflows of water from Lake Michigan have nothing to do with Canadian waters, as if the Great Lakes were not interconnected.

Unless the Government amends the trade legislation to exclude water Canadians will never be certain that water will not be one of the natural resources to be shared under the agreement. We urge the Government to amend the trade legislation and to exclude water from it once and for all.

* * *

PORNOGRAPHY

CALL FOR PASSAGE OF LEGISLATION

Mr. Jim Jepson (London East): Mr. Speaker, pornography is a multi-million dollar industry in Canada with the underworld as the main benefactor. It victimizes women, children, and innocent family members.

Bill C-54, the Government's porn Bill, was introduced for first reading on May 4, 1987, and the Justice Department has received overwhelming support for it from Canadians across the country.

Why is the Department continuing to listen to the vocal minority projected by the media as the vocal majority? Let's give this Bill second reading and get it to committee now where we can hear witnesses.

As a Government we said we would be bringing in legislation. I have to ask who is deep-sixing Bill C-54. The Government and the Department of Justice have brought forward strong juvenile prostitution laws and stronger laws against family violence. Let's be consistent and get on with Bill C-54. This is clearly the wish of an overwhelming majority of Canadians.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF NUCLEAR-POWERED SUBMARINES

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) would make a half decent fire-fighter. Just when he puts out one caucus brushfire up pops another one.

This time it seems a growing number of his colleagues, both in and out of Cabinet, are opposing his plan to spend billions and billions of dollars to purchase a fleet of nuclear-powered hunter killer, attack submarines.

In fact the Conservative Member for Nanaimo—Alberni (Mr. Schellenberg) actually defied the Prime Minister and wrote to his constituents that these subs were a complete and utter waste of taxpayers' money.

A private poll just handed to the Government, which shows that a majority of Canadians are opposed to this plan, is bound to fuel the growing revolt in his caucus against his foolhardy proposal.

The Tories are having a hard time selling nuclear subs on doorsteps right across Canada. Canadians are asking why we

need to spend billions of dollars on a batch of nuclear subs. Well, the Conservative Member for Esquimalt—Saanich (Mr. Crofton) has the answer. He says that we need the subs to chase after drug runners and fish thieves. With thinking like that, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that Canadians do not want these nuclear subs?

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

GOVERNMENT MEASURES

Mr. Bill Tupper (Nepean—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, historically and currently Canada has been blessed with an efficient, creative, and productive Public Service. No Government can function without an efficient and responsive Public Service and the present Government is no exception. True, the Public Service may be under stress, but we should not be surprised at this because of rapidly evolving circumstances.

The present Government has been a responsible employer. It introduced master bargaining, a fully funded dental plan, employment equity measures, additional day care centres, and a smoking policy for the workplace. It abolished mandatory retirement, and created a self-funded leave program and voluntary early retirement measures.

The Government also introduced a most successful workforce adjustment program, developed measures to ease the impact of privatization on employees; introduced performance pay and productivity bonuses for managers; and created the Canadian Centre for Management Studies which will bring together leading practitioners and scholars to contribute directly to new and improved management practices in the Canadian Public Service.

* * *

REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

EASTERN ONTARIO—CALL FOR NEW PROGRAM

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) put the economy of eastern Ontario in jeopardy on the day he appointed the Hon. Member for Lanark—Renfrew—Carleton (Mr. Dick) as the regional Minister to protect it.

As of June 30 the Government has cancelled all regional industrial development incentives for eastern Ontario. The Government is now in the position of having deserted regional development in this region of Canada.

When is the Government going to depart from its callous ways and bring in a new regional development program for eastern Ontario to support industry and tourism? This is the first time since 1970 that a large part of eastern Ontario has been without an industrial regional development program. The Government was very quiet about letting the industrial development incentive package drop and obviously wanted to play it low key.

We in eastern Ontario demand that the Government bring in a regional development and tourism program. If the Prime Minister can give $164 million to Lac St. Jean in a by-election, he can bring in an industrial and tourism incentive program for eastern Ontario for years to come.

* * *

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

RESPECT FOR LAW

Mr. André Plourde (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup): This morning, I feel I must bring to the attention of Hon. Members what happened to me last night at Ottawa International Airport, an incident that was very significant, especially after the passage of Bill C-72. In fact, I wanted some information, and I went to one of the Transport Canada employees at the airport and spoke to him in French. To my astonishment, he was unable to respond in French. I repeated my question but failed to get any results, so that finally, an RCMP officer stepped in and saved the day.

Mr. Speaker, this very ordinary incident made me think of how vigilant we will have to be about enforcing the Official Languages Act. Now that the Bill has been passed, I think we have a duty to ensure that all possible steps are taken to enforce the legislation.

I therefore urge all Ministers to ensure compliance with the legislation within their respective departments and within the Crown corporations for which they are responsible.

* * *

[*English*]

INDUSTRY

SITUATION OF TRUCKING INDUSTRY

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, the Government is allowing two grave threats to the Canadian trucking industry to grow and fester because of deregulation and the Mulroney-Reagan free trade deal.

First, U.S. truckers are pouring into Canada supported by an American tax regime which gives them a tremendous advantage over Canadian carriers. It is only a question of time before Canadian truckers shut down in Canada and move south to take advantage of U.S. capital depreciation rules. The Canadian Government should level the playing field forthwith.

Second, the Motor Vehicle Transport Act has been the law of the land for six months and its implementation has created chaos in the trucking industry. Shippers and truckers both agree that there are serious problems with the regulatory process related to the Motor Vehicle Transport Act. The provinces and Territories are each implementing the Act in their own peculiar way, leading to a complete lack of regulatory uniformity.

The present Government long ago let the trucking industry know that it is not interested in exercising its powers under that Act. Therefore, today's confusion is no surprise.

The Government must take steps to correct serious problems that have arisen as a result of the implementation by the provinces and Territories of the Motor Vehicle Transport Act.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—ONTARIO GRAPE AND WINE INDUSTRY

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, as an Ontario Member of Parliament I understood the frustration of my western colleagues at the implementation of the National Energy Program. Because of the grave consequences to western Canada I fully supported their efforts to have the NEP scrapped. Therefore, westerners will understand when I speak of my concern for Ontario's grape and wine industry.

Mrs. Lena Byl of my riding has pointed out to me comments attributed to the Premier of Alberta who was quoted as saying that 150 grape growers in Ontario should not be allowed to put the free trade agreement at risk. Let me set the record straight on this.

My riding is one of at least ten in Ontario with grape growers. There are at least 240 grape growers in my riding of Niagara Falls alone. The Canadian grape and wine industry is unique to only a few parts of this country and contributes millions of dollars to provincial and federal tax coffers. It is an important industry to everyone in this country.

However, I agree that Premier Peterson and the Ontario Government have a responsibility to assist this industry as well. I look forward to both our federal and provincial Governments working together to help this important sector of Ontario's economy.

[*Translation*]

PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY

RESPECT FOR ELECTION PROMISES

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Transport (Mr. Bouchard) was to announce to the people of la Montérégie, the people of Beauharnois, that there would be a bridge. This reminds me of the fifties when Duplessis promised to pave road sections.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Masse) promised there would be more developments in his riding. The Minister promised that the Quebec City area would get a centre . . .

Mr. Speaker, Quebecers should be warned. Remember the false promises of the Conservatives and this Prime Minister, his promise about social programs which he never kept, his promise about the old age security pensions that were de-indexed.

Let the people of Quebec, around Quebec City and shipyards, remember the promise that the shipyards would have more work than they could cope with! Let them remember how they were cheated by this Government on the frigate contracts.

Mr. Speaker, broken promises won't go over well during the next election campaign.

* * *

• (1110)

[*English*]

POLITICAL PARTIES

LIBERAL PARTY'S NOMINATION MEETINGS

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, the deep, deep slide in Liberal fortunes as recorded in the polls can in part be attributed to the shocking and disgraceful behaviour of that Party's supporters at various Toronto nomination meetings. They kick and scream, stuff ballots, and spend tens of thousands of dollars buying phoney memberships. The police have to be called in to keep order.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) is unwilling or unable to do anything about these ugly squabbles. No wonder Canadians have no confidence in him or his Party.

The Liberals should be ashamed of themselves for turning Hog Town into "Eatanswill North".

S. O. 21

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

OPPORTUNITY TO APPOINT CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES TO NICARAGUA

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): Mr. Speaker, according to the first report of the Special Committee on the Central American Peace Process, in line with the spirit of the Esquipulas II Accord and to encourage negotiations, the United States should end its economic embargo against Nicaragua and stop objecting to the granting of loans to Nicaragua by international financial institutions. Furthermore, the U.S. should be urged to maintain its decision to stop supplying military aid to the Contras.

The Committee recommended as a minimum solution to inadequate Canadian representation the appointment of a *chargé d'affaires* in Nicaragua, because relations between Nicaragua and the United States have worsened and Canada's role has become very important.

I urge the Government to act quickly on the Committee's recommendations on the peace process.

* * *

[*English*]

TOURISM

IMPORTANCE OF SERVICE SECTOR TRAINING

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, no nation has more splendour than Canada. The beauty of this magnificent land abounds in every region.

Moreover, each region presents a uniqueness of landscape and culture that causes our nation to be the most intriguing land on earth.

We have been blessed with rich natural resources and scenic countryside that are the awe-inspiring wonder and grandeur of the world. Our cities are modern, alive, and exciting. One-fifth of the world's freshwater is contained in our innumerable lakes and rivers.

Our country has what the world community wants to visit. Citizens of many nations yearn to explore our land of peace and beauty.

Yet, unfortunately, our capacity to serve tourists at a professional level of excellence is, at best, quite inconsistent. Therefore, I call on all levels of government to enhance and enrich their involvement in service sector training so that we might attain the volume and quality of tourists that this land so richly deserves. Our objective ought to be to make Canada the most desired nation on earth to tour and visit.

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE FOR GLENGARRY—PRESCOTT—RUSSELL CONSTITUENCY

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, on June 30, the federal Government's Industrial Regional Development Program, better known as IRDP, ended. This good program was established, naturally, by the Liberal Government in the early 1980s.

Mr. Speaker, there is therefore no remaining federal program to encourage industry to set up in the rural regions of eastern and northern Ontario.

Although it is true that Ontario is doing well, the situation in my riding of Glengarry—Prescott—Russell is not so rosy. The Prescott area, for example, is still suffering from an unacceptable unemployment rate of over 12 per cent.

I know that the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion is now negotiating with his provincial counterpart from Ontario to draw up a master agreement for the regional development of Ontario.

Personally, I have already spoken to the Minister and I encourage him to set up such a program to develop the eastern part of the province. Glengarry—Prescott—Russell needs federal Government assistance and I urge the Conservative Government to restore a good program such as the Liberal Government set up in the past.

* * *

[*English*]

SENIOR CITIZENS

INCIDENTS OF ABUSE

Mr. Andrew Witer (Parkdale—High Park): Mr. Speaker, Canada's senior citizens are one of our most valuable resources and, unfortunately, one of our most vulnerable. Having made an invaluable contribution to our country, many seniors are now threatened by growing incidents of elder abuse.

There have been cases reported where senior citizens have been mistreated by landlords, made prisoners in their own home or forced to turn over their small pensions to abusive relatives.

Last month in Toronto representatives of the Government and community groups met to formulate a strategic plan to deal with the problem. They proposed changes to the Criminal Code, expanded education of the public, and increased research and data collection on abuse cases.

I urge the Minister of State for Seniors (Mr. Hees) and the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) to commit all of the resources required and to seek the co-

operation of all levels of government in order to eradicate elder abuse in Canada.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—U.S. DRAFT LEGISLATION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister for International Trade. Yesterday the two Houses of the U.S. Congress endorsed their version of the legislation implementing the Canada-U.S. trade deal. In that legislation is a brand new power for the U.S. administration to harass Canadian exports and so-called Canadian subsidies.

After two years of negotiation, after all the promises raised by the Government, the end result is that Canada is being singled out as being uniquely subject to a brand new trade remedy law, a brand new power to harass and to penalize Canadian exports. That is the result of two years of negotiation.

Considering that the Derek Burney mission is a total failure, that Canada is now subject to a brand new trade power to harass our exports, what will the Government do? Does the Minister have some way to respond to this serious new invasion of Canada's trade rights by the United States?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): The hon. gentleman can splutter all he likes. It does not change the facts. There is no new trade remedy given or sought by the version of the U.S. legislation approved yesterday by the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee. All Members of the House should be pleased that both these committees have acted. The Chairmen of both those committees have assured the public at large that they believe it will pass in splendid style in the United States. I would have thought the hon. gentleman would have been pleased with that.

The so-called Baucus-Danforth amendment does not give any new trade remedy to the United States. It does not change the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement that we have entered into. As a result of our representations many changes in language have been made with respect to that amendment. While we still do not like it, and do not think it should be in the Bill or is necessary to be in the Bill, it only gives the Americans the same kind of powers to investigate alleged subsidies and the like as we have in our legislation. I can tell the hon. gentleman that he does not need to be upset, and his theatrical performance can be toned down somewhat because it is not the crisis he is pretending it is.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, he is the one talking about theatrical performances? You have to be kidding!

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT OF CANADIAN LEGISLATION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, it simply proves once again that the Minister has not read the proper documents. Again, his illiteracy is proving to be a disadvantage for Canadians.

Section 31 of the legislation endorsed yesterday by the United States gives the U.S. Administration new powers not only to monitor Canadian exports and determine subsidies, but to initiate actions unilaterally against those exports. That is a brand new power. It singles out Canada exclusively. It does not apply to other countries. Yet the Minister somehow has his head stuck in the sand or some other place where darkness prevails and does not understand that this is a clear violation of existing trade law. It is a brand new power. It makes Canadian exporters vulnerable to brand new trade actions. I want to know if the Minister is going to amend our Bill to give us the same powers the Americans are abrogating to themselves.

• (1120)

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I repeat again that the amendment known as the Baucus-Danforth amendment, in its final form, does not create any new remedies for American industries or for American interests whatsoever. It provides certain powers for the U.S. trade representative to investigate complaints if an industry believes it is competing against subsidized imports into the United States, it gives certain powers to investigate to try to establish what the facts are. It establishes no new remedies. It is not in conflict with the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. We don't think it is necessary. We don't think this is the proper place to have such a provision inserted.

It has been universalized in its application so it does not apply just to Canada. It will apply to any country that enters into a free trade agreement—

Mr. Axworthy: There's only one, then.

Mr. Crosbie: —with the United States. There may well be others, including Japan, where the Senate Finance Committee is now investigating and doing a study to see if there might be room for a trade agreement between Japan and the United States. So I can tell the hon. gentleman—

Mr. Foster: That we struck out.

Mr. Crosbie: —there is no new remedy being provided for American interests under this amendment.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, when the Minister says that Canada has not been singled out, there is only one nation that is proposing to sign a

free trade agreement with the United States, and that is Canada.

An Hon. Member: So far!

Mr. Axworthy: Therefore, we are the only country to which these new powers will apply. I appeal to the Minister. As the Minister responsible for defending Canadian interests, he knows full well that Section 31 gives the U.S. trade office new powers. It will be monitoring exports to determine all the subsidies. It will be able to take unilateral action against those subsidies on the government level, not relying upon industry petitions.

Those are substantial new powers that are not in the U.S. trade law now. They are not in our laws. They are brand new. They will provide severe and very harsh new constraints upon Canadian exports. I don't understand why the Minister refuses to stand up for Canadian interests.

He has a Bill in front of the House. That Bill could be clearly amended simply to parallel, if he wants, what the Americans are doing to us. If we are supposed to have reciprocity, why don't we at least have reciprocity in protecting Canadian interests? Why are this Government and this Minister refusing to stand up for Canada once again?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, every time the Opposition cries wolf, we are not going to respond "bah bah" as the hon. gentleman wants us to do. This is ridiculous. Just because the Hon. Member says something is so, doesn't make it so. I am going to read what the clause says:

> An entity can make a complaint to the United States Trade Representative if the industry is likely to face increased competition from subsidized imports, with which it directly competes, from any other country designated by the President following consultation with the Congress as benefiting from a reduction of tariffs or other trade barriers under a trade agreement that enters into force after January 1, 1989.

Mr. Axworthy: It sounds like Canada. It sounds like us.

Mr. Crosbie: There is no point shouting when I am trying to answer the question. I will outshout you if I have to.

Mr. Axworthy: We know that. That's all you can do.

Mr. Crosbie: What this means is that this applies not just to Canada but to any country that benefits from a reduction of tariffs or other trade barriers under a trade agreement. That could be the MTN agreement or any other trade agreement that lowers barriers with the United States after this Act comes into force. So it does not apply just to Canada.

In any event, the hon. gentleman is completely wrong as usual, wrong-headed and wrong.

APPLICATION OF UNITED STATES AND CANADIAN LAW

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Minister for International Trade. In the Bill agreed to yesterday by the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, they have kept in Article 3, the provision that says: "In the event of a conflict between U.S. law and the agreement, U.S. law shall prevail". In our Bill, Article 8 states that our Bill will override every other Canadian law whenever there is a conflict. How can the Minister tolerate such a flagrant difference between our law and their law? Is he now prepared to amend our law and either take out Article 8 altogether or make it the same as the American provision?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, there is another little wolf on the wolf's hind legs again.

Mr. Axworthy: Forget the insults, John. You're an absolute failure as a Minister.

Mr. Crosbie: The hon. sheep is pretending to be a wolf. That is the difference.

Mr. Axworthy: Stand up for this country, you big fraud!

Mr. Crosbie: You couldn't even gum anyone to death.

With respect to the question, this is a question of statutory drafting. Clause 8 of our Bill, which states that the Bill would override any inconsistent provision in other Bills relating to the same subject matter, is a common piece of statutory drafting in Canada. That kind of clause appears in many of our federal statutes.

In the United States there is a congressional system, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, but hon. gentlemen opposite have difficulty in grasping that. They have a President and they have a Congress which is independent of the President. The Congress doesn't trust the President, therefore, their habit is to say—

Mr. Foster: We don't trust you so it is all the same.

Mr. Orlikow: We don't trust you.

Mr. Crosbie: And the Canadian public doesn't trust any of you. That is why you are where you are and we are where we are.

Some Hon. Members: Let's go! Let's go!

Mr. Crosbie: We are going to have a election, don't you worry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Supplementary, the Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East.

REQUEST THAT LEGISLATION BE AMENDED

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, this is not just a drafting provision. This is a matter of substance. Clause 8 in our law, Bill C-130, makes the Canadian-U.S. Free Trade Agreement in Canada sort of a quasi-constitution subject only to the Constitution of Canada, but able to override every other Canadian law whenever there

is an inconsistency or conflict. The provision in the American statute—and it has nothing to do with the American system—is exactly the opposite. It provides: "In the event of a conflict between U.S. law and the agreement, U.S. law shall prevail". Therefore, every other law to be passed by the American Congress can amend the agreement and their Bill. How can the Minister tolerate such a difference in provisions? Why doesn't he do as much for Canadians as the American Congress is doing for its people?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, Clause 8 in our Bill is a matter that has been dealt with before the present legislative committee. That is the proper place for this to be discussed. If the committee, for example, wanted to recommend a change, naturally we would consider whether or not there should be a change. But the committee has not recommended any change.

Mr. Axworthy: You said we can't.

Mr. Crosbie: All that Clause 8 states is that this particular piece of legislation will overrule any inconsistent other federal legislation that has not been amended in the Bill. Twenty-seven federal statutes have been found to have provisions inconsistent with the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. We are specifically amending them. But it is possible that in some obscure provision in some other piece of federal legislation, and God knows there have been thousands of pieces of legislation passed in the last 100 years, there happens to be something that has not been discovered, that we have not seen in our research, that it is inconsistent with this trade legislation, it will be overbound by this federal trade legislation. That is a common statutory provision in our Canadian practice and I see no reason at the present time—

Some Hon. Members: Come on!

Mr. Crosbie: But if the committee in its wisdom, in looking at this, makes a recommendation, then we will consider it.

* * *

CHILD CARE

REQUEST FOR DIRECT FEDERAL GRANTS TO PROVINCES

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. Crosbie: Child care is needed over there, Madam, right next to you.

Ms. Mitchell: Child care is in far greater crisis than it was four years ago.

Mr. Crosbie: There is a crisis over in the Liberal ranks.

Mr. Manly: The Tories think this is funny.

Ms. Mitchell: Child care is in a far greater crisis than it was four years ago, with long waiting lists, few services for children under three, day care centres closing, under-paid workers leaving, and working parents are very concerned about care for their kids. Despite four years of promises and press releases, the Government has not provided one new federal cent for child care services.

• (1130)

Since it is now obvious that there will be no shared funding available to the provinces before the next election will the Minister consider using part of the $1 billion that he found this week and allocate at least $320 million of it for direct good-faith grants to provinces so that they can begin to deal with our child care emergency? Will he do that?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, no, I will not do that, since it is less than what we are doing now. I know that that was the NDP policy.

The Hon. Member says that the Government has done nothing. She is wrong on that point. In the four years since we took office we have has done a great deal. There was the $6.4 billion program over seven years, not to mention the 200,000 spaces, not to mention that after seven years there will be $800 million per year for spaces only support, almost $1 billion a year.

Despite all that, since the Government took office that has been increased by 100 per cent in terms of expenditures under CAP. The Hon. Member says that we have done nothing. Like everything else, it gets tiring always to have to correct the Hon. Member. I understand her philosophy. While I disagree with her even on that, I always have to keep changing and correcting her position.

PROVISION OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, if the Minister had listened, I said that there was not one new federal cent for child care services. The money the Minister mentions was only in press releases. Of course he has done some things, but unfortunately they have been the wrong things, in our view.

This week the Senate Committee on Child Care joined many other experts across the country in pointing out the numerous flaws that there are in the child care strategy, including the inadequacy of funding, the need to ensure quality of care, the promotion of non-profit child care, and the need to expand services. Since the announcement this week corrects none of these flaws, and the Minister admitted yesterday that this $1 billion does not deal with these problems, would it not make practical sense to allocate good-faith grants now in order to have time to redraft the plan so that we can be proud of our first national child care program in Canada?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I did not admit anything of the kind. I did not

say that at all. In fact I said that the $1 billion will increase quality. I said that it will increase the salaries of child care workers. I will explain it to the Hon. Member again.

The money for 1988-89 flows as of April 1, 1988—April 1, 1988. We are in July now and April was a few months back.

The point I make is that the provinces can sign on. It is more money for this year than even the NDP wanted.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, the Minister can surely not deny that it is money on paper. There is no money in place yet. Again, I say that. It is not just New Democrats who are saying it but experts across the country are saying that the money is being used in the wrong way. The Minister has said in the House, when I questioned him before, that accessibility, affordability, and quality are important national child care objectives. We agree with that. However, he knows that his plan will not achieve these goals. Two hundred thousand spaces will not even begin to meet the need over seven years.

Will the Minister act on his child care promises to Canadian families? Will he show some good faith by putting some money in now before an election? Will he provide emergency funding while he redesigns a workable national child care program, and go to the electorate with it?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I have showed good faith. The money is available as of April 1, 1988. The money is there. The federal-provincial agreements will be signed.

Ms. Mitchell: Will be—not now. Not one cent has gone.

Mr. Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I finished saying that the money is available April 1, 1988. If the Hon. Member knows anything about social policy—anything at all—she will know how to take a look at the adjustment over each fiscal year to see how the adjustments are made. The money is available as of April 1, 1988.

The point we are really debating is this. We wanted to give Canadian parents a choice. What the Hon. Member and the NDP want, and something which the Liberals joined in yesterday, is for the Government to drive everything. They want the parents to be told by government how to have care and how to access it. We oppose that. We reject it. That is why we have a plan which was agreed to by other provinces, the federal Government, and by parents who want a choice.

ENTREPRENEUR IMMIGRANTS—MONITORING SYSTEM

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

Since the Government assumed office in 1984 not only has it doubled and tripled its levels of entrepreneurial immigration to the detriment of other classes such as the family and assisted-family classes, but as Toronto newspapers have been demonstrating for the last several weeks, by failing to implement a comprehensive monitoring system and by lowering the standards, thereby making it easier for business immigrants to get into the country, the Government has created a huge incentive for widespread abuse.

Since the Government's own study in 1985 indicated that it could not even locate over 40 per cent of all business immigrants entering the country, or those who were supposed to have entered, why has the Government refused to establish a monitoring system that would ensure that promises for investment and job creation be fulfilled? If the Government is not prepared to do so now, will it at least re-evaluate the entrepreneurial program within the Government's immigration policy?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I remind the Hon. Member of three things. First, this program has been in place since the late 1970s. Until we got here there was not a finger lifted even to review what was going on under this program, let alone monitor it. My predecessor introduced a review of this system. I said as soon as I took this portfolio that I would be instituting a monitoring system, and that there would be a private sector advisory committee on how to do it. I will be announcing that very soon.

It is this Government and this Party which have aggressively expanded the Government's sponsored refugee program, family reunification, and the independent immigrant program.

ENFORCEMENT OF LEGISLATION

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that it was this Government that tripled the number of business immigrants, and expanded the program to make it easier to qualify. It is now being irresponsible in not following up and ensuring that, if there is a priority for rich immigrants, they at least be followed up on their promises to invest and create jobs for Canadians.

I ask the Minister again why she permits a double standard to continue whereby family or assisted-family class cases are meticulously screened and refused for the slightest of oversights while the rich are not only able to buy themselves into the country more easily but many of them who do so do so free of charge? Will the Minister apply the force of our Immigration Act equally to all its applicants without accounting for the size of people's wallets?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the important part about the lowering of the amount of investment required is because of a bilateral agreement with provinces that have very little capital investment. That does not apply all across the country. It applies in provinces that need investment and, indeed, it was at their request that we did this. So we are now balancing the business immigration program—

Mr. Marchi: No one is coming over.

Mrs. McDougall: It has just been put into effect. We are now balancing the program in a way that will spread that investment out across the country instead of just having it go to some of the richer provinces.

• (1140)

The cornerstone of our policy is that we do indeed apply the standards of the Immigration Act to everyone, and will continue to do so. We will be enhancing the monitoring and the standards around this program. For those who have been in office while the program was instituted with absolutely no monitoring, I find this remarkably hypocritical.

ADMISSION OF HONG KONG BUSINESSMEN

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. In an article in *The Globe and Mail* today Victor Malarek documents abuses in Canada's immigration system that the Minister of Immigration and all her employees cannot document.

Can the Minister tell the House why it is possible that 18 Hong Kong businessmen admitted under the program promoted by the Government can supposedly live with their families in two houses in Metropolitan Toronto while continuing to live in Hong Kong, and still escape the detection of the Department?

Is this the type of monitoring the Minister meant when she told *The Globe and Mail* on July 5: "I told my officials that I really want this program monitored and very carefully watched"?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I cannot comment on the case that is under way at the present time, except to say that even the story in the paper suggests that what is being investigated goes back for many years. It did not start last week, last month, or even last year. It goes back for quite a long time, and that is the only comment that I will make on this case.

CONDITIONAL VISAS—GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Government has two immigration policies—Bill C-84 to slam the door on refugees, and Bill C-55 which lets this program be wide open for the wealthy.

Can the Minister explain why there is such widespread cheating, rampant among these wealthy immigrants, while only half of them have restricted conditional visas which require them to enter the country and establish the businesses that they promised to do under the terms of their entry, which they are not doing?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I have already suggested to the House that until this Party took office there was not even a review of this program.

Mr. Orlikow: Four years. How many more years do you want?

Mrs. McDougall: There has been a review of this program. We are looking actively at how to monitor more effectively. Conditional visas do involve Charter considerations. That may or may not be the answer, but we are looking at it very actively and will be making some announcements soon.

IMMIGRANT DOCTORS—STAFFING OF RURAL HOSPITALS

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. Bearing in mind the alleged near crisis reported by some rural medical associations, as the result of the unwillingness of Canadian trained doctors and nurses to staff hospitals in rural Canada, would the Minister give consideration to allowing for a designated system that would appropriately label some rural communities as difficult to staff medically and allow those hospital administrators to apply in foreign lands, simultaneously with any advertisement with provincial and Canadian medical associations, and specifically without the requirement for the three-month waiting period while time is wasted in applying in the domestic market for medical staff?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is to be commended for his continuing interest in what is a real problem in the rural parts of Canada.

There is a program of co-operation between federal and provincial health authorities. In the Immigration Department we do expedite the entry of foreign doctors when the problem comes to us.

At the moment there are two log-jams. One is with the standards and interests reviewed by the medical association. The other is at the provincial level. To the extent possible, we are prepared to break the log-jam on the immigration side. We do process those applications very quickly.

I would be interested in helping out in other ways that might expedite the situation, and if designated areas are one of them I would be happy to do that. It will not solve the fundamental problem of foreign doctors coming and practising briefly in an area and then moving on, and that may create another source of difficulty in the future.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

DROUGHT IN ONTARIO—ASSISTANCE FOR LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture and it concerns the

desperate drought situation in many districts and counties of Ontario and in some areas of Québec.

After the federal-provincial Ministers' meeting two days ago, the Minister announced that the same assistance would be provided in Ontario and Québec as has been provided in the West. So far the only program is the livestock program in the West.

Will the same $60 per head of breeding cow be provided in the Ontario counties and districts affected? Will the same $15 per acre of assistance in tax deferral be provided for Ontario counties and districts affected? When will application forms be available? Will the funds be provided on the same date as they are being provided in western Canada, which I assume is using the starting date of July 1 with payments being made sometime in late August? Could the Minister clarify those issues?

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity for further clarification, although the message coming out of the federal-provincial meeting was very clear.

At the federal-provincial meeting in Toronto on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday I said that the same process that we followed in western Canada would be followed in eastern Canada. As of last Tuesday we had already formed the federal-provincial drought co-ordinating committee in the East. One meeting had already been held.

What I said then, and what I am saying here today, is that the same process will be followed in the eastern part of the country that was followed in western Canada.

CORN PRODUCERS—CROP INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is the following. I hope that the Minister will be able to provide exactly the same assistance in eastern Canada as is being provided in the West. That is what farmers want to know. They are not so much concerned about the process as they are that the funds will be provided on the same basis.

I also want to deal with the question of the losses in wheat, soybeans, corn, and a number of horticultural crops. Those losses are estimated to be well over half a million dollars already. By the end of the month the losses could approach 80 to 90 per cent in corn alone.

Is the Minister prepared to accept the recommendation of the Ontario corn producers that the yield factor be raised from 80 per cent to 90 per cent, and that the pricing factor be raised to the current day pricing?

In co-operation with provincial Ministers is the Minister willing to extend the application date for crop insurance until September 1, provided that the producers enrol for a two or three-year period? Will that type of assistance that has been proposed by the Ontario corn producers cover other crops? Is the Minister willing to accept those recommendations, many of which were contained in the federal-provincial review committee and were reported over a year ago? So far no legislation has been brought forward or policies adopted to implement those recommendations in the 1987 federal-provincial crop insurance review committee report.

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be appropriate for anyone who is paying the bill to accept any recommendations at this time. Any recommendations at this time are sheer speculation, and they will be speculation until later in the year when we are closer to harvest time, or at the normal harvest time, depending on the specific crop.

We will work jointly with the provinces and with the producer organizations to come up with recommendations to deal with the situation, exactly the course of action that we followed in western Canada.

We are interested in fairness and equity. We are interested in enhancing the crop insurance program. We are interested in encouraging a greater participation and a greater enrolment in the crop insurance program. But we are also interested in ensuring that there is fairness and equity in financing.

We are proposing to the provinces that we have a more equitable way of financing, more on a tri-partite approach. If the provinces would follow this, this would mean that there would be fairness and equity in crop insurance. It would also mean that Canadian farmers would pay somewhat less. That concept already exists in the Province of Québec and in the Province of Newfoundland. If we get on with the job, if the provinces are prepared to pay their fair share, then we can make an awful lot of progress in the next week to ten days.

* * *

• (1150)

PUBLIC SERVICE

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY—SCIENTIFIC AND PROFESSIONAL CATEGORY

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. The Minister knows that despite the Government's employment equity program to increase employment of women in the federal Public Service, 232 scientific and professional jobs held by female public servants will be gone by 1991. Representing only 25 per cent of this group, women will lose 30 per cent of the jobs.

Will the Minister not admit that it is sheer hypocrisy to talk about increasing employment of women in the federal Public Service while making such disproportionate cuts in this very, very important category?

Hon. Pat Carney (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed that the Hon. Member has

not congratulated this Government for being the first one to accentuate employment equity and to set targets for the employment not only of women but also of the disabled, natives, and visible minority groups.

Yesterday we published a report called *On Target* which indicated that in the first three years of this very important program we increased the number of women in the scientific and professional groups. It is reflected in the report that the increase was from 5,305 in 1985 to 5,580 in 1988. I think that should answer the Hon. Member's concern.

Mr. Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, that is what boasting does in refusing to deal with the fact that the numbers will be dropping back toward the levels they were in 1985. That is outrageous, Madam Minister.

REPRESENTATION OF VISIBLE MINORITIES

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the same Minister who knows very well that visible minorities are very seriously under represented in the Public Service, representing perhaps 3 per cent of the Public Service by her own figures, less than half of their proportion in the Canadian population.

How can the Minister reconcile the Government's supposed commitment to multiculturalism with a paltry 4.2 per cent increase in the numbers of persons from visible minorities who will be employed in the federal Public Service by 1991? At that kind of rate of increase, Mr. Speaker, it will take until the middle of the next century to achieve fair representation for visible minorities.

Hon. Pat Carney (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I do not think that our efforts to increase the employment of women, minority groups, the disabled, and natives are outrageous. They are without precedent in the history of any previous Government. We are the first ones to bring in a commitment to employment equity and we have delivered, as yesterday's report shows.

The Hon. Member should be aware that, of course, there may be a downsizing in this group as the Member suggests because we are devolving certain aspects of employment to the territorial Governments and to Indian bands, where nurses and teachers will be affected. That will be because their jobs are being devolved to other agencies. The Hon. Member should take that into account.

In terms of the other issues he raises, I suggest he both read the *On Target* report and the targets that we have set for the next three years. The Hon. Member should be aware that this Government has spent in excess of $30 million in order to ensure that special measures for employment equity are both in place and enforced.

ABORTION

PLANNED USE OF BRAIN TISSUE FROM ABORTED FETUSES

Mr. Jim Jepson (London East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. As the Minister knows, researchers at Halifax Dalhousie University plan to use brain tissue from aborted fetuses for transplantation, a practice that I am sure most Canadians will find clearly unacceptable and morally repugnant.

The U.S. Government in a move to to stop fetal tissue transplants is refusing federal funds to any institution that carries out medical research with fetuses. Can the Minister assure this House that there will be no federal funds awarded to any university, institution or organization which would try to carry out this despicable practice?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I too read the news reports with great alarm. I think that human life either in utero or in vitro, which is induced for experimental purposes, is both ethnically and morally unacceptable and wrong.

That does not relate, for example, to the spontaneous abortions and the medical and ethical procedures relating to organ harvesting and cadavers. There is also a very strong medical difference with respect to the fact that other options could not be used.

I say, as the Minister of National Health, that while there is review for any federal funding of medical research, this Minister will not approve such a procedure.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

REQUEST THAT MINISTER MEET UNION REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. There has been a definite deterioration in the morale of the Public Service of Canada under this Government and there has been a total lack of constructive dialogue between the duly elected representatives of the Public Service of Canada and the Treasury Board.

Today, regardless of what the Minister says, we find that in the science and professional job cuts female public servants have been the hardest hit.

Why has the President of the Treasury Board chosen not to meet with representatives of the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada despite their many requests to do so over the past several months? Is the Minister prepared to commit herself to a meeting without further delay to discuss issues of pressing concern to its members and representatives?

Hon. Pat Carney (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member should be aware that I held a special reception in May in order to meet with union representatives and to get acquainted with them, because this is a year of tough negotiations. I explained at that time that I did not want to undercut the collective bargaining process that we have in place at this time.

I am quite willing to meet with the representatives at a time when my participation would be helpful, but considering the lack of progress at the bargaining table I do not see what point would be served at this time.

LABOUR RELATIONS—GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister. The Minister and the Government have adopted an increasingly confrontational and non-communicational approach to labour relations with its own employees.

When will the President of the Treasury Board and Treasury Board officials get their heads out of the sand, stop stonewalling the bargaining units, and start treating the employees with a sense of decency? When can we expect some action and not just the damning, the ignoring, the downsizing and the degradation of the Public Service of Canada? When will the Minister and the Government start treating them with some respect?

Hon. Pat Carney (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I think this Government has been a good employer of the Public Service. We have brought in special measures such as the self-funded leave provision which was introduced recently. We have brought in the employment equity scheme and we have brought in a whole series of special benefits and measures that will assist the Public Service.

In view of the Hon. Member's concern, possibly he could suggest that the unions involved should come to the bargaining table and accelerate their efforts to settle on these agreements.

* * *

TELEFILM CANADA

FORMER CHAIRMAN'S EXPENSE ACCOUNT

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, last October Peter Pearson, Executive Director of Telefilm Canada, a $100 million Canadian cultural agency, made serious allegations about the Chairman, Mr. Jean Sirois, an appointee and friend of the Prime Minister. I quote:

> No examination of the Chairman's expense account and billings could stand public scrutiny . . . The Chairman stridently intervened to help personal and political friends.

My question is for the Chairman of the Communications and Culture Committee of the House of Commons. On three occasions, March 1, March 15, and May 4 that committee promised hearings into these serious allegations but last night the Conservative majority overruled this commitment. Why this whitewash? Did the Chairman receive instructions from the Prime Minister's Office to bury these embarrassing allegations against a friend of the Prime Minister?

Mr. John Gormley (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, without accepting the ridiculous premise to that question, I would offer two points in response.

First, the Member should recall that on June 22 the committee held a planning meeting and decided at that point to forgo the calling of witnesses and instead issue a written report. The Member was represented at that meeting of the committee.

Second, it is a tradition in this place that committees set their agenda and decide on the calling of witnesses in committee meeting. I would suggest that this Member continue that practice.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Waddell: That is a pretty lame excuse.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, they promised an investigation, but they will do nothing. Because Sirois is a personal friend of the Prime Minister, Mr. Pearson will not have an opportunity to defend himself.

DEMAND THAT MR. PEARSON BE ALLOWED TO JUSTIFY HIS POSITION

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway): My supplementary question is: How can the Committee Chairman justify such an action and when will Mr. Pearson be able to tell his story to this House or a Committee of this House?

● (1200)

[*English*]

Mr. John Gormley (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake): Again, Mr. Speaker, without accepting the preamble to that question, I would suggest that the Hon. Member consult with those who represented him at the June 22 meeting when the committee made the decision to issue a written report on this matter and to forgo the calling of witnesses. I would suggest that the Member's actions have now jeopardized the tabling of that written report.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There will be one question from the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys and one question from the Hon. Member for Don Valley East.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

WATER PATROL UNITS

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. The RCMP has cancelled its' water patrol units. The water patrol units of the RCMP have been responsible for patrolling and for matters relating to the Shipping Act and the Migratory Birds Convention Act. It is the only agency patrolling for water safety and has been responsible for uncovering a great deal of illegal drugs coming into Canada, a racket which now amounts to $10 billion a year. In light of the good work these units have done, why has the Government disbanded them?

Mr. Murray Cardiff (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for the question and for bringing to the attention of the House the good work of these units. I would like to take notice of the question and have the Solicitor General respond to it when he returns.

* * *

TAX REFORM

INTERIM SALES TAX CHANGES

Mr. Bill Attewell (Don Valley East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. There were press reports earlier this week indicating that he may be shelving the interim sales tax measure that was announced last February. Such a move, of course, would create a cloud of uncertainty for tax professionals and business people. What are the Minister's intentions in this regard?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, over the course of the few months since we did release those proposals on the interim sales tax changes, we have had considerable consultations and discussions with members of the private sector, tax professionals and others who do have an interest in this particular issue. On the basis of these consultations, we are proposing to make some technical changes which will make the proposals more workable. I would expect to be introducing legislation into the House, based on these technical revisions that I have referred to, some time in the next little while.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to six petitions numbered as follows: 332-4756, 332-4848, 332-4900, 332-4938, 332-5007 and 332-5014.

(*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*)

* * *

[*English*]

HERITAGE RAILWAY STATION PROTECTION ACT

PRESENTATION OF REVISED REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Mrs. Jennifer Cossitt (Leeds—Grenville): Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the legislative committee on Bill C-205, an Act to protect heritage railway stations, I have the honour to present a revised report on Bill C-205 to the House with amendments.

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

* * *

PETITION

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Brian White (Dauphin—Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured today to present a petition from several hundred people representing many towns in Manitoba who are concerned that as a result of the Supreme Court decision, the unborn in Canada have no protection currently under Canadian law. They humbly pray and call upon Parliament to enact legislation to protect the life of the child from conception until birth.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 344 and 367.

[*Text*]

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES WORKING IN VANIER, ONT.

Question No. 344—**Mr. Gauthier:**

Are there employees of the Government now working in Vanier, Ontario and, if so (a) in which departments or agencies are they employed (b) for each department or agency, what is the number of employees?

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): I am

informed by the following departments and agencies as follows:

(A) and (b)

Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada	6
Economic Council of Canada	125
Energy, Mines and Resources Canada	110
Environment Canada	67
External Affairs Canada	24
Health and Welfare Canada	668
Public Works Canada	7
Revenue Canada, Customs and Excise	10
Supply and Services Canada	100

DEAF CANADIAN STUDENTS AT GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

Question No. 367—**Mr. Young:**

1. Are deaf Canadian students currently enrolled in Gallaudet University in Washington, D.C. and, if so (a) in what numbers (b) what are their annual (i) tuition (ii) residence fees (c) do they receive financial assistance from the Government or, to the knowledge of the Government, from any provincial Government to cover the cost of attending this institution (d) what is the total cost of their education there and from what sources does that money come?

2. Are deaf students currently enrolled in Canadian universities and, if so (a) in what numbers (b) what kind of financial assistance is provided to them (c) does the government contribute to this support and, if so, what is the total cost per year to the government?

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Secretary of State of Canada): 1. Yes. (a) 134, (b) (i) U.S. $1,700 per semester, (average cost); (ii) U.S. $1,650 per semester, (average cost).

(c) According to Gallaudet University, most of their Canadian students receive assistance from the Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Persons Program (VRDP), a federal-provincial cost sharing program administered by Health and Welfare Canada. Also, students may receive assistance from the Canadian Student Loans Program (CSLP), provincial bursaries, loans and grants.

(d) Total costs vary from student to student, depending on what course is being taken. An average amount would be $12,000. Sources of money are: own or family contributions, VRDP, Canadian Student Loans Program (CSLP) of the Department of the Secretary of State, provincial bursaries, loans and grants.

2. Yes.

(a) Precise numbers on all deaf students have not been recorded. Canadian Co-ordinating Council on Deafness 1984 survey identified 35 profoundly deaf students studying full-time in university who requested support services.

(b) Financial assistance is provided by VRDP, CSLP, provincial loans, bursaries and grants.

(c) Federal government contributes via VRDP and CSLP. Total cost has not been broken down to identify costs for specific groups.

N.B. The above information refers to students who require special services and does not include those who choose not to identify themselves as deaf or request special services.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The questions as enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered.

* * *

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 352 could be made an Order for Return, the return would be tabled immediately.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that Question No. 352 be deemed to have been made an Order for Return?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

FUNDING FOR INDO-CANADIAN ORGANIZATIONS

Question No. 352—**Mr. Riis:**

In the past four years, have any Indo-Canadian organizations received funding from the government and, if so, for each year, which organizations and, in each case, what amounts of money?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

LOBBYISTS REGISTRATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-82, an Act respecting the registration of lobbyists, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, before Question Period, I was dealing with Motion No. 2. I have been informed that Motion No. 2 will be ruled out of order because it adds something further to the Bill.

I cannot see how Motion No. 2 is different from Clause 5 of the Bill. As a matter of fact, the only difference I can detect is that there is in my motion the following subclause:

> (v) the appointment of any individual to any body or office established by or under the authority of any Act of Parliament or by or under the authority of the Governor in Council,—

In fact, that particular subclause was in the original Bill when we debated it at second reading. In the legislative committee, the Government withdrew that subclause. I simply added it back in.

Right at the end of the motion, there is another part that is different. I have added such other information relating to the identity of the individual, the client, the employer or any corporation or subsidiary. I cannot see that my Motion No. 2 is any different from what is in the Bill now except for the addition of the appointment of any individual. In other words, those who lobby on the appointment of an individual are considered to be taking part in lobbying activities.

I cannot understand why the motion would not be accepted. As far as I can see, it does not go beyond the scope of the Bill which we debated in principle and which is before us today.

There is one other point I would like to bring to Your Honour's attention. It must have been an error in the printing of Motion No. 6 which has been accepted. It reads: "graphs 5(1)(a) to (g)," and it should be (f) rather than (g).

Mr. Boudria: That is what it says. Mine must be reprinted.

Mr. Rodriguez: I am looking at the Order Paper of Monday, July 11.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is correct, of course, but I would like to inform him that on today's Order Paper, it has been corrected.

I would first like to thank the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria), the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) and the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Hawkes) for their representations concerning the amendments at report stage. The Chair has taken the representations into consideration and is now ready to make a decision on Bill C-82.

[*Translation*]

There are eleven motions in amendment at the report stage of Bill C-82. These motions in the names of the Hon. Members for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria), and Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez), cause the Chair some difficulty. The majority of these motions were dealt with in the legislative committee which studied the Bill.

• (1210)

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 1, 2 and 3 attempt to introduce a further element into Clause 5. This is of course with respect to the representation made by the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez). Clause 5 states in part that "every individual who for payment undertakes to arrange a meeting or to communicate with a public office holder shall file". Thus it appears that the principle or scope, and those words are used interchangeably, of Clause 5 is to restrict registration to items based upon arranging meetings or communicating with public office holders. In addition, the Bill makes no reference, among other items, to mass mailing, advertising campaigns, collecting information, or summary of costs. Accepting this point, that the scope of the said clause is as stated, then to insert additional items not previously covered would indeed take the clause beyond what was originally envisaged at second reading.

Accordingly, as paragraph 1 of Citation 773 of Beauchesne's states, an amendment is out of order if it is beyond the scope of the clause under consideration. That reference is further supported by Erskine May, twentieth edition, page 555.

[*Translation*]

I thus find that the proposed motions numbered 1, 2 and 3 are beyond the scope of the clause and therefore are inadmissible and consequently will not be put to the House.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 4, 6, 7 and 8 were considered at length in the legislative committee. Nevertheless, after consultation, Hon. Members have made the case that this matter of requiring lobbyists to register certain items is of enough significance that it warrants further consideration as permitted under Standing Order 114(10). Accordingly, Motions Nos. 4, 6, 7 and 8 will be debated together but voted upon separately.

[*Translation*]

Motions numbered 5 and 9 were moved, debated but negatived at the committee stage. Therefore, in accordance with Standing Order 114 (10), they shall not be selected for the consideration of the House.

[*English*]

Motion No. 10 is similar to Motion No. 9 and as a consequence will not be put to the House.

[*Translation*]

Motion numbered 11 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) attempts to give the registrar more powers than those that were envisaged when the House gave the Bill approval in principle at second reading. Therefore, in accordance with paragraph 1 of Beauchesne citation 773, I declare it inadmissible.

[*English*]

To summarize for Hon. Members, Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 10 and 11 are not admissible and will not be selected. Motions Nos. 4, 6, 7 and 8 are in order.

[*Translation*]

Therefore, I shall now put motions numbered 4, 6, 7 and 8 to the House which will be debated together but voted on separately.

[*English*]

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt) moved:

Motion No. 4:

That Bill C-82 be amended in Clause 5 by striking out lines 11 and 12 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"(e) the fee charged by the individual for performing the activities described in subsection (1); and

(f) such other information relating to the".

Motion No. 6:

That Bill C-82 be amended in Clause 6 by striking out line 30 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"graphs 5(1)(a) to (f), that employee shall,".

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell) moved:

Motion No. 7:

That Bill C-82 be amended in Clause 6 by striking out lines 38 to 41 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"(a) the name of the employee;

(b) the name and address of the person or organization by whom the employee is employed; and

(c) the proposed subject-matter of the meeting or communication, as the case may be."

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt) moved:

Motion No. 8:

That Bill C-82 be amended in Clause 6 by striking out line 41 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"employed;

(c) the proposed subject matter of the communication; and

(d) the summary of the costs incurred by the person or organization while performing the activities described in this subsection."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On debate, the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria).

Mr. Hawkes: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would just draw your attention to Motion No. 4. Looking at the lineage and the way it is worded, there are three words which complete a previous clause. I can see what the Hon. Member is intending but in the absence of those three words we would end up with a script which might not be what it should be. At least that is my reading of it. We can proceed with the debate but I think there is a technical problem which people might want to look into while we are proceeding.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Very well. On debate.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate at report stage of Bill C-82. Of course, I regret that not all motions were acceptable to the Chair but of course I accept the ruling in that regard. That leads me to debate Motions Nos. 4, 6, 7 and 8, and I want to address my remarks principally to Motion No. 7. That happens to be the one I proposed.

Bill C-82, as we know, offers a two-tier system of registering lobbyists. It says that there shall be a category of consulting lobbyists and from them we should ask certain information. For another category, the Tier II or so-called other lobbyists, we should ask merely the name and address of the person or organization by whom the employee is employed, and that the employee who files a return referred to shall as soon as practicable in the circumstances advise the registrar of any change. That is the only thing we are asking of those people.

In my opinion we are asking far too little of Tier II two lobbyists. I want to remind the House that the whole purpose of having a registration system is to offer some form of transparency. Of course, as it pertains to Tier I lobbyists, we will be asking for a bit more information and that is good. I think we should have gone one step further and asked to register the fees that lobbyists charge as well. However, that amendment being inadmissible, we obviously will not be able to ask that.

Nevertheless, the whole purpose of the exercise is to provide a certain transparency. In the case of Tier I lobbyists one could argue that there is at least an element of that which will be required of those so-called Tier I lobbyists or, in other words, consulting lobbyists. When we talk about consulting lobbyists, we talk about the GCIs and Frank Moores of this world.

As we deal with Tier II lobbyists, we are talking about a different kind of person. At least, the Government thinks we are talking about a different kind of person. We are talking about someone who, let us say, is the vice-president of government relations for General Motors or Inco or another similar company. That could be the definition of a Tier II lobbyist but it is not necessarily so. Let me give you the following scenario.

For example, say that a company has one of its vice-presidents as a Tier II lobbyist but that company does lobbying work for another company. I will give an example. Say we have a large corporate entity by the name of Imasco. That, of course, is a large corporate entity and owns a number of subsidiaries, one of them being Imperial Tobacco, another one being a cookie factory and so on.

• (1220)

In that situation there may be no transparency at all because if the lobbyist is working for the parent company, it will not be at all evident which one of the subsidiaries he or she is lobbying for because we are not asking enough information of the Tier II lobbyists. We are not asking from them the same thing that we are asking of Tier I lobbyists, namely, the subject of what the lobbying activity entails.

One could even argue that in the case of very large multinationals, the parent company could in fact be lobbying two completely diametrically opposed things, depending upon

which one of its subsidiaries it is arguing for. In the case of the large multinational which I raised a while ago, if it were lobbying for or against a tobacco initiative, it would be totally different than if it were lobbying for or against something pertaining to its food production department.

I want to keep my comments very brief in this regard because we made the point at committee that we need a more transparent system. The Government has offered us a system of registering lobbyists after considerable controversy.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the Conservative Government had some very serious problems and it still does, during the summer of 1985. Subsequently, and as I said, the problems are still with us, the Prime Minister made a statement in the House and sent letters to Hon. Members, dated September 9, 1985, in which he discussed the issue of public sector ethics, and Lord knows the Government certainly needed some ethics at this point. However, in this case the Government announced that it would draft a new code for public office holders. Furthermore, instructions would be given to Ministers, imposing specific limits on the hiring, on a permanent or contract basis, of members of their families. Lobbying legislation would also be forthcoming, Mr. Speaker. I just want to quote, very briefly, one paragraph of this letter to show that we need the amendment I am proposing to the House today, if we are to meet the objectives the Prime Minister set in his letter of September 9, 1985. He said and I quote: "The fifth component of this comprehensive approach to public sector ethics is the undertaking of this Government to introduce into the House of Commons, at an early date . . . ", mark those words: "at an early date", " . . . legislation to monitor lobbying activity and to control the lobbying process by providing a reliable and accurate source of information on the activities of lobbyists . . . " Now listen carefully, Mr. Speaker, the next sentence is very important: " . . . we will require, among other things, paid lobbyists to register and identify their clients." That does not apply to the Tier II lobbyists I referred to earlier. " . . . This will enable persons who are approached by lobbyists for Canadian corporations, associations and unions, and by agents on behalf of foreign governments and other foreign interests, to be clearly aware of who is behind the representation . . . ", and finally: " . . . I have accordingly asked my colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, to prepare, on an urgent basis, legislation to govern lobbying activity " . . . "On an urgent basis", Mr. Speaker . . . that was September 9, 1985. It is now July 15, 1988, in a session extended by this Government.

I think it is clear that the Conservative Government has again failed to keep his word. In any case, I believe that with my amendment and the amendments moved by the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez), we could at least try to provide a measure of transparency throughout the system, something the Prime Minister himself had asked for. Mr. Speaker, I would ask all Members in the House to support the four motions before it today, and more specifically, a motion I moved myself, Motion No. 7, which is not very exacting but which nevertheless would be better than the system proposed by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre).

[*English*]

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, can I get a clarification? Since I have three amendments, do I get 30 minutes to debate? Do I see you nodding? He is awake. The Speaker is always awake when I am on my feet. I don't get away with anything around here.

I want to direct my comments to the three amendments which stand in my name on the Order Paper. Bill C-82 is the Government's response to the unanimous report of a standing committee of the House of Commons. The committee studied the issue of lobbying as a result of an open letter to Members of Parliament and Senators dated September 9, 1985, signed by Brian Mulroney, Prime Minister of Canada. Among other things that he said to Members of Parliament and Senators was the following:

> The fifth component of this comprehensive approach to public sector ethics is the undertaking of this Government to introduce into the House of Commons, at an early date, legislation to monitor lobbying activity and to control the lobbying process by providing a reliable and accurate source of information on the activities of lobbyists. We will require, among other things, paid lobbyists to register and identify their clients. This will enable persons who are approached by lobbyists for Canadian corporations, associations and unions, and by agents on behalf of foreign governments and other foreign interests, to be clearly aware of who is behind the representation.

It was as a result of this letter that the committee studied the issue of lobbying and produced a unanimous report. In that report we recommended that lobbyists be registered. We recommended that the item on which they are lobbying be registered and that the client who hired them be registered.

The standing committee did not recommend a two-tiered system. Bill C-82 makes a differentiation. The committee has always held that a lobbyist is a lobbyist is a lobbyist and that whether lobbyists are hired by a private company or an association such as the Pharmaceutical Association, their activities are identical. The purpose of their existence is to try to influence the legislators with respect to regulations and/or laws.

Bill C-82 has attempted to set up a two-tier system, Tier I containing all of those who are identifiably lobbying consultants such as GCI, PAI, and a host of other lobbying consultants. Tier II would cover associations and unions. The Government proposes to require different information from the two tiers. The first group will be required to name their client and the issue on which they are lobbying. However, Tier II will be treated entirely differently. They need only declare who they are. In other words, all they have to do is hand over their business card. That is the only registration required.

I used to think that the most powerful lobbyists were the Frank Moores type. I thought those were the powerful lobbyists, the ones with clout. I have since had reason and opportunity to change my thinking on that question. In fact,

the most powerful lobbyists on the Hill and around the bureaucracy are the associations like the Bankers Association, the Pharmaceutical Association, and BCNI. They really have the clout around here. We have observed the influence that they have had on the Government with respect to legislation. They will escape, scot-free, from the network of registration.

• (1230)

Canadians have every right to know who is doing what to whom and, I would add in one of my amendments, for how much. That is absolutely essential in a democratic system. It must be totally transparent. My amendments seek to erase the difference between Tier I lobbyists and Tier II lobbyists.

Second, I want to ensure that the amount of money paid by the lobbying activity, or the amount spent on a lobbying activity in the case of associations, is on the public record. That amount indicates the importance of the issue to those who want to have the change.

Third, even the Tier II proposal of the Government would eliminate the registry of those who would attempt to get an appointment to a board or commission. That is maintained in Tier I but completely eliminated for Tier II so that all the hacks can continue to be appointed without any right of the public to know about the relationship between those making the appointments and those making the representations on behalf of the appointees.

That is not in keeping with what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) wrote us in 1985, when he stated in his letter that we would have a transparent system, that we would not only be registering the lobbyists but registering the particular lobbying activity.

It is absolutely essential that the public be aware of the particular issue. We know that there is direct and indirect lobbying. All of us are aware of the vast numbers of letters we received with respect to the tobacco legislation. While we have no proof, all the letters were the same and obviously some groups were spending considerable amounts of money to put out those letters and have people sign and mail them. I suggest that that is a form of lobbying about which the public has a right to know. Parliamentarians and bureaucrats have a right to know who was sending out this information and how much they were putting into the lobby. In fact, it was all done by the Tobacco Manufacturers Association, who hired Bill Neville to make the big pitch. Canadians have a right to know that. Canadians have a right to know about the issue, who is behind it and how much they are paying.

Bill C-22, to amend the Patent Act, suddenly came upon the scene. Were the drug companies approaching the bureaucracy and, if so, those who were opposed to the changes ought to have been aware of it so they could mount their campaign as well.

Where did the question of free trade originate? I have no doubt in my mind that it originated with BCNI. I have no doubt that Tom d'Aquino and BCNI were pushing the Government into adopting the free trade program. We have a right to know what those who lurk in the shadows and dark recesses of Government are doing. We should be able to put the light on those who hide behind the curtains and do their deals in the dark.

The Canadian public has every right to know, as the Prime Minister once said. That does not only apply to access to information, it applies to all things relating to Government, including influences on Government. It is extremely important.

The Government took the position in committee not to accept any amendments. It refused to accept any changes to the legislation in the committee. In fact, I got the distinct impression that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre) was an unwilling sponsor of this Bill. He did not even want to have a lobbying Bill. The lobbyists have done a very effective job on the Government with respect to the lobbying Bill.

The Minister kept saying the Government did not want to register lobbying, that it wanted to register lobbyists, in spite of the fact that the Prime Minister said lobbying activities must be registered. We supported the principle of lobbying but we cannot support a Bill that has turned out to be a powder-puff Bill. We cannot support that because it would be participating in a nothing Bill.

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in the debate on this Bill and the amendment proposed by my colleague, the Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez). We are concerned about the issue of the public's right to know. That should not be confused with other issues that have been raised in the House.

The public has the right to know who is attempting to influence the decisions of Government. Not only should they know who is doing it, they should know the specific issues they are raising and how much money is being spent on it.

Let us consider the example of the submarine program, which is subject to millions of dollars of lobbying, and consider how that relates to the importance of this legislation. Yesterday there was a debate on the submarine program. Conservative Members spoke in favour of it and Opposition Members spoke against it.

Unfortunately, there are small groups of very powerful and influential people in this country who want this program to go ahead because of the large amounts of money they can make. These groups include the classical organized lobbying groups like Public Affairs International, Government Consultants International, Corporation House and a number of others.

Mr. Ouellette, who heads Government Consultants International, is a personal friend of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) from law school days. He was a principal instrument in his leadership campaign. The same organization involved Frank Moores, a personal friend of the Prime

Minister. These people are not without influence and are the louder voices looking for a share of the spoils of the Government. The people have a right to know what they are doing in the Prime Minister's Office, how much is being paid and for what.

This program has attracted a very nefarious type of undertaking. The former Chief of Defence Staff and Deputy Minister of Transport, Mr. Ramsey Withers, is now on the payroll promoting this program. He held a very important position in Canada as Deputy Minister of Transport and Chief of Defence Staff. He is being paid a pension by the Government of Canada and should not be lobbying for private groups for private advantage. That type of activity cannot be allowed to continue. It should be made clear in this House that Ramsey Withers has no business lobbying this Government on this issue.

• (1240)

We have the spectacle of a former Minister of National Defence, Mr. Jean-Jacques Blais, who served in this House as a Minister of the Crown, now lobbying as well. It would appear he is not only receiving money as a lobbyist but he is also receiving money from the Government of Canada, although indirectly. That is unacceptable. It should not be allowed to continue. This Government must take positive action to deal with these amendments and this legislation to stop this. The Canadian public is being exploited in a very serious way by these kinds of activities. People who have held strong positions of trust in the Government are now turning around and using those positions of trust for personal financial advantage, and in this case, for a very questionable program.

It even goes further than that. Lobbying is being conducted by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Beatty). There are reports in the newspapers that he is using officers of the Armed Forces to travel back and forth across this country promoting the submarine program. That is lobbying. It is absolutely unacceptable. It appears to be a politicizing of the Armed Forces, and we cannot tolerate that.

The Minister of National Defence has also used the resources of his Department to enhance the decision-making process around the nuclear submarine issue in the public eye. That is not acceptable. It undermines democracy. The particular issue of the submarines illustrates every negative aspect of the lobbying issue.

What it is is louder voices, smaller groups and louder voices. The Government is getting its message out by spending millions of dollars of taxpayers money. The submarine manufacturers in Britain and France are promoting this project using millions of private dollars. The defence contractors are spending millions of dollars in getting their message out. In short, there is a very small number of groups, who stand to make a very large amount of money, which are getting their message out.

What about the other side of the question, the fairness of the decision-making procedure, whereby these groups who are critical of this program do not have the resources to raise that that kind of money. When there are private interest groups, which stand to make a lot of money off the success of this particular program, having access to millions and millions of dollars to promote it, and when the prize is in the billions of dollars, they ought to be putting up an equal amount of money to be allocated to other groups so that these groups can campaign and give the other point of view. That would be a legitimate approach to this issue.

The citizens of this country would then have a fair chance. They would be allowed to look at advertisements not only of submarines and Soviet threats and all the jobs that allegedly will be created by this program, but they would also be able to look at such things as Canada being mortgaged for generations for a program in which the first submarine will not be delivered for 10 years. The technology in that submarine will be absolutely out of date by the time it hits the water.

My colleague, the Hon. Member for Esquimalt—Saanich (Mr. Crofton), wants to use these nuclear submarines to chase dope importers and fisheries violators. He is right on track. When the Minister of National Defence first raised this, he wanted to protect Arctic sovereignty. When that fell apart under the criticism of experts in the field who said there were more cost effective ways of doing that, then the Hon. Member for Esquimalt—Saanich stands and displays his incredible knowledge of this subject by suggesting that we can use nuclear powered submarines to chase dope importers and fisheries violators. I guess we can. We can probably use a sub to surface ship missile in Esquimalt to shoot them as they come out of the harbour in Colombia. But I would think that most people would find there were other more cost effective ways of handling that problem. We have a serious problem here.

The message from the other side of this controversy is not being heard. The democratic system and decision-making procedure should be made to work. People with good reputations say we are not spending $8 billion on this program. The Department of Supply and Services estimates it at $10 billion. The security adviser to the U.S. Senate estimates it at $12 billion. Other naval analysts are saying it will cost in excess of $16 billion. The security adviser for the Senate suggests that this will mortgage the defence budget of Canada for a complete generation. That $16 billion will not allow us to do anything else in defence, to take care of things like search and rescue and peacekeeping. The public should know that. The only way to let the public know is effective lobbying legislation. They should also know that this program will harm things like medicare and old age pensions.

Something else the Canadian public should know is that spending $16 billion on a submarine program that will be out of date by the time the first sub goes in the water is going to destabilize the world situation. It is going to act as an initiative for further moves in the arms race. It will undermine the

nuclear proliferation treaty. In all seriousness, we must give people in this society the other point of view in a fair and equitable way. This is what this Bill is for.

What about the lost opportunity costs of this Bill, the things we could do if we chose not to buy the submarines to chase dope importers and fish violators? If we did not want to use the money for nuclear submarines, our municipalities in Canada could create tens of thousands of person-years of work by improving municipal infrastructures. They have pleaded for that program. Health care in this country is in a crisis situation. Some of that $16 billion could be used to help people receive coronary bypasses in a timely way with elective surgery. Education is in chaos. The $16 billion could help there.

I know my colleague from the Conservative Party, the Hon. Member for Esquimalt—Saanich, is getting more and more frustrated and wants to get up and speak on this issue so I will close by saying the situation is critical. Lobbying is the issue and the friends of the Prime Minister and the powerful interests should not be the only ones who get their message out.

Mrs. Lise Bourgault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the motion put forth by the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) and the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) has been discussed time and time again, most recently by the legislative committee. The motion requires the lobbyist to disclose the subject matter of his or her lobbying. As the Minister said repeatedly, the interests behind these lobbyists are generally long known.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't take much imagination to realize that Mrs. Judy Erola, who is President of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association of Canada, is interested in the pharmaceutical industry. That is pretty obvious, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

In drafting this Bill, we had four guiding principles, openness, clarity, access to Government and administrative simplicity. What the New Democratic Party are proposing in its amendment will create what we call an administrative nightmare. It is unbelievable to think that the people who are doing the right thing, which is lobbying, will have to suffer an administrative process whereby it would be impossible to find the end of it.

I want to be brief in my comments because I am sure the Minister will at third reading of the Bill make the points about why we tabled this important legislation, Bill C-82. You may ask if this Bill is perfect, Mr. Speaker, I do not know. That is why we put in a three-year review, so we can find out if there are problems after that time and make the necessary improvements.

In summary, this Bill proposes a lobbyist registry with some basic, and, I think, important attributes. If we have not gone far enough, as some critics suggest, then Parliament has a perfect opportunity in three years to revisit the system and make improvements. I call for the vote on the amendments now, Mr. Speaker.

• (1250)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): The question is on Motion No. 4 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 6.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 7.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 8.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cooper): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Normally at this time the House would proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at the report stage of the Bill now before the House. However, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 13(5), the recorded divisions will stand deferred until 6 p.m. on Monday, July 18, 1988.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I raised earlier this day the fact that there was a technical problem with the wording of Motion No. 4. I assume that it will be reprinted in Monday's edition with the correct additions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Member is correct as usual. That will be done.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE NATIONAL PARKS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeds to consideration of Bill C-30, an Act to amend the National Parks Act and to amend an Act to amend the National Parks Act, as reported with amendment by a legislative committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There are 13 motions on the Notice Paper at the report stage of Bill C-30, an Act to amend the National Parks Act and to amend an Act to amend the National Parks Act.

After careful consideration, I am now ready to make my decision concerning the grouping and voting for the proposed motions in amendment.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 standing in the name of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Browes), and the Hon. Members for Davenport (Mr. Caccia), the Yukon (Ms. McLaughlin), and Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman), respectively, are proposing to amend Sections in the original Act and not clauses in the Bill presently before the House. Therefore they are out of order. The Members can be referred to many references in this regard.

[*Translation*]

Motion no 2 is admissible and will be debated and voted upon separately.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 5 and 13 are acceptable and will be debated together with a vote on Motion No. 5 being applied to Motion No. 13.

[*Translation*]

I will now put motion no 2 to the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I understand from the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Browes) that the government amendments which were moved as they appear on the

Order Paper were indeed discussed in committee. They come about as a consequence of activities which have occurred since the Bill was introduced. The option was to come forward with a new Bill with those items in it, or to seek the unanimous consent of the House to move those amendments at this stage. I think you would find, Mr. Speaker, a predisposition on the part of Members of the House to accept those amendments. Therefore they can be put before us at this stage. I would be pleased to move them on behalf of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. In reply to the Parliamentary Secretary's intervention, and on the assumption that he is referring to Motions Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, yes, we concur on our side.

Mr. Robert Wenman (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I request that the House give consent to move Motion No. 10 and the subsequent motion thereto. That motion would be to delete line 5 and substitute the following: "Land Districts, and to include, subject to negotiation and agreement with the Government of the Province of British Columbia, that region of Renfrew".

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I am wondering if we are not jumping ahead of ourselves just a bit in terms of the order. I do not have any objection at all to the proposal of the Hon. Member, nor do I have an objection to the proposal of the Parliamentary Secretary in terms of unanimous consent to allow the motions in the name of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Browes) to be considered.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, the bit of confusion may be that the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) correctly identified that there is unanimous consent to move Motions Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, but they happen to be standing in the names of different people at different places. Indeed, the Hon. Member is the sponsor of one of those motions.

Mr. Speaker, you will find unanimous consent to accept those motions. Then, I think the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman) wishes to amend Motion No. 10 which stands in his name. I think he has shared with the House the thrust of that amendment.

If Your Honour were to proceed and put the motions, then the Chair would find those people willing. In my case where the name of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment appears it would be my pleasure to take her place and move her motions on her behalf.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

• (1300)

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to allow the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman) to move his motion which the Chair will consider to be a new Motion No. 10?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In view of the unanimous consent given by the House to permit honourable members to move these motions in amendment, I am prepared to group these motions as follows:

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 1, 2, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12 will be grouped for debate and voted on as follows:

(a) Motions Nos. 1, 2, and 11 will be voted on separately;

(b) Motion No. 7 will be voted on separately with the vote being applied to Motion No. 12;

(c) An affirmative vote on Motion No. 9 obviates the need to vote on Motion No. 10. A negative vote on Motion No. 9 necessitates the requirement of a vote on Motion No. 10.

[*Translation*]

Motion nos 3 and 4 will be debated together but voted upon separately.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 5 and 13 will be debated together, but voted on separately.

[*Translation*]

Motions nos. 6 and 8 will be debated together but voted upon as follows:

[*English*]

An affirmative vote on Motion No. 6 will obviate the need to vote on Motion No. 8. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 6 will necessitate the requirement of a vote on Motion No. 8.

[*Translation*]

I shall now put motions nos. 1, 2, 7, 9, 10, 11 and 12 to the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Caccia: I rise on a point of Order, Mr. Speaker, to draw to your attention that in light of the subamendment put forward by the Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman), it no longer follows that a favourable vote on Motion No. 9 will automatically dispose of Motion No. 10, because Motion No. 10 is now different from Motion No. 10 listed in the Order Paper. You may wish to reconsider that aspect of your judgment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Both Motions Nos. 9 and 10 amend the same part of the same clause. Is the Hon. Member in agreement with the Chair on that point?

Mr. Hawkes: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It being a Friday with all divisions deferred, we are talking now about the wisdom of the decision for deferral given the nature of the amendments. The Chair would certainly have the support of the House if the Chair decided to look at the division aspect of it and we could get on with the debate on the basis of the groupings. In fact, if we were to know by the time of the vote on Monday, it would certainly be clear to the House what the sequence of voting will be.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Since we will be voting for Motion No. 9 we could not possibly vote for Motion No. 10 if Motion No. 9 is adopted.

Mr. Caccia: This is my point. By voting favourably for Motion No. 9 the Chair would still want to consider Motion No. 10 presented by the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West who has today introduced a text different from that on the Order Paper. I am alerting you to this necessity, Mr. Speaker, and to the fact that in your ruling, paragraph (c), you indicated that an affirmative vote on Motion No. 9 obviates the need to vote on Motion No. 10. I would submit that an affirmative vote on Motion No. 9 will still require a vote on Motion No. 10 in order to take into account the substance of the subamendment of the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair understands the point being made by the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia). If the Hon. Member does not mind, and if the House agrees, we will proceed with the debate and take care of the vote a little later.

Mr. Angus: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It being a Friday and Members want to give the opportunity to all those who wish to participate, I wonder if, in light of the fact that the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West has to move westward, we could deal with the grouping containing Motions Nos. 9, 10, 11, and 12 first and return and go through the normal process.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This is what the Chair intends to do. The Chair will put the motions to the House.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-30 be amended in Clause 1 by striking out lines 4 to 7 at page 1 and substituting the following therefor:

"1. (1) The definitions "park" and "park warden" in section 2 of the National Parks Act are repealed and the following substituted therefor:

""park" means a National Park or National Marine Park described in Schedule I;"".

Motion No. 2.

That Bill C-30 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out lines 5 to 8 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"2. Section 3 of the said Act is repealed."

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-30 be amended in Clause 10

(a) by striking out lines 23 to 27 at page 12 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) The descriptions of Waterton Lakes National Park and Elk Island National Park set out in Part I of Schedule I to the said Act are repealed and the descriptions set out in Part II of Schedule I to this Act are substituted therefor."

(b) by adding immediately after line 8 at page 13 the following:

"(8) The description of Kejimkujik National Park set out in Part VIII of Schedule I to the said Act is amended by adding thereto the following:

"And all that Parcel at South West Port Mouton, Queens County, shown on a plan of survey by David L. Crooker, N.S.L.S., said plan being recorded in the Canada Lands Survey Records on July 24, 1986 under number 70492;

said parcel containing 2218 hectares."

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-30 be amended by adding immediately after line 15 at page 14 the following:

"15. (1) Subject to subsection (2), the Governor in Council may, by a proclamation setting out the boundaries thereof, establish a reserve for a National Park in the Renfrew, Barclay and Clayoquot Land Districts on Vancouver Island in the province of British Columbia and in the internal waters and territorial sea of Canada adjacent to the coasts thereof, pending the disposition of any claim by aboriginal peoples of British Columbia to any right, title or interest in or to the lands comprised in the reserve and the establishment of a National Park therein.

(2) A proclamation may be issued pursuant to subsection (1) where

(a) the Governor in Council is satisfied that Her Majesty in right of Canada has the administration and control of the entire interest of Her Majesty in the lands described in the proclamation;

(b) the Government of British Columbia has agreed that the lands are suitable for a National Park; and

(c) a notice of the proclamation setting out the boundaries of the lands has been published

(i) in the *Canada Gazette* at least ninety days prior to the date of issue of the proclamation, and

(ii) at least once a week for four consecutive weeks during the period of ninety days preceding that date in a newspaper or alternative medium serving the area in which the lands are situated and in two major daily newspapers in each of the following regions, namely, the Atlantic provinces, Québec, Ontario, the prairie provinces and British Columbia, in both official languages and in any other language that, in the opinion of the Minister, is appropriate.

(3) Upon the issue of a proclamation pursuant to subsection (1), the *National Parks Act* applies to the reserve established thereby as if it were a park within the meaning of that Act.

16. Following the disposition of any claim referred to in subsection 15(1) in respect of the reserve established pursuant thereto, the Governor in Council may, by a proclamation amending Schedule I to the *National Parks Act*, establish a National Park comprising all or any portion of the reserve under the name designated and having the boundaries set out in the proclamation."

Mr. Robert Wenman (Fraser Valley West) moved:

Motion No. 10.

That Bill C-30 be amended by adding immediately after line 15 at page 14 the following:

"15. (1) Subject to subsection (2), the Governor General in Council may, by proclamation setting out the boundaries thereof, establish a reserve for a National Park in the Barclay, Clayoquot and Renfrew Land Districts,to include that region of Renfrew District commonly known as theCarmanah Watershed area,on Vancouver Island in the province of British Columbia and in the internal waters and territorial sea of Canada adjacent to the coasts thereof, pending the disposition of any claim by aboriginal peoples of British Columbia to any right, title or interest in or to the lands comprised in the reserve and the establishment of a National Park therein.

(2) A proclamation may be issued pursuant to subsection (1) where

(a) the Governor in Council is satisfied that Her Majesty in right of Canada has the administration and control of the entire interest of Her Majesty in the lands described in the proclamation;

(b) the Government of British Columbia has agreed that the lands are suitable for a National Park; and

(c) a notice of the proclamation setting out the boundaries of the lands has been published

(i) in the *Canada Gazette* at least ninety days prior to the date of issue of the proclamation, and

(ii) at least once a week for four consecutive weeks during the period of ninety days preceding that date in a newspaper or alternative medium serving the area in which the lands are situated and in two major daily newspapers in each of the following regions, namely, the Atlantic provinces, Québec, Ontario, the prairie provinces and British Columbia, in both official languages and in any other language that, in the opinion of the Minister, is appropriate.

(3) Upon the issue of a proclamation pursuant to subsection (1), the *National Parks Act* applies to the reserve established thereby as if it were a park within the meaning of the Act.

16. Following the disposition of any claim referred to in subsection 15(1) in respect of the reserve established pursuant thereto, the Governor in Council may, by a proclamation amending Schedule I to the *National Parks Act*, establish a National Park comprising all or any portion of the reserve under the name designated and having the boundaries set out in the proclamation."

And:

To delete line 5 and substitute the following:

"Land Districts, and to include, subject to negotiation and agreement with the Government of the Province of British Columbia, that region of Renfrew" . . .

Mr. Jim Hawkes (for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-30 be amended in Clause 15 by striking out lines 16 to 31 at page 14 and lines 1 to 7 at page 14 and substituting the following therefor:

"15. Section 10 of *An Act to amend the National Parks Act*, being chapter 11 of the Statutes of Canada, 1974, are repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"10. (1) Subject to subsection (3), the Governor in Council may, by a proclamation amending Schedule I to the *National Parks Act*, establish a National Park, under the name designated and having the boundaries set out in the proclamation,

(a) in the rural municipalities of Val Marie and Old Post in the province of Saskatchewan;

(b) in the district of Thunder Bay in the province of Ontario;

(c) in the county of Bruce in the province of Ontario;

(d) in the districts of St. Barbe and Humber West in the province of Newfoundland.

(2) Subject to subsection (3), the Governor in Council may, by a proclamation amending Schedule I to the *National Parks Act*, establish a National Marine Park in the county of Bruce in the province of Ontario under the name designated and having the boundaries set out in the proclamation.

(3) A proclamation may be issued pursuant to subsection (1) or (2) where

(a) the Governor in Council is satisfied that clear title to the lands described in the proclamation is vested in Her Majesty in right of Canada;

(b) the government of the province in which the lands are situated has agreed that they are suitable for a National Park or a National Marine Park, as the case may be; and

(c) a notice of the proclamation setting out the boundaries of the lands has been published

(i) in the *Canada Gazette* at least ninety days prior to the date of issue of the proclamation, and

(ii) at least once a week for four consecutive weeks during the period of ninety days preceding that date in a newspaper or alternative medium serving the area in which the lands are situated and in two major daily newspapers in each of the following regions, namely, the Atlantic provinces, Quebec, Ontario, the prairie provinces and British Columbia, in both official languages and in any other language that, in the opinion of the Minister, is appropriate.""

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-30 be amended in Schedule I by adding immediately before the description of Elk Island National Park at page 24 the following:

"(3) WATERTON LAKES NATIONAL PARK

In the Province of Alberta, all those parcels of land more particularly described under *Firstly* and *Secondly* as follows:

Firstly, commencing at the northeast corner of Blood Indian Reserve 148A (formerly Blood Indian Reserve Timber Limit A) according to plan no. 4513 in the Canada Lands Surveys Records at Ottawa, a copy of which has been deposited in the Land Titles Office for the South Alberta Land Registration District at Calgary under no. 1714 H.I., said corner being at the intersection of the northerly boundary of section 28, township 1, range 28, west of the 4th meridian and the left bank of Belly River according to said plan;

Thence easterly along the northerly boundaries of sections 28 and 27, including the road allowance, in said township to the northeast corner of said section 27;

Thence southerly along the easterly boundaries of sections 27, 22, 15, 10 and 3, including the road allowances, in said township to the International boundary between Canada and the United States;

Thence westerly along said International boundary to its intersection with the Interprovincial boundary between Alberta and British Columbia;

Thence northerly along said Interprovincial boundary to its intersection with the height of land known as Avion Ridge which separates the waters flowing into Bauerman Brook from the waters flowing into Castle River according to the map of Waterton Lakes Park filed in said office under no. 7673 Book E.X Folio 203, a copy of which has been recorded in said Records under no. 40398;

Thence generally easterly along said Avion Ridge, on which are located Newman Peak and Mount Glendowan, to its intersection with Cloudy Ridge according to said map;

Thence generally northeasterly along said Cloudy Ridge to the headwaters of an unnamed small creek that flows into Yarrow Creek immediately west of Yarrow Cabin according to said map;

Thence generally northerly along the right banks of said creeks to the easterly boundary of section 16, township 3, range 30, west of the 4th meridian;

Thence southerly along the easterly boundary of said section 16 and across the road allowance to the northeast corner of section 9, in said township 3;

Thence easterly across the road allowance and along the northerly boundary of section 10, in said township 3, to the northeast corner of said section 10;

Thence southerly along the easterly boundary of said section 10 to its southeast corner;

Thence easterly across the road allowance and along the northerly boundary of section 2 in said township 3 to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of said section 2;

Thence southerly along the easterly boundary of the west half of said section 2 to the southeast corner of said west half;

Thence on a bearing of 180 degrees 07', a distance of 20.117 metres to a standard post on the northerly boundary of section 34, township 2, in said range 30;

Thence easterly along the northerly boundaries of sections 34, 35 and 36, including the road allowances, to the northeast corner of said section 36, in said township 2;

Thence southerly along the easterly boundaries of sections 36, 25 and 24, including the road allowance, to the southeast corner of section 24, in said township 2;

Thence easterly along the northerly boundaries of sections 18, 17 and 16, including the road allowances, to the northeast corner of section 16, township 2, range 29;

Thence southerly along the easterly boundaries of sections 16, 9 and 4, including the road allowance, to the southeast corner of section 4, township 2, range 29;

Thence southerly across the road allowance to the northeast corner of section 33, township 1, in said range 29;

Thence easterly across the road allowance and along the northerly boundary of section 34, in said township 1, to its northeast corner;

Thence southerly along the easterly boundary of said section 34 to tis southeast corner;

Thence easterly along the northerly boundaries of sections 26 and 25, including the road allowances, to the northeast corner of said section 25 in said township 1;

Thence easterly across the road allowance and along the northerly boundary of section 30, township 1, range 28, to the northwest corner of said Indian Reserve;

Thence southerly along the westerly boundary of said Indian Reserve to its southwest corner;

Thence easterly along the southerly boundary of said Indian Reserve to its southeast corner, said corner being at the intersection of said limit and the left bank of said Belly River according to said plan no. 4513;

Thence generally northerly along said left bank, according to said plan no. 4513 in said Records and to plan 55466 in said Records, copy of which is registered as 6508 J.K. in said Office, to the point of commencement; as said parcel is shown on plan 50467 in said Records, a copy of which has been deposited under no. 171 J.K. in said Office;

Secondly, the whole of Parcel X and that part of Chief Mountain Highway right-of-way lying within the limits of said Indian Reserve according to plan RD 3817 in said Records, a copy of which has been filed under no. 2184 G.U. in said Office;

Said parcels containing together about 505 square kilometres (195 square miles)."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On debate the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West.

Mr. Wenman: Mr. Speaker, may I first express my appreciation for the courtesy of the House in giving consent to consider my motion. As we discussed this among ourselves in the House, all members of the House of Commons are enthusiastic about the Carmanah watershed.

The Carmanah watershed partly in and adjacent to the boundary of the Pacific Rim National Park possesses the most significant ecosystem of Sitka spruce at least in Canada and perhaps in the world.

Sitka spruce are rare in Canada and they grow only on the West Coast. They present a majestic, striking example of Canadian forests. It is difficult to describe to you, Mr. Speaker, or anyone in the House a Sitka spruce tree of this nature. Perhaps I could suggest that Members look at the pillars in the Chamber and see that those pillars tower approximately 75 feet. If one were to put a Sitka spruce in place of that pillar, the pillar would only be part way up that Sitka spruce. If one were to take a Sitka spruce out to the tower in the Parliament Buildings that so many Canadians know and to the top of which they have gone, one would still look up to see the top of a Sitka spruce tree of the nature of the Carmanah giants.

Some people simply call them "big trees". To me they appear as living pillars holding up the sky; they are so tall as they reach forward and upward, there is no way to describe them. By this motion I want to be sure that all Members in the House of Commons, their children, and their grandchildren might have the chance not only to see the Sitka spruce but to know and feel them through the experience of a visit to that area.

Unlike West Coast valleys which are short and narrow, the Carmanah watershed contains 600 hectares of flat alluvial river bottom in the shape of an oval. It is approximately .8 kilometers by 7 kilometers and it is formed by the meandering Carmanah River. Ecologists recognize the uniqueness of this river bottom which provides the large number of Sitka spruce groves that contain approximately 2,000 of those West Coast giants.

Individual trees average 8 feet in diameter and 250 feet in height. The largest tree recently identified measures 12 feet in diameter across the bottom and towers 315 feet into the sky.

I would like to begin by crediting MacMillan Bloedel for being the first to identify officially the tallest Sitka spruce trees on record, possibly the tallest in the world, on June 13, 1988. Frank Hastings of MacMillan Bloedel measured, recorded and publicized the tallest of these giants which lie less than a mile from the famous West Coast Trail in the Pacific Rim Park. It is important to point out that MacMillan Bloedel immediately put a stop to all logging roads in the Carmanah area, upon the request of various interest groups and their own recognition.

• (1310)

In fact, we need to recognize that MacMillan Bloedel has been a responsible corporate citizen in setting aside 14,000 hectares of reserve parkland throughout the Province of British

Columbia for ecological, wildlife and recreational purposes. The size of the commitment that they have made, just to put it into perspective, is equal to more than 35 parks the size of Stanley Park in Vancouver. I give credit to MacMillan Bloedel for its initiative.

Secondly, I would like to recognize Mr. Clinton Webb of the Western Canada Wilderness Committee, along with those individuals from the Heritage Forest Society and the Sierra Club of Western Canada, for their public awareness campaign. I was indeed impressed by their dedication and energetic commitment to the preservation of the Carmanah Watershed.

It is my understanding that MacMillan Bloedel is also committed to preserve and to protect the giants of Carmanah and is requesting reserve status for a portion of that area.

I am also pleased to report that the Government of British Columbia has responded positively to MacMillan Bloedel's initiative, and I am sure that it is now ready to begin discussions with the Government of Canada regarding lands that will have to be set aside to protect and preserve the Sitka spruce trees of Carmanah.

I want also to assure you that Members of Parliament from British Columbia, including the Hon. Member from Vancouver Centre (Miss Carney), are strongly in support of this move. In fact, I know the Hon. Member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) is strongly in support of this move as well, as are other members of the British Columbia government caucus. It is my understanding also that all members of all political Parties from British Columbia are in support of this move today, and I am sure that they will express that following my comments.

It is imperative that the watershed be saved. The land proposed to be in the amendment is to be included in the Pacific Rim Park, and it includes the streams and the run-off areas that contribute to the unique hydrological balance which allows these spruce trees to survive.

Since the valleys rise steeply to over 3,000 feet, disturbance of the valley sides by roads or logging would quickly alter the run-off patterns and cause erosion, which would rapidly change the valley bottom, making it unlikely that the Sitka spruce would survive. Together with hemlock, fir and giant red cedars in the valley, the Sitka spruce-dominated river bottom present the most significant and one of the few remaining intact ecosystems of its type in the world.

I would also credit MacMillan Bloedel with having identified other Sitka spruce groves on the West Coast that have considerable merit as well. As these unique forest areas of Canada disappear, so does the potential for long-term economic growth through tourism. Locally and regionally, preservation of the valley has strong support. A recently constructed non-ecologically damaging foot trail has provided passage for those who believe in the value of sustainable development. I hope that as summer recess looms on our Parliament many Members of Parliament would have an opportunity to share my experience with the giant Sitkas in the Carmanah Valley by visiting it over the summer break.

I am reminded of my first visit to the forest with the youths who are working there to provide a trail through the trees. As I shared their last cream and coffee in their primitive campsite, I was encouraged by their fresh zeal and enthusiasm, which gives them the energy to open up this beautiful forest so that others might share this primeval experience. Our own insignificance is put into perspective against the silent giant trees which have presided over the history of many generations of our people.

Pacific Rim Park will preserve unique ecological areas of the West Coast of Canada that offer tremendous potential for human and tourism experience. The addition of the Carmanah watershed will preserve another unique ecologically-forested area for our heritage, enhancing the diversity of life and lifestyles that we struggle to maintain in our country.

I commend this motion to you and I express my appreciation to all Members of the House of Commons from all political Parties who have supported us.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, this group, except for Motion No. 10, is housekeeping amendments, and we support them. With particular regard to Motion No. 10, the one that has been moved by the Hon. Member of Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman), we certainly congratulate him on his fine initiative and we support his motion as well, in the hope that both the Government of Canada and British Columbia will come through and make what he proposes a reality, an enjoyment for generations of Canadians to come, and in that sense we are very glad to support him.

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to speak on this motion put forward in the name of the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman). I would like to commend the Hon. Member for his initiative in two areas. First of all, he took the initiative to visit the area. He saw it, he was open to the beauty, the wonder, the awe and majesty of the area. Second, he came back and filed this motion. He not only filed it but he has talked about it with his colleagues in the Conservative Party and has received a considerable amount of support for it. I want to be very open in my commendation of the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West, Bob Wenman. Pardon me for being out of order in mentioning his name.

If rumours of a Monday election call are true, this might be the last speech I make in this Chamber, since my present riding, Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands, is going to be disappearing. If it is, there is nothing that I feel more strongly about than this particular issue. It is central to the work I have tried to do in the House of Commons. It is also very important to Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands, which is a riding that will be disappearing at the time of the next election.

The fact is that politicians come and go, political boundaries come and go. This afternoon we have an opportunity to do

something that will last for all time. That is why I feel so strongly about this important issue. We have an opportunity to preserve a living forest, with the largest Sitka spruce not only in Canada but possibly in the world. As our world becomes increasingly urbanized, it is so important that we preserve places and spaces such as this that can still move us to a sense of awe and wonder and enchantment.

It is important to note that the motion specifies the region "commonly known as the Carmanah watershed". We are talking about the entire valley, 7,000 hectares, more or less. We are not just talking about a couple of groves of big trees on the valley floor.

The large spruce are found on the valley floor, while on the hillsides you will find decent sized hemlocks and some old large-sized cedars. It is important that we preserve the hillsides and not just the valley floor. This is not only for aesthetic purposes. To preserve the spruce on the valley floor, we have to preserve the hillsides as well.

Anybody who has driven through British Columbia's backwoods of Vancouver Islands will know that in some places we have clear-cut areas that should have never been clear-cut. I am not completely opposed to all clear-cutting, but in some places we have clear-cut very sensitive areas, very steep hillsides, so that, afterwards, there is nothing to hold the very thin layer of soil that is on those hills. Then the rains come and the thin layer of soil is washed away and, when further rains come, there is nothing to retain the water so that it can be gradually released to the valley floor. Instead of a gradual release of water, there is a flash flood which, in turn, creates even more erosion, and a beginning of the eroding of the river banks as well.

• (1320)

Each large spruce on the floor of the Carmanah Valley uses hundreds of gallons of water every day. If the rains come down and get washed away immediately, there will not be that gradual release of water for the dry period which occurs even on the west coast of Vancouver Island.

Some people say we already have Cathedral Grove so why do we need something like Carmanah Valley. First, Cathedral Grove is fairly small. Second, it is composed of fir trees. I do not think there is anything more magnificent in the world than fir trees. I think they are even more magnificent than spruce. But fir trees are shade intolerant. They do not grow in the shade. They only grow in an area that has been cleared. That is why on Vancouver Island you can trace the growth of fir from the time of large fires. In Cathedral Grove on Vancouver Island the fir trees will eventually die. When they do, they will fall and that will be the end of Cathedral Grove as we know it. But spruce are more tolerant of shade. They will grow as part of a climax forest. That means self-perpetuating.

In the Carmanah we can see spruce in all stages of growth, seedlings taking root in old logs, young saplings, mature trees and old trees ready to die that will soon fall, and the cycle continues. Trees die but the forest lives. If we saved only a few groves of particularly big trees on the valley floor, when they died—this would only be a matter of time—that would be it. We know comparatively little about forests and how trees reproduce themselves. It is important that we preserve a valley like this so we can study how the genetic imprint of trees is passed from one generation to another.

It will take much hard work and much co-operation by all parties affected, by members of all political Parties in this House, both the federal and provincial Governments, MacMillan Bloedel, the IWA, environmental groups and not least by the aboriginal people. I was pleased to see in the motion moved it says that this will be:

> —pending the disposition of any claim by aboriginal peoples of British Columbia to any right, title or interest in or to the lands comprised in the reserve and the establishment of a National Park therein.

It is very important that the aboriginal people, in this case the Nitinaht people, be included. Carmanah, of course, is derived from a Nitinaht word. It is urgent that we take action because logging plans are moving. Logging roads have come right to the head of the valley. And there is an issue of jobs here. People are worried about the loss of jobs in the forest industry. This emphasizes the need for intensive forestry in the areas to be logged so there is a rapid turnover. There are jobs also in the tourist industry.

In conclusion, let me stress the need for the House to move today on this issue and to continue to move. Passing this motion is only the beginning of a negotiation process. We should see the importance of this issue not only to this generation, not only to the people of Vancouver Island but to future generations and to our world. We talk about the destruction of rain forests in other parts of the world. We also have a responsibility to preserve something of our own forests so that future generations can be moved, as the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman) was, and as I was when I was able to visit the area. This is one of the heritages given to us by the Creator. We should not allow it to be despoiled.

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I would like for a moment to comment on this matter. We have seen a number of projects come forward. In early times we saw the Tsitika watershed, the Tahsish watershed, Meares Island, Moresby Island and the Carmanah Valley. It is critical to remember that the people who will be displaced out of the logging operations in the Carmanah Valley live in Port Alberni. They are people who will be unable to put food on their tables or pay their mortgages. Compensation is a critical factor to the people who live there.

When the Moresby Island issue went through, loggers were to be compensated, but my understanding is they never got so much as a plane ticket home. Many of those affected are in Port Alice and other areas that I represent. When Meares Island was put into limbo, the Ucleulet operations, the Port Alberni operations were again suspended and there was a

reduction of 6,000 people in that area. That community suffered grievously.

There will be more suffering as this project goes ahead. I do not speak against it but I speak for compensation. It must occur. The people in those communities must be supported. The preservation of the environment is a cost of doing business. It is an operating cost of the Government, something not honoured on the West Coast in Ucleulet and Port Alberni, or in the Moresby Island situation. I urge that this cost, which is of benefit to all Canadians, be calculated as a cost to all Canadians not just to the people who live in Port Alberni and Ucleulet.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I have a quick comment for people listening who might be concerned about the difference between Motion No. 9 and Motion No. 10. It is the Government's position that the passage of Motion No. 9 does include the area under discussion. It would indeed protect the valley. We are turning this area into a park reserve rather than a park.

There could be a problem if Motion No. 10 were accepted that the specificity of the valley itself might make it more difficult in a legislative sense to do some of the work, and the generality of Clause 9 is the Government's preferred option in relation to this. But I think both motions are trying to get at the same result. I just wanted to put that on the record.

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to one of the motions. We are supporting all of them. I want to thank the Government for listening to the people who appeared before the committee and then seeking unanimous consent in this House to allow them to come forward.

The motion I want to speak to is Motion No. 11 which was in the name of the Parliamentary Secretary. That motion will give the Government the ability to establish new national parks in new areas of the country. We have long had a dream in Thunder Bay to protect a range of mountains known as the Nor'westers as a provincial or national park. The committee in its consideration and the Parliamentary Secretary in her wisdom have decided that there is a desire in a least four parts of our country for the establishment of national parks and have provided the tool to the Government to allow that to occur. In Thunder Bay we have talked about it.

Under the master planning process of the Thunder Bay Parks and Recreation Department we have a written desire to move toward the development of a wilderness park known as the Nor'westers encompassing parts of the City of Thunder Bay, parts of Reserve No. 52, and parts of the Township of Neebing. This motion allows the planning to commence. It sets out some rules that would protect the owners of the land, would protect the communities and the interested parties. We have had some controversy in Thunder Bay over this matter. The Parks and Recreation Department went to the city council and said, here is an idea. The department asked for permission to meet with the band council and to meet with the neighbours to the south and west, the neighbouring municipality, to talk about the idea. Unfortunately, one of the city councillors decided he would put out a press release which caused all sorts of bad reactions from those neighbours.

• (1330)

This amendment, on the other hand, ensures that that kind of consultative process will occur. It talks about ensuring that the lands are owned by the Government of Canada, that the Government will not arbitrarily draw a line around a municipality on land owned publicly, whether provincially or municipally.

The Government cannot automatically incorporate private lands and would have to use another process to obtain them before the lands could be declared a national park. The province has to agree that the lands are suitable for a national park or a national marine park, as the case may be.

Then there is a procedure to ensure that people are informed through Gazetting and four weekly ads in local and provincial papers in both official languages and in a language that is deemed appropriate. If it were a park in the far part of northwestern Ontario, for example, Ojibwa may be the appropriate language to advertise in so that the people there could have a chance to review it.

I am quite pleased to support this amendment as well as the others. I think it is an excellent bit of progress for national parks, and I compliment the members of the legislative committee, including the chairman with whom I had discussions about this very matter some time ago, for seeing this change implemented in order to give us the power to create those parks where they are needed and where people want them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motions Nos. 1, 2 and 11 will be voted on separately. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motions?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 1 (Mrs. Browes) agreed to.

Motion No. 2 (Mrs. Browes) agreed to.

Motion No. 11 (Mrs. Browes) agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motion No. 7 will be voted on separately with the vote being applied to Motion No. 12. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motions?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 7 (Mrs. Browes) agreed to.

Motion No. 12 (Mrs. Browes) agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: An affirmative vote on Motion No. 9 will obviate the need to vote on Motion No. 10. A negative vote on Motion No. 9 will necessitate a vote on Motion No. 10.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Motion No. 9?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 9 (Mrs. Browes) agreed to.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Given your ruling and the fact that Motion No. 9 just passed, perhaps I missed something, but now what happens to the amendment to Motion No. 10 and what appeared to be a willingness of the House to adopt the proposal of the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman)?

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I think we gave unanimous consent to the amendment being included as part of Motion No. 10 earlier this day, but the vote on Motion No. 9, following your ruling, obviates the need for a vote on Motion No. 10. It is Motion No. 10 as amended that we are not voting on.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, in light of what the Parliamentary Secretary just said, it seems to me that you have to call Motion No. 10 because Motion No. 10 now incorporates Motion No. 9. That is what the Parliamentary Secretary indicated a moment ago. We concur with whatever is required to be done in order to support the motion put by the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman). It seems to me that you will have to call Motion No. 10.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair knows that everyone is in favour of the motion proposed by the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman), Motion No. 10. However, because Motion No. 9 amends Clause 5 at the same line as Motion No. 10, Motion No. 10 could not carry. We could not carry both motions. That is why the Chair indicated that if Motion No. 9 carried, the Chair could not put Motion No. 10.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering then if there would be unanimous consent to take the vote on Motion No. 9 again so that we could force a vote on Motion No. 9 and perhaps give time for the Government to consult so that when it comes to the deferred vote on Monday, the Government might have had a change of heart and would actually vote against Motion No. 9.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, in the interests of progress and getting to another Bill this day, if we simply let things stand and if there are deferred divisions on Monday, there may be consultations and some way of working things out. However, at this point, the Government has indicated that Motion No. 9 is broader and should therefore be the motion which passes, and I think it has been passed.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, for the sake of clarity and brevity, unless you consider the subamendment by the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman) as a subamendment to Motion No. 9, then you would call that subamendment an amendment to Motion No. 9 and having then incorporated it into Motion No. 9, we will know that we have approved it. Is that acceptable to the Parliamentary Secretary?

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared, with unanimous consent, to set that issue aside and continue on, giving us a chance to consult a little further, if that is agreeable.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will set aside the issue for now.

We will now deal with Motions Nos. 3 and 4 which will be debated together but voted upon separately.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport) moved:

Motion No. 3.

That Bill C-30 be amended in Clause 3 by adding immediately after line 18 at page 2 the following:

"(2) Immediately following subsection 3.1(5) of the said Act the following is added:

"3.2.(1) The Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Minister, designate a site containing a unique or rare natural feature of phenomenon, or a site of high scientific value and public interest, whose protection is feasible as a Canadian Landmark.

(2) The Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Minister, establish criteria for the selection, administration and management of Canadian Landmarks.""

Motion No. 4.

That Bill C-30 be amended in Clause 3 by adding immediately after line 18 at page 2 the following:

"(2) Immediately following subsection 3.1(5) of the said Act the following is added:

"4.(1) The Governor in Council may set apart any land the title to which is vested in Her Majesty, as a National Wilderness Park."

"(2) National Wilderness Parks shall be administered, managed and controlled in a manner consistent with sections 5(9) and 5(10) of this Act, and with preservation of the wilderness character of the Park as the only priority.""

He said: Mr. Speaker, for the sake of brevity, I will explain only that it was Mr. Speaker, in his previous incarnation as Minister of the Environment in 1979, who approved in principle the Canadian Landmarks Program. This motion, therefore, takes into account the establishment of that program, and since authority at the present time does not exist in the present law, it seeks to introduce the powers for Cabinet, on recommendation of the Minister, to introduce the designation of Canadian landmarks in the future National Parks Act. In other words, we are taking one step further following a decision that was made by Mr. Speaker in 1979 by putting it in the Bill.

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, I too will be brief. I want to indicate my Party's support for Motions Nos. 3 and 4. Clearly, as the Hon. Member has said, it is the next logical step forward and it is regrettable that the Bill was not changed before now.

Mr. Barry Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, with respect to Motions Nos. 3 and 4, the Government agrees that the idea is a good one because we need to define ways to protect unique natural sites, but without the process of prior consultation with the affected communities, as we recognized in Bill C-30 that with respect to the heritage fund there was not enough consultation, the Government will not be accepting this motion.

The motion is also complicated by the fact that it would not provide authority for the Minister to acquire lands for the purpose of landmarks nor for the Governor in Council to establish regulations for their protection and control. Unfortunately, the Government will not be able to support Motion No. 3.

Motion No. 4 is opposed by the Government as to the rationale to focus on the national wilderness park. There is a clause in the Bill which the Government believes will cover that. It was passed unanimously. Therefore, the Government will not be supporting Motion No. 4 either.

• (1340)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 3 in the name of Mr. Caccia.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 4 (Mr. Caccia).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11) the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Motions Nos. 5 and 13 will be debated together but voted on separately.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport) moved:

Motion No. 5:

That Bill C-30 be amended in Clause 8 by striking out lines 7 to 14 at page 12 and substituting the following therefor:

"(3) The Governor in Council may, by order, amend Schedule III to designate a portion of Banff National Park in the vicinity of Mount Norquay a commercial ski area, but that schedule is not subject to subsequent amendment by the Governor in Council."

Motion No. 13:

That Bill C-30 be amended in Schedule III thereof by adding to the description under Banff National Park immediately after paragraph 1 at page 41 the following:

"(b) The whole of Parcel DD according to Plan 67271 in the Canada Lands Surveys Records at Ottawa, a copy of which is filed in the Land Titles Office for the South Alberta Land Registration District at Calgary under number 8011493, said parcel containing 918 hectares, more or less."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is probably the most controversial aspect of this Bill. Under normal circumstances it would certainly warrant a full intervention in the time made available under the rules. However, I will try to compress it for the sake of moving this Bill ahead.

The issue here is the Sunshine ski areas and the description of its boundaries in the Bill. When the Bill was introduced the Government was committed to define those boundaries in the Bill itself. The reason was simply the fact that there was already a ten-year old commitment to these boundaries as a result of a public planning process which took into account all considerations on the part of all concerned sectors. In other words, the Minister was introducing a Bill with our full concurrence because the boundaries he was proposing were the ones that were arrived at through public consultation and it was a good idea to have those boundaries entrenched in the legislation. Unfortunately, the Bill was held up for almost 16 months, I understand because of opposition from members of the Alberta Progressive Conservative caucus who forced the Minister, so to speak, to retreat on this subject.

What we are doing with these two amendments is to bring back into the Bill what the Minister had in the Bill at second reading when it was debated in this House. It is extremely disappointing to see that the Minister could not defend his own Bill in committee. The Parliamentary Secretary also gave in. What we are doing here is putting some starch back into his

collar and some courage in his position by urging the Government to stick to the wording of the Bill on second reading so that it will contain the boundaries of Sunshine Ski Village.

We could go over a phenomenal amount of documentation submitted to us in committee on this matter, quite a number of press clippings that would make the debate very juicy and interesting. However, the fact is that while on the first occasion when the Bill was introduced the Government was determined to define these boundaries, we now find ourselves at report stage facing a retreat on the part of the Minister in particular. As I say, the purpose of these amendments is to bring back into the Bill the definition of this ski village so it is well determined, defined clearly, and not allowed to expand into the national park in a manner that would be out of control.

I commend these two motions to the consideration of my colleagues in this House today and I thank you for your consideration.

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I want to indicate that we support these two motions. I have always made the argument that when we have matters of environmental concern, particularly concerning parks under federal jurisdiction, we should try to ensure that the same kind of approach necessary at a municipal or provincial level through the planning act is adhered to. In this case the only way to do that is by fixing the boundaries of Sunshine Village ski area in legislation, so if someone in the backroom decides to redraw the boundaries to expand it or contract it, they cannot do it. It would have to be an Act of Parliament, and therefore the residents of the area will have a chance to put pressure on the Government, rather than a lobby group.

I just wanted to add those comments and say we support the amendments.

Mr. Barry Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, those two motions would overturn a subamendment to a government motion which was voted on and passed by the legislative committee. I would like to add that the Minister has been consistent and emphatic that the boundaries of commercial ski areas within the parks must be legislated. He further insists that no new commercial ski areas are to be established within national parks. We therefore have a Bill that will clearly and explicitly transform these policies into legislation.

The Minister has not made a final decision on the boundary matter, nor has his Department. That will be made following completion of the environmental assessment and further public consultation. Then, and only then, will the Sunshine Village ski area boundary be legislated. Therefore, the Government will not be supporting these two motions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 5 in the name of Mr. Caccia.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The question is now on Motion No. 13 in the name of Mr. Caccia.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

We will now deal with Motions Nos. 6 and 8, which will be grouped for debate and voted on separately.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport) moved:

Motion No. 6:

That Bill C-30 be amended in Clause 8 by adding immediately after line 14 at page 12 the following:

"10. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any existing aboriginal or treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada under section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, or any rights conferred by land claim settlement with aboriginal peoples within a National Park."

Mr. Angus (for Ms. McLaughlin) moved:

Motion No. 8:

That Bill C-30 be amended in Clause 13 by adding immediately after line 42 at page 13 the following:

"(2) Nothing in this Act or the National Parks Act in any way derogates from or abrogates the aboriginal and treaty rights that are already constitutionally recognized in subsection 35(1) of the Constitution Act, 1982."

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, this is a very important motion because it will determine the capacity of this Bill, once proclaimed, to function and not be stopped by very understandable and justifiable court challenges.

I will explain briefly what it is all about. It has to do with aboriginal rights and in legal terms is called the non-derogation clause. The matter was first brought to our attention by the witness from the Tungavik Federation of the Nunavut who made the point that there is in this Bill a potential conflict between the proposed amendments to the National Parks Act and Section 35 of the Constitution of Canada.

• (1350)

This observation by witnesses was supported and reinforced by several other witnesses, including the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society and the Prairie Treaty Nations Alliance. Professor Morse of the Ottawa University Law School pointed out that the conflict was not only limited to the matter of traditional subsistence, which had by that time been dropped, but applied as well to the issue of aboriginal rights as envisaged in our Constitution. Professor Morse pointed out that Section 6(1) of the National Parks Act could also conflict with Section 35 of our Constitution.

This amendment is taken word for word from the Petroleum Resources Act which was passed in the first session of this Parliament which the Government must be fully familiar with and, hopefully, supportive of.

In conclusion, this amendment is intended to avoid conflict between the National Parks Act and our Constitution as it concerns our aboriginal people. For that reason, and for the functioning of the law in the future, we sincerely hope that it will be accepted by the Government.

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly in support of the motions of the Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) and the Member for Yukon (Ms. McLaughlin). We must ensure that this kind of override is contained in the Bill.

A few minutes ago I spoke about Motion No. 11, which was passed, which provides for the potential development of a national park in the district of Thunder Bay in the Province of Ontario. Within that district, and in fact within the candidate park about which I spoke, the Nor'westers, there is reserve No. 52. While there is not necessarily an outstanding land claim in process, a determination may at some point in time when research is completed be made, first, to start a land claim and, second, be settled. That may have some bearing on a future national park.

We must assure aboriginal peoples who have treaty rights that nothing in this Act will force them to give up something which is their due. I encourage support for both amendments, realizing the ruling you have made.

Mr. Barry Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, this motion relates to traditional subsistence activities which the committee discussed long and clearly with regard to hunting, fishing, and trapping. The committee, in fact, passed unanimously some changes to the Bill at that stage.

However, Section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, provides that the existing aboriginal and treaty rights of Canada's aboriginal peoples are recognized and affirmed. Furthermore, Section 35(3) makes it clear that rights under existing and future land claim agreements have the same protection as other treaty rights.

It is felt, therefore, that the insertion of what is called a non-derogation clause into the National Parks Act at this point in time is not necessary given the overriding constitutional protection for native rights. The Government, therefore, will not be supporting these motions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: An affirmative vote on Motion No. 6 will obviate the need to vote on Motion No. 8. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 6 will necessitate a vote on Motion No. 8.

The question is on Motion No. 6. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded divisions on the motions stand deferred.

Normally at this time the House would proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at the report stage of the Bill now before the House. However, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 13(5), the recorded divisions will stand deferred until six o'clock on Monday, July 18, 1988.

INDIAN LANDS AGREEMENT (1986) ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-73, an Act to provide for the implementation of an agreement respecting Indian Lands in Ontario, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

Mr. Maurice Foster (for Mr. Penner) moved:

That Bill C-73 be amended by adding immediately after line 8 at page 2 the following:

"7. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any aboriginal, treaty or other rights or freedoms of Indian people in Ontario."

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, there have been some discussions among the Parties and with the private Member whose motion is scheduled to be debated at two o'clock. I think you will find a general predisposition to move through report stage, and perhaps even third reading stage, of this Bill prior to seeing the clock at two o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for that?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-73 provides a framework for negotiation between the federal and provincial Governments to implement the provisions of the 1986 Ontario-Canada Indian Land Agreement. This is an extremely important piece of legislation for 16 bands in Ontario.

One of the most important claims is that made by the Manitoulin bands which involves unsold surrendered lands of some 90,000 acres. The bands involved are the Sheguiandah, Sheshegwaning, Sucker Creek, West Bay, Wikwemikong, and Whitefish River. The bands in the North Channel area of Batchewana, Thessalon and Serpent River are also affected by this agreement. There are also other bands, such as the Garden River Band, which are affected.

The amendment provides that the provincial Government interests in these unsold surrendered lands would be able to be turned over, by a specific agreement, to the bands concerned. We are told that some $4.3 million is presently held in trust by the federal Government for the province in royalties.

More important, at second reading the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. McKnight) indicated that funding would be provided for these bands to negotiate these agreements and finally get these Indian land claims settled. No one has any illusions that this will happen in a few months or even a few years, but at least we are putting in place a framework with the legislative authority to carry this out. I am especially concerned about the Manitoulin and those in the North Channel area because those negotiations have been under way for years and years. This will provide a legal framework.

Most bands and Indian associations in the province support this agreement which provides for opting in, that is, negotiations are not automatically required. It is simply a framework agreement which gives bands the opportunity to opt in. Those bands which are not involved in the 1924 Indian land agreement are concerned that there might be some impact of this 1986 agreement.

• (1400)

The Hon. Member for Cochrane—Superior (Mr. Penner), proposes in his motion that:

Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any aboriginal, treaty or other rights or freedoms of Indian people in Ontario.

There are bands like those in Treaty III and the members of the Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians who are very concerned that even though their bands are not directly involved, the precedent set by the negotiations between the federal and provincial Governments and the bands involved might have some impact on their future rights with regard to their treaties.

This is a non-derogation amendment. There are precedents for this kind of non-derogation clause. It does not in any way affect their treaty or aboriginal rights and freedoms.

We had hoped the Government would have introduced one of its own amendments, but I understand it will not do so. If this amendment is adopted by the Government, we believe it would satisfy the concerns of a number of bands who appeared before the legislative committee.

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of this agreement to those five bands in the Manitoulin Islands district who have been negotiating for many years. They have almost 90,000 acres of unsold surrendered lands on which the province has a claim because of the 1924 agreement. They want to get on with the settlement of those claims.

The Minister has made a commitment that he will provide the additional funding required for any research, especially for the negotiations that will take place under the framework of the 1986 Indian Lands Agreement.

I hope the Government will give further consideration to the acceptance of our non-derogation clause, but the Bill will ultimately be passed so that the economic benefits will flow to literally dozens of bands in Ontario for the betterment and improvement of the economic lot of the bands and communities concerned.

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, we support the amendment. There is a need to ensure that there is final protection and that nothing in Bill C-73, an Act to provide for the implementation of an agreement respecting Indian lands in Ontario, be construed as to abrogate or derogate from any aboriginal, treaty or other rights or freedoms of Indian people in Ontario.

We support that amendment and we will support the Bill at third reading.

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism) and Minister of State (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)): Mr. Speaker, we have given serious consideration to this proposed amendment but we feel that given the nature of the Bill and its wording it is not necessary.

The concern that has been raised by both Hon. Members stems from representations made by concerned Indians who will be affected by this Bill. When asked for specific examples of potential conflict between Indian rights and the agreement, none were brought forward. It is dubious at best to include a general clause in the legislation where there is no specific problem to be addressed. By doing so, we would run the risk of frustrating the over-all intent of Bill C-73.

There is concern that a broad clause protecting all treaty and other rights of the Indian people of Ontario could be at odds with the terms of negotiated specific agreements. For instance, a specific agreement could provide that unsold surrendered lands now being used as municipal streets, provincial highways or other public installations, which have been occupied by non-Indians for many years, would remain as such but Indian bands would in return be adequately compensated. It is the case in this example that the rights of Indian bands to these lands come into conflict with the terms of the specific agreement. It is because of this potential conflict that we did not consider it wise to include such a general provision regarding the protection of Indian rights.

This is not to say that the agreement does not concern itself with, and that we are not concerned with, the protection of Indian rights. First, it is the case that an Indian band involved in negotiations for the purpose of arriving at a specific agreement must be satisfied that the deal is acceptable and does not unduly compromise its rights. They have that protection.

Second, several provisions of the agreement expressly state that Indian rights are not to be compromised. In particular, I want to refer to Clauses 5 and 6 of the agreement which stipulate that neither the 1986 Indian Lands Agreement nor any specific agreement negotiated thereunder will affect the validity of any treaty or surrender, and that no federal-provincial agreement concerning any letters patent will affect any rights or the recourse that any band may have against any person or lands, including the Crown or Crown lands. Furthermore, in response to the concerns that the Bill could adversely affect lands that do not enter into specific agreements, Clause 12 of the agreement states as well that the specific agreement will affect any band unless that band confirms that particular specific agreement.

I believe the concerns expressed by the Members are fully addressed in the Bill itself. Furthermore, is it necessary to state that aboriginal rights are protected by the Constitution of this country?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on the motion standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Cochrane—Superior (Mr. Penner). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the nays have it.

Motion (Mr. Penner) negatived.

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved that the Bill, as amended, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Valcourt (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved that the Bill be read the third time and passed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, we have made amazing progress in the last 24 hours. We have passed seven Bills through a variety of stages.

Perhaps a representative of the Government could give us an indication of what we will be doing on Monday and whether we can go home on Tuesday?

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, the Senate has more Bills before it than we have before the House of Commons.

On Monday, I believe, we will begin dealing with the ACOA Bill that has been reported back to the House by the Senate. It

is my understanding that the debate on Monday will commence on our message to the Senate about their behaviour in the other place.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I am rising as the communications critic for our Party. I understand that my hon. friend's Party was able to get 100 telephones installed at their campaign headquarters. Given that information, I wonder whether the House of Commons will be sitting on Tuesday?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am not sure it is a relevant question, but the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary.

Mr. Hawkes: I heard conversation in the lobby today about the difficulty in getting telephones for a number of people who intend to run again. It has been suggested it may take six weeks, a fair portion of an election campaign. I want to thank our Party activists who have had such foresight to make those orders such a long time ago that we are prepared for every eventuality.

• (1410)

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Assistant to the Deputy House Leader indicated that ACOA would be up, but could he give us an idea of what other legislation is on line? There is nothing under Government Orders that is obviously going to come forward.

Mr. Hawkes: I think, Mr. Speaker, that you can expect all the projected kinds of things. We do have a lot of votes at six o'clock on Monday. There seems to be a predisposition in the case of some of those Bills to move immediately after the votes, perhaps, to the third reading stage so they could go on to the Senate as well.

We have made commitments to members of the opposition Party to make sure that the ACOA discussion is still alive after Question Period on Monday, so I think that will take us very close to the votes and there will be negotiations on the Order, I think, throughout the day on Monday, if that is agreeable.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being two o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS--MOTIONS

[*English*]

CULTURE

SUGGESTED REVIEW OF CULTURAL ASSISTANCE POLICIES

Mr. Bob Corbett (Fundy—Royal) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of undertaking a review of its cultural assistance policies with regard to the funding of semi-professional and amateur organizations that are exemplary of Canadian culture but which are ineligible for any federal assistance program under the current criteria.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to debate this Private Member's Motion, M-171, today in the House of Commons. As you, Mr. Speaker, have just advised the House of the content and substance of the motion, I will not take the time of the House to read through it once again. As Hon. Members will note, M-171 calls upon the federal Government to reassess its cultural assistance policies dealing with semi-professional and amateur organizations.

I have been a member of this place long enough to know that doubtless there are some here who would say that the federal Government cannot afford to fund every group that comes knocking with tin cup in hand. In case there are any of those Hon. Members in the House, I would ask that they hear my arguments and decide for themselves whether Motion M-171 is worthy.

The introduction and debate of this motion is really the culmination of a long chain of events that began back in 1983. I will elaborate on this in a moment or two. Naturally, when I undertook this project and began to look into the programs and funding available to amateur groups through the federal Government, I also did some research into federal initiatives for funding for similar professional groups and amateur sports. I should say that Canada should be very proud of its commitment to both our professional artists and to our young athletes.

The year 1987 marked the thirtieth anniversary of the Canada Council which was set up by an Act of Parliament in 1957 to "foster and promote the study and enjoyment of and the production of works in the Arts". That quotation comes from the object of the Canada Council Act. This Government increased the 1987 budget for the Canada Council to $98 million, a $5 million increase from the previous year. The Government has indeed demonstrated by its actions a deep commitment to fostering the arts.

In 1986-87, the Canada Council administered 100 programs and some 4,000 grants. This contribution to the development of the arts in Canada is significant and the Canada Council should be applauded by every Member of the House, and indeed, every Canadian, for its undeniable contribution. It is very difficult indeed to find fault or criticize the way in which Canada treats its professional artists. Like all things, however, those who are professional today were once children or young adults aspiring to be artists, musicians, writers and so on. At some point in their careers, these artists were once amateurs who, I am sure, found it very difficult to gain recognition, let alone be taken seriously as an artist.

I mention the professional artists in arguing for support for this motion because I think it is very important to note that Canada is very supportive of the arts as a profession. However, there is a void in our support for young people who wish to participate in an art form. By way of example I will explain my motivation behind introducing Bill C-171.

Cultural Assistance Policies

I have been contacted on a regular basis since early 1983 by the Hillsborough Girls Choir. Hillsborough is a small village in my constituency of Fundy—Royal. This choir, while it is considered to be an amateur choir, has performed all over the world and has proudly represented this country on many occasions. Apart from its local performing schedule, which is very extensive for an amateur group, the choir has performed across Canada in competitions and workshops. It performed for the Governor General in 1981 and for Prince Charles and Princess Diana in 1983. The Hillsborough Choir recorded an album in 1982 and on several occasions it has performed on both radio and television.

The choir's visit to Wales also in 1983 was the subject of a documentary produced by the New Brunswick Department of Education. This was broadcast locally as well as in the public network in Maine. The Hillsborough Choir has, to its credit, an impressive and extensive list of both national and international awards.

Besides the various things I have mentioned, I think it is important to know that the school choir was honoured by an invitation to the World Music Congress in Oregon back in 1984. It was at the opening ceremonies of the Canadian Music Educators' Conference in Sackville, New Brunswick, in May of 1983. It has been on two consecutive occasions the winner of the Leslie Bell Choral Award, both in 1981 and 1983, for the most outstanding choral performance. It has as well attended international competitions in Wales, as I previously mentioned, in 1983.

All one has to do is to look at what the Hillsborough Choir has accomplished since it was established in 1979 to admit that these so-called amateurs are just not simply a bunch of girls from Hillsborough, New Brunswick. This group has made a significant contribution to Canadian culture. The choir and its director, Mrs. Ruth Schiller, has displayed a dedication and professionalism which is, I believe, unprecedented for a school-based amateur choir. These are only a few of the reasons I have introduced this motion.

I find it particularly disturbing that the Hillsborough Girls Choir has been treated with, I must say reluctantly, such a small amount of respect by the federal Government. The choir has never once received any form of assistance from the Government, either the previous Government or the present Government, to pursue its goals. I have tried over the years to secure even the smallest amount of financial aid for the choir and every time, for one reason or another, I have run up against a stone wall. The federal Government policy simply does not support or endorse groups like the Hillsborough Girls Choir who ably represent Canada around the world.

I understand that the federal Government cannot become involved with funding every single amateur choir or organization that springs up. I am not suggesting that. I am, however, suggesting that organizations that are deserving of federal assistance should have it made available to them by some means. What is most perplexing about federal government policy in the field of cultural assistance funding is the fact that there are amateur choirs, groups and organizations, which are actually receiving funding from the federal Government. Unfortunately, this funding is only available to groups that are considered multicultural. I find this a little unfair. Indeed, Canada is a multicultural nation, a fact we should be and have been promoting for many years. But there are a lot of people all over Canada who are losing out because their group or organization does not conform to the criteria for consideration under the multicultural guidelines. Many people simply do not understand why one group may be funded while another is not.

• (1420)

Members of the public often do not differentiate between one federal program or another. They see that the grants come from the federal Government and when one group appears to be favoured over another, the public has the impression that the federal Government is biased in its distribution of funds. This might not be the case but, certainly, the public perception in my riding tends toward precisely such a view.

As an example, the constituents who have contacted me quote the case of the Hillsborough Girls Choir, arguing that the group performs in both official languages of Canada and five other languages representative of a small part of Canada's diverse ethnocultural background. The choir itself is not a Ukrainian choir, or a Chinese choir, or an Acadian choir, nor does it purposely reflect any other visible minority group but, rather, it is representative of our unique "Canadian culture", and Canada's diverse ethnic and cultural roots through music and the languages in which they perform. Some of the group's repertoire has been composed in Canada by Canadians. This is Canadian culture. This is, to quote a popular phrase, "Canada's unique cultural identity".

The second point of contention I have with the present government policy is in its support of the performing arts. When the case of the Hillsborough Girls Choir was again brought to my attention in September of 1987 I wrote to the Minister of Communications (Miss MacDonald). I would now like to take a moment to read from the reply. It says:

> I fully recognize the meritorious achievements of the Hillsborough Girls Choir over the years and I am sympathetic to its needs. However, I must advise you that the cultural initiatives program administered by my Department is designed to assist the professional artist. Policy discussions took place in the fall of 1986 concerning the funding of amateur organizations between interested Departments and agencies at the federal level. Due to the number of projects submitted by professional organizations and limited financial resources, it was decided that the federal cultural bodies could not commit themselves to fund amateur groups.

I must reiterate that I do not believe that it is possible for the federal Government to fund all amateur groups such as the Hillsborough Girls Choir. I am merely advocating that some of the federal money spent to promote the performing arts should be going to encourage the development of young performers by sponsoring amateur or semi-professional groups, such as the Hillsborough Girls Choir, which do not have access to the

sponsorships and endowment funds more readily available to professional people.

Also, in the reply from the Minister she commented on the number of applications being submitted by professionals for consideration for funding. My first reaction to that particular statement was of shock and surprise. To such a comment I reply that certain amateur groups are as deserving of our support as the professionals, and that these groups should be considered under different criteria from that of professionals. What we need is a separate program from those which currently exist, similar to our support of Canada's various ethnic cultures through the policy of multiculturalism and the recent legislation passed in the House.

For a nation struggling to make its cultural mark in the world, Canada has in my opinion taken a rather narrow view. I am not saying that professional performers should be cut off because it is well known that carving a living out of the performing arts is a struggle. However, we must not, through our ignorance or devotion to a policy that has worked well, deny our young performers, who may very well be Canada's professionals of tomorrow, the opportunity of experiencing this profession firsthand. Of course, there must be specifications, rules and guidelines, but there also has to be a willingness to support the very serious and dedicated amateur performing artists.

In this respect I refer to Canada's policy toward the promotion of fitness and amateur sports. Again, Canada and Canadians should be very pleased with the commitment that the federal Government has made in this area. Under the Ministry of Fitness and Amateur Sports there are two divisions known as Fitness Canada and Sport Canada. Both of these federal government organizations are well equipped, amply funded, and have been given the policy direction to achieve very commendable goals. All one has to do to recognize this fact is to take a look at the success of the recent Olympic Winter Games in Calgary. The co-ordinated efforts of the federal government Department have produced world-class amateur Canadian athletes.

It is precisely this type of commitment that is required for our amateur or, more appropriately, semi-professional performing arts groups. I strongly advocate a further review of federal policy in this area. I am not saying that we deprive one area for the sake of another, but simply that we redirect our efforts and resources to accommodate a most deserving and worth-while part of Canada's expanding culture.

Motion M-171 simply asks the Government to take another look. One way of addressing this matter might be to establish a special task force or committee comprising representatives from Parliament, Government and the public to look into this matter with the purpose of making a constructive policy change. No matter how the issue is addressed, such an undertaking will require much thought and dialogue before any solution can be found.

It is time that we, the legislators of the country, give this issue some serious thought toward positive action. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the House to lend their support to Motion M-171.

Mr. David Daubney (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to comment on the motion of the Hon. Member for Fundy Royal (Mr. Corbett). I thank him for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and for his thoughtful remarks this afternoon. It is certainly evident that he is committed to the arts in Canada in their many forms of expression.

I would like to take a few minutes to clarify for the House what I think some of the principles, some of the notions inherent in the question the Hon. Member has put to the House, are. Some of the questions I will address are the following. For example, what is professional? What is semi-professional? What is amateur? What are our expectations as Canadians?

In reading *The Ottawa Citizen* several weeks ago I came across three reviews, three opportunities for Canadians to understand and even attend live theatre experiences. The first play, *The Jester and the Queen,* was performed at the National Arts Centre in the Studio. It featured an international company from Czechoslovakia which performed six days in English and three days in French.

The second play *Stealing Home*, was performed by a professional Canadian theatre company in a tent on the grounds of the Victoria Museum here in Ottawa. Performing in the Ottawa-Hull Children's Festival, of which I had the honour of being a director for a number of years, this Caravan Stage Production has a cast, according to *The Ottawa Citizen* reviewer that is an "accomplished group", able to handle their many roles and musical numbers well", but adds that "at times the production strikes controversial chords . . . and comes with a parental guidance rating". In both cases our expectations are high, and we recognize the professional techniques of trained performers.

The third play, a very well known one, *The Miracle Worker,* was performed in a new theatre here in the National Capital Region by an amateur theatre company, Nepean Little Theatre, in the newly constructed professional facility in Nepean, the Centrepointe Theatre, at the new City Hall in the City of Nepean. It is a building, I might add, and a theatre, built entirely with municipal, provincial and private sector funding, and not with one federal dollar. I will come back to this point later in my remarks. *The Ottawa Citizen* said that the actress playing Annie "gives the play a most convincing, subtle and rounded performance" and that the whole production is a "mostly successful one".

• (1430)

All three plays, the international professional, the national professional, and the regional or local amateur, are given equal play in the newspaper of the nation's capital, and the fact that

such a wide range of theatre experience is available to audiences is very important.

My point is that the issue is a complex one. A thriving arts scene requires the participation of amateurs, semi-professional—which I have always understood to mean "pre-professional'—and professional. Sometimes it is difficult to differentiate between them.

Let us talk for a moment about professional employment in the cultural sector. The term "professional" signifies full time employment at a high salary after a significant level of training and experience.

Does that mean that the Montreal, Toronto, or Vancouver actor who is between plays and television commercials and finds work as a waiter is not a professional actor? Is "professional" defined as earning the wages of a doctor or a lawyer which are classified as professions by employment agencies?

A principal dancer in the National Ballet of Canada, and we are talking about household names here, in 1984 earned $573 a week, or approximately $30,000 per year, before deductions for rehearsal clothing, ballet shoes, and so on. Is the principal dancer of Canada's largest ballet company any less professional than the physicians of this country, especially after equal years of training and professional performance experience?

In the 1984 study: *What Jobs Pay*, by Paul Anisef and Etta Baichman, some very interesting statistics underline the point that, in the cultural sector, salaries are not reflective of professional training and experience in Canada, unlike our neighbour to the south where movie stars like "Rambo" Stallone are rumoured to make $20 million for one violent picture. In the report it states:

> Of the 5,963 paid-up members in Actor's Equity, only 25 to 28 per cent are usually working at any given time. Only 15 per cent of ACTRA's 6,800 members (including actors and writers) are fully occupied in the profession. In March, 1983, 54.7 per cent of ACTRA members earned less than $3,900, 73.9 per cent earned less than $8,000.

In an average first year with Canada's major ballet company, a dancer earned a minimum of $311 a week. The minimum weekly salary for opera singers performing in town, with our largest company, the Canadian Opera Company, was $421 a week. The average annual income of dancers with modern dance companies in 1980-81 was only $6,000. Certainly, in recent years there have been some slight improvements to keep up with inflation, but the net disposable income has not increased.

One last example. Recently, a visual artist visited the Department of Communications and indicated that she had sold almost $60,000 worth of work in the last fiscal year, but her take home pay after deducting the costs for studio and supplies was only $6,000. What physician or any other professional would stand for that?

In other words, in spite of subsidy, because of the volume potential in the Canadian market-place, because of low ticket prices and fees for service, because less than 10 per cent of Canadian businesses give to the arts, the word "professional" in the arts means paid somewhat, some of the time. This country has a lot more work to do here, and the Government is committed to help in this area.

What about semi-professionals? What do they earn? Or have they decided that, by choosing to be semi-professional, they can balance their regular income from more regular sources with the opportunity to express their creativity on a frequent part-time basis? Are they really apprentices, artists in training, not yet trained sufficiently to be able to earn full-time work?

Finally, what does amateur mean? It does not mean poor quality, that is clear. To me, amateur means joy, the joy that comes from volunteering one's time and talent, a passion for self-expression strong enough to compel participation.

Amateur cultural organizations are essentially volunteer organizations. The actress in a local amateur production may some day decide to work semi-professionally, but today she is volunteering in order to be able to participate in the performing arts and to experience the thrill of a live audience. Occasionally, there is a live audience in the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker, but it does not look as though we had one this afternoon!

Cultural activity is supported by all levels of government, some better than others. Traditionally, the federal Government has supported primarily, although not exclusively, the professional sector, as the Hon. Member pointed out. Through our support to cultural agencies such as Telefilm, the Canada Council, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, to museums and galleries across the country, and through the many programs sponsored by government Departments, we provide close to $2 billion a year in support of our nation's culture—$2 billion is a significant sum of money.

We accept our role because of the value we place on Canadian culture. We encourage other players, particularly the private sector, to increase their participation and join us in promoting the development of the arts in Canada at both the amateur and professional levels.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the New Democratic Party to speak on this motion. It is a very interesting motion and I congratulate the Hon. Member for putting it forward, and for taking us away from the general to talk about a specific issue which is getting funding for the Hillsborough Girls Choir. As the communications critic for my Party I learned something in listening to the Hon. Member's speech on how he attempted to get funding for what is no doubt a very good cause.

Today I had a meeting with a young man who works for a band called L'Insolite. In English it means "unexpected". It is a drum and bugle corps band from St. Jérôme, Québec. It is a world-class band just like the Hillsborough Girls Choir. The band has 65 youths age 13 to 21. In addition, the band has 20 young instructors who are not paid, and another 15 people who

volunteer their time as organizers. That is approximately 100 people associated with this cultural endeavour, this band from St. Jérôme, Québec. I talked to Mr. Norman Lalonde who works with the band. He is from St. Jérôme. He told me how the band raises money. For example, a few weeks ago on a Saturday it had a benefit day and raised money from approximately 3,000 towns people who came to this fund-raising occasion. I guess the Hillsborough Girls Choir raises money in a similar manner.

[*Translation*]

I may add that Mr. Bill Clay, the New Democratic Party's candidate for Laurentides and, I hope, the new Member for Laurentides after the next election, introduced me to Mr. Normand Lalonde . . .

[*English*]

I am grateful to him for that introduction so that I could learn a little about the local band, and today I also learned a little from the Hon. Member from Nova Scotia who talked about his problem. I wish to deal with some of the remarks in his speech. Let me try to distil his speech down and he can correct me if I am wrong. What he is basically saying is that if you go for cultural funding in Canada you can only get it from the cultural initiatives program if you are a professional group. You cannot get it if you are amateur. If you are multicultural, you might be able to get the money from the multicultural program. If you are not multicultural, then forget it, you are not going to get it from that program.

• (1440)

He also said in his speech, I think, if you are a professional or amateur athlete, you can get funds. So amateur athletes get funding but amateur cultural initiatives do not get funding. I see what the Member was saying.

It is very interesting to note that the Member seems to support—and I agree with him—state initiatives and financing for the athletic sector, which, in his words, "produce class amateur athletes". If I might say so, as a socialist, it is good use of the state's power and money to produce a good in the end. I am glad that the Hon. Member agreed with that principle. He does not always agree with those particular principles and neither does his Party.

Let us talk a little bit about getting funding for cultural programs. I have also run into this with respect to professional groups from Vancouver, specifically a program called "The May Works" which is a cultural festival that is put in on May Day in Vancouver to celebrate with theatre, musical performances and so on. It is a workers' day, a May Day. We did get some money from the cultural program, the initiatives program, and I am very grateful that we got it. I think it was about $7,000.

I will tell the Hon. Member what I found out in pursuing that grant. There are two funds; the Canada Council and the cultural initiatives program. The cultural initiatives program gives about $17 million, I believe, in funds. I am talking off the top of my head but I believe these figures are right. I was told by people who are administering the fund, when I tried to get money from them, that in fact they have about $100 million in applications. So there is quite a big demand out there, and there are limited resources. It is a profession, and I agree that they do fund professional groups.

We should look at this situation in the light of why we have a Canada Council and why we have a cultural initiative fund. As to why we have both, as far as I could determine, the Canada Council gave money equally to groups across the country. I am not sure I could say the same thing, although this is disputed, for the local initiatives fund. It is very open to being a political slush fund, where the Ministers can deal out grants.

We had evidence with the previous Minister that there was some mal-distribution, if you like, where some areas of the country got more than others. So I say that it is right in the sense that we have to look at the role of those two funds. Why do we have those two funds? Should we only have one fund, a Canada Council rather than a special initiatives fund? Could the Canada Council administrate that? Why should the Minister's office administer it? We should look into all of that.

The second thing we should look into is, should the fund, whether it is Canada Council or the cultural initiatives fund, or both funds, be giving money to amateurs as well as professionals? That is a good question, and I am not sure that I have the full answer for that. One of the problems that the amateur cultural initiatives have in getting funds is that they used to be able to get money from the federal Government. There used to be lots of money in the federal Government because the federal Government had the lottery funds.

I think in 1979 the Conservative Government gave over the money from the lotteries to the provinces. We might want to have another look to see whether we can get some of that back. Are the provinces funding properly? The band in St. Jérôme were saying that they were having difficulty getting money from the province. Are the provinces using these lottery funds in the way that they are supposed to be using them? Are they just using them for sports and not for cultural initiatives? It follows from what the Member raised that we should look into that as well. So we should look into why there are two funds, should it fund amateur as well as professional, and what is the role of the provinces in terms of lottery funds and money that has been turned over to them?

Now, with respect to multicultural aspects, I would not want to say to those groups, "We are going to cut you off because you are getting an advantage that the others are not getting". I would prefer to put the multicultural aspect out here, if you like, to separate it, and to say, "We do need funding for multicultural groups", and that may include cultural funding, like a Ukrainian choir, a Sikh dance group and so on. I believe that there have been grants—you might correct me if I am wrong—I hope that there have been grants in the multiculturalism area. I trust that the Member is saying that. We would

have to check with the multicultural people and take a look at their grants to see whether they have in fact given the cultural institutions. I think that they pursue different criteria, a multiculturalism approach. I would not want to end that because some other group was not getting it. I would prefer, in the case of the Hillsborough Girls Choir, to expand the funding in other initiatives.

If the Member is making the point that cultural institutions are equal to sports, then I think he is right concerning that. I do not think he can say that there should be funding for amateur sports and no funding for amateur cultural institutions. In some ways they are all part of Canadian culture, in a broad definition of culture.

The NDP, my Party, and I hope the Hon. Member, believe in a broad definition of culture, a culture for the people and not just for a few elite groups. The Member for Ottawa made some comments, as well as the Member from Nova Scotia, about the Government's deep commitment to helping the arts. I have two criticisms here that I want the Hon. Member to consider. The Government has underfunded the CBC and in fact politicized the boards of the arts, organizations like Jean Sirois and Telefilm and some of the other bad political appointments. I will finish by saying that the Hon. Member's point was well taken and worth considering and studying. I want to broaden the study to look at the things that I suggested, and I hope that the Hillsborough Girls Choir can continue to represent Canada both here and abroad and that the L'Insolite band from St. Jérôme can represent St. Jérôme, Québec, and Canada abroad just as successfully as before. I hope that we can find some additional funds for them and for the people that help them.

• (1450)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for External Relations): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to rise in the House today and respond to the comments of the Hon. Member for Fundy Royal (Mr. Corbett) concerning the Government's funding of various Canadian cultural groups.

In fact, this gives me an opportunity to focus on a vital aspect of one of our Departments, and I am referring to the Department of the Secretary of State. And speaking of the Department of the Secretary of State, I think I should say that the new incumbent is someone of immense value both to Quebec and to Canada. He has great credibility in Quebec and the other Canadian provinces, and even internationally. Mr. Speaker, I know to what extent the Department of the Secretary of State . . .

Mr. Waddell: Wait and see!

Mr. Champagne: I know it hurts the NDP to realize that intelligent people, men of integrity and especially men of this stature, come to us instead of to their party. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in politics, intelligent people generally opt for parties that are doers, not dreamers. I think this was borne out by the election in Lac-Saint-Jean, and the Hon. Member should listen instead of making remarks.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back to the fact that the Department of the Secretary of State is a very important department, and that also extends to the riding level, in Champlain, among my constituents. The Department is very much involved in promoting the status of women and in helping and promoting the status of the disabled, and since the motion moved by the Hon. Member for Funday Royal is about multiculturalism, it is a Department that covers a host of different aspects and facets since it promotes the linguistic duality of this country.

This Department already offers many support programs for professional and semi-professional groups and tries to respond to their needs. The Department also encourages our cultural agencies such as the Canada Council to be more receptive to the needs of groups and performers in the multicultural sphere.

Mr. Speaker, in its structure, its range of activities and its staff, the Department of the Secretary of State reflects the regional, linguistic and cultural realities of this country. Many of its activities complement those of other departments. However, the Department plays a distinctive and important role within the Government in that it defends the interests of our socio-cultural communities.

In other words, its mission is to contribute to enhancing our national identity and to preserving the cultural heritage of all Canadians. It would be impossible for me to describe or even to touch on all the aspects of the programs offered by the Department of the Secretary of State in the areas of literature, visual arts, and the performing arts. But these areas are an inherent part of several large programs of the Department of the Secretary of State.

All those involved in the Multiculturalism Program, the Status of Disabled Persons Secretariat, the Women's Program, and the Native Citizens Directorate are firmly committed to promoting the interests of the groups that concern them. Literature, visual arts, and performing arts make up an important part of their activities in this regard. For instance, Mr. Speaker, we know that the Minister responsible for Multiculturalism wants to ensure that all Canadian men and women will have the opportunity of participating fully in our national life.

The Minister strives to help them preserve their cultural and linguistic heritage. He is thus the advocate of multiculturalism within the federal Government and with the support of the Department he administers a wide array of national and regional programs. The Multiculturalism Program provides technical and financial assistance to hundreds of volunteer community groups and to the heads of various specific projects that are seeking to bring about a better understanding and a greater appreciation of Canada's cultural diversity.

The Program has for a long time provided considerable resources to the publication of literary works and to the visual and performing arts.

In 1986-87, the Multiculturalism Program provided more than a million dollars to assist 161 projects to publish literary works, and more than $2.2 million for 243 projects in the visual and performing arts.

Grants are available as well in the dramatic arts field, to those who wish to create or produce plays or to hold workshops. For instance, the Secretary of State recently subsidized the production of a play entitled *The New Canadian Kid* that explores the integration of immigrant children into Canadian society, and the production of a play entitled *Skin*, performed during the Children's Festival in Vancouver.

In the areas of film and audio-visual productions, grants are awarded to encourage development, scriptwriting and production. For instance, the Department of the Secretary of State contributed to the presentation of a program of multicultural films in repertory cinemas throughout Canada and sponsored a part of the Toronto Film Festival called *Cultures in Conflict*. It also provided financial assistance for the production of a T.V. series entitled *Inside Stories*, which probed the lives of ethnic communities in Toronto. The scripts are the work of writers who live in these communities.

Furthermore, the Secretary of State provides funds for folk art organizations and for the training of artists. Those funds are also available to amateurs, both organizations and individuals. They are also used to finance the translation into English and French of Canadian literary works written in foreign languages.

Also worthy of mention, Mr. Speaker, are the funds provided to community and amateur theatre groups and to various special activities. The latter are extremely varied and include the following, for instance:

The Canadian Heritage Festival, an annual event of national scope that is held in a different province from year to year;

A heritage festival organized by the Moncton Multicultural Association, that calls on the talents of a large number of regional artists;

The re-issuing of a general guide published by the *Sikh Education Society of Vancouver;*

The organization of a cultural festival in London, Ontario, for the purpose of introducing the general public to Eritrean crafts, cooking and music;

An art contest and an essay competition for the children of Kelowna, organized by the multicultural association of that region.

The production of a pamphlet and a short film on the experience of immigrant women in Prince Edward Island;

The organzation, this fall, by the Edmonton Chinese Multicultural Centre of a cultural presentation entitled *A Duet of East and West*, and the showing, every two weeks, of films on Chinese culture.

And finally, last March in Winnipeg the first national conference on folk arts was held. The Department of the Secretary of State was particularly proud to sponsor that important meeting which dealt with the future of folk arts in Canada and was attended by the spokespersons of various communities, artists, and public servants. Participants discussed the future of multicultural folk arts in Canada and the ways of promoting and enhancing them to best advantage.

I could go on and on and continue to list other similar projects.

The program to assist multiculturalism will provide $192 million in the course of the next five years to implement the Canadian Multiculturalism Act. This means $62 million in new money. Of these new funds, $14.5 million will be devoted over the next five years to the promotion of heritage languages and cultures. In 1991-92, the annual budget for that item will be $13.8 million.

Part of this amount will be used to finance activities aimed at promoting various cultures through literature, the visual arts, and the performing arts.

The Department of the Secretary of State has already created a multiculturalism secretariat to encourage federal departments and agencies to help implement the multiculturalism policy stated in the Canadian Multiculturalism Act.

The Disabled Persons Participation Program has a budget of $3.2 million. Again, Mr. Speaker, these funds are used to finance a wide variety of projects carried out by associations of the disabled, among other things.

We could mention the Insight Theatre Company, which received a $20,000 grant to produce a film with blind actors, and "A Show of Hands", the only Canadian theatre troupe made up of deaf and hard of hearing actors, which received $50,000 for a cross-country tour.

Among the activities of the National Week of the Disabled, let us mention the gala held at the National Arts Centre that brought together disabled artists, including actors, singers and musicians.

A resource centre for the arts in Newfoundland received $7,000 to produce the "Trawler Show".

The Women's Program has a budget of $13.2 million to promote women's issues. The visual arts, literature, theatre and film are indeed effective vehicles for this purpose.

Although it would be ideal to have more money to help all sectors of artistic activity more, our present granting policies and eligibility criteria are meeting Canadians' needs adequately.

I would not hesitate to add, Mr. Speaker, and I know that my time is running out, that we are and will remain attentive to all groups and individuals in these fields, in order to encourage the arts and interest all Canadians in them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The time provided for consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired,.

It being three o'clock, pursuant to Order made June 20, 1988, this House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 3 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, July 18, 1988

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Ministry's response to the five petitions bearing the numbers 332-4722, 332-4785, 332-4812, 332-4830 and 332-4836.

[*Editor's note: See today's Votes and Proceeding.*]

* * *

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

MEASURE TO CHANGE NAME OF CHAPLEAU CONSTITUENCY

Mrs. Claudy Mailly (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue) asked for leave to table Bill C-308, an Act to change the name of the electoral district of Chapleau.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of this House that the Hon. Member introduce this Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mrs. Mailly: Mr. Speaker, when the electoral map was being re-drawn, the Commission suggested that the whole rural section of my riding be amputated, and it chose as the new name for the new riding that was thus created, the name of Chapleau.

Because of representations made by the residents of my riding, including the mayors of all the rural municipalities that did not want to be amputated from the riding of Gatineau, the judge decided not to change the structure of my riding.

But inadvertently the new name was kept, Chapleau.

Mr. Speaker, we have nothing but respect for Mr. Chapleau as a figure in our history, but he has no association, either geographical or historical or emotional, with the Gatineau region.

I therefore ask this House to permit me to return to the former name, adding to it "La Lièvre", which is the other river valley in my riding, so that the name for the new riding would be "Gatineau—La Lièvre", with the same structure we had before, that is, 80 per cent rural. It would be much fairer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of this House to adopt the Motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the Bill be read a second time? At the next sitting of the House?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

• (1110)

[*English*]

PETITIONS

OPPOSITION TO BILL C-33—DEINDEXATION OF PUBLIC SERVANTS' PENSIONS

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and duty to present a petition which has been certified as correct as to form, pursuant to Standing Order 106, from a number of residents of St. John's, Holyrood, Torbay, Bay Bulls, Goulds, Portugal Cove and other communities in Newfoundland, who state that the Conservative Government, through Bill C-33, seeks to deindex the pensions of federal public servants who now have complete protection through full linkage to the Consumer Price Index, and that the Government has insisted on dropping full indexing for public servants. The undersigned petitioners pray and call upon Parliament to reject Bill C-33 as regressive, unfair, untimely and against the best interests of public servants and all Canadians, and that Parliament affirm full indexing to the Consumer Price Index as the model for inflation protection for all Canadians.

Order Paper Questions

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 365 and 374.

[*Text*]

FOREIGN DOMESTIC WORKERS

Question No. 365—**Mr. Heap:**

Since November, 1981, according to the latest statistics available (*a*) have domestic workers been refused landing in Canada under the Foreign Domestic Program and, if so, in what numbers and, in each case, what was the applicant's (*i*) country of last permanent residence (*ii*) age (*iii*) number of dependents (*iv*) gender (*v*) reason for rejection (*b*) have domestic workers applied for landing under the program and been accepted and, if so, in what numbers?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Since its inception in November, 1981, the Foreign Domestic Program has accepted 14,199 workers as permanent residents. Very few do not qualify. For example, of the 28,869 foreign domestics who have entered Canada as temporary workers, from 1981 to the end of 1987, only 635 have been refused permanent residence. The approximative 14,000 remaining are in the immigration stream or they have left Canada having decided not to become permanent residents.

Foreign domestics refused for permanent residence

Total	Nov. 1981 to Dec. 1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987*
635	27	119	149	188	46	106

Data on the composition of the refusal group will be available at the end of August, 1988, covering the period June 1, 1987 to June 30, 1988. Statistics on refusals for 1987 are available; however, it should be noted that the data breakdown requested only started as of June 1, 1987. Prior to June 1, 1987, there was no collection of specific data on refused applicants (i) country of last permanent residence (ii) age (iii) number of dependents (iv) gender (v) reason for rejection.

*Preliminary Statistics

GREAT LAKES—CONTAMINATION MONITORING PROCEDURES

Question No. 374—**Mr. Langdon:**

Are contamination-monitoring procedures being carried out for the Great Lakes and, if so (*a*) with what frequency (*b*) by what groups or individuals (*c*) in what areas?

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of the Environment and of the Fisheries and Oceans as follows:

Contamination monitoring procedures are being carried out for the Great Lakes by Environment Canada, the Ontario Ministry of Environment, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and eight Great Lakes states under the Canada/U.S. Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. Environment Canada is responsible for the monitoring of conventional parameters and contaminants in the waters of the open lakes by carrying out the following: Lake Ontario—two cruises/year; Lake Huron—two cruises/year; Lake Superior—one cruise/year; Niagara River—weekly (Niagara-on-the-Lake, Fort Erie); St. Lawrence River—daily.

Environment Canada also operates a network of 30 air quality monitoring stations throughout the Great Lakes Basin and monitors contaminant trends in herring gull eggs in 13 colonies.

Since 1977, DFO has carried out a contaminants monitoring program on fish and other biota on the Great Lakes in response to federal commitments respecting the 1972 and 1978 Canada/U.S. Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement.

Annual surveys are carried by DFO throughout the Great Lakes at approximately 20 sites (10 sampled annually) to determine trends on selected contaminants in fish and other aquatic biota. The program receives the assistance of the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and is part of a co-ordinated international study involving the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Environmental Protection Agency. Results of these annual surveys are presented through the surveillance Workgroup of the International Joint Commission to the Water Quality Board and reported biennially.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The questions as enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered.

Mr. Grisé: I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADIAN EXPLORATION INCENTIVE PROGRAM ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

On the Order: Government Orders.

July 14, 1988—Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-137, an Act to provide for incentives to assist in financing exploration for mineral resources and hydrocarbons in Canada and to amend the Canadian Exploration and Development Incentive Program Act.—The Minister of State (Forestry and Mines).

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to this, but in fact there is no copy of the amendments in the folders which are on the desks of the Hon.

Members. I asked a Page to find one, but according to the Order Paper they are listed in *Votes and Proceedings* of last Thursday. Perhaps we can spend a minute until the House is able to review what these amendments coming back from the Senate are. I do understand that they are technical amendments and should be treated in that way.

On a procedural point, I am not sure whether the motion allows us to consider these amendments or whether it is for the acceptance of the amendments which have been sent back to the House by the Senate.

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, my understanding from the other Parties was, that there was no necessity to debate these amendments. However, if my friend wishes to debate them, I am perfectly prepared to suggest that the House not proceed with these amendments immediately so as to give my friend an opportunity to review them. Instead, we could move to the second item on the Order Paper, which is an item which we intend to debate, and there are members from the other Parties here who are prepared to debate it. We can take up Bill C-137 after Question Period, if my friend wishes.

Mr. Cassidy: Agreed. Mr. Speaker, I have consulted with my colleague from Yorkton—Melville, who is acting as House Leader today. It might make sense to ensure that the members of the Opposition have at least reviewed the amendments coming back from the Senate.

Mr. Speaker: Under the circumstances, I think that the suggestion made by the Hon. Minister of State may be a very good one. It seems to be agreed to by the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy). I must ask if there is consent in the House to adjourn this matter and to proceed with another matter on the understanding that we could revert back later today or at another appropriate time.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Members. I will call the next order.

* * *

CANADIAN ORGANIZATION ACT, ATLANTIC CANADA, 1987

MEASURE TO ENACT—NON-CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)) moved:

That a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this House disagrees with the text of the Message made by the Senate to Bill C-103, an Act to increase opportunity for economic development in Atlantic Canada, to establish the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts, because this House believes that in dividing the Bill, the Senate has altered the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of the grants of aid and supplies set out in the Bill, contrary to Standing Order 87, as recommended by Her Excellency the Governor General to this House, and has therefore infringed the privileges of this House, and asks that the Senate return Bill C-103 in an undivided form.

He said: Mr. Speaker, one normally starts these speeches by thanking the House for an opportunity to address the matter. I have to say to the House that I regret very much the necessity to make this speech and move a motion of reply. Recent actions of the Senate have caused Members of the House of Commons grave concern, and I think that we should send a signal of that concern to the Senate and to the Canadian public.

First of all, I want to set the debate by explaining what happened. The Government introduced and passed Bill C-103, an Act to increase opportunity for economic development in Atlantic Canada, to establish the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation, on May the 10th, 1988. By this Act our Government established the principle that we wanted Atlantic Canada to grow through federal government assistance directed regionally and not directed from Ottawa.

This was a new and innovative step by our Government—a departure from the "Ottawa knows best" attitude of the previous Liberal administrations. When the Bill reached the Senate the Liberal majority instructed the Senate Finance Committee to divide Bill C-103. The procedural acceptability of this move was challenged and the Speaker of the Senate ruled the motion out of order.

The Speaker of the Senate based his ruling on the fact that Bill C-103 involves the payment of taxpayers' funds and the sound legislative theory that the Senate could split Bills originating in the Senate but not Bills originating in the House of Commons.

The decision of the Speaker of the Senate was challenged by the Liberal majority in the Senate and overturned by that majority. The Bill was split by the Finance Committee and Part I was reported back to this House on Friday, July 8, 1988.

Progressive Conservative Members of Parliament immediately objected to this high-handed action by the appointed Liberal Senators.

I must say that we were pleased to be joined by our colleagues from the New Democratic Party, in a rare demonstration of non-partisanship, in order to establish the rights of the elected representatives over the rights of the appointed Senators. We were distressed that the Liberals in the House refused to back the democratic principle that elected representatives have pre-eminence when it comes to spending the taxpayers' money. I suggest that we are indebted to the Chair for the strength of the arguments put forward by Mr. Speaker in the ruling. I want to refer to some of them.

• (1120)

First, on the question of whether this was common practice, the Speaker said:

> I have been unable to find any instance in our practice where the Senate divided a Commons Bill or where the Commons has divided a Senate Bill.

The Speaker pointed out that there was one precedent for consolidation of two Commons Bills into a single legislative measure by the Senate which took place on June 11, 1941 with a message from the Senate to the House asking for concurrence. The Commons agreed with the Senate's proposal waiving its traditional privilege, and a single Bill was eventually given Royal Assent. Mr. Speaker went on to state that concurrence was specifically sought by the Senate.

The message received last Friday was not one of seeking the Commons consent but one of saying, "We have done it. Tough luck". In our opinion the Senate should have respected the propriety of the original Bill and asked if we would concur in the splitting of that Bill. That is the one part of the argument which the Speaker of the Senate made and which the Chair made in its ruling.

The other part is under Standing Order 87, namely, the question as to who controls the spending of taxpayers' money. Our Standing Order reads:

> All aids and supplies granted to the Sovereign by the Parliament of Canada are the sole gift of the House of Commons, and all Bills for granting such aids and supplies ought to begin with the House, as it is the undoubted right of the House to direct, limit, and appoint in all such bills, the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of such grants, which are not alterable by the Senate.

The Speaker went on to say something that I have not heard in my nine years here. The Chair said:

> I have ruled that the privileges of the House have been infringed . . . The cure in this case is for the House to claim its privileges or to forgo them, if it so wishes, by way of a message to Their Honours informing them accordingly.

I want to state unequivocally on behalf of the Government, and I hope all Members of this House of Commons, that we are claiming our privileges, the privileges traditionally granted to elected representatives over appointed representatives. As I said when the message originally came back, this action is an affront to Atlantic Canadians. It has been two months since the Bill passed the House of Commons. By dividing this Bill the Liberals have ensured that further delay will result before it is enacted in its entirety.

I want to go into some detail as to why it is important that Bill C-103 be passed, complete, in its original form, not just for the procedural purposes but for Atlantic Canada.

Mr. Robichaud: Why complete?

Mr. Lewis: Just hang on, my friend. Let me quote some of numbers. We want to demonstrate to Atlantic Canada that we feel that the decision-making authority ought to be given to Atlantic Canada to direct its own future. We have had years of mismanagement from the Liberal Party with local authority being refused and all decisions being made in Ottawa. If my friend from New Brunswick wants to continue the practice of all decisions being made in Ottawa, let him take the floor and state that for his people back home. Even his colleague is not in favour of that.

We want Atlantic Canada to know that Parliament and this Government feels that it should be treated the same as western Canada. Atlantic Canadians know that we have passed the Western Diversification Fund, that it is in full operation and not being held up by the whims of one Senator. It is in full operation.

Mr. Robichaud: Full operation?

Mr. Lewis: Let us look at what this authority has done. We have interim authority, certainly. But we want to give full and final authority to the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. Let us run through what this program has meant to Atlantic Canada so far.

The program has solicited in the region from February 15, 1988 to May 30, 1988, 2,886 applications, 643 of which have been approved for a total contribution of $58 million, making possible over $209 million worth of investment in Atlantic Canada. During the month of May alone, 917 new applications were received by ACOA as compared to 304 in the previous year under the old programs left by the Liberal Government. Look at that increase, Mr. Speaker. That is why we want ACOA for Atlantic Canada.

Furthermore, during the same period, 306 applications were approved under ACOA as compared to 144 under the same program in 1987. We have some 1,900 active applications. There is a great deal of interest in this program in Atlantic Canada and that is why we want to pass this Bill to try to meet the needs of Atlantic Canada.

This legislation will give the ACOA Minister and the agency more flexibility; it will give it decision-making in the region; ACOA will be able to participate in co-financing of regionally advantageous projects with other Departments. ACOA will help the newly established designated areas of exceptional opportunity and it will help harness federal programs to the common goal of increasing opportunity for economic development in Atlantic Canada. But, and here is the but, should Bill C-103 be allowed to die, as my friend from New Brunswick wants it to do—he wants to go back home with that on his record. He will have to answer as to what he did in his four years in Parliament. He will have to answer that Atlantic Canada did not get any opportunities. I tell him to put that on the record.

Mr. Robichaud: What about your responsibilities?

Mr. Lewis: I ask him to stand up and state firmly where he stands. He should tell the people that he does not want this Bill to pass.

Mr. Robichaud: You don't want it to pass.

Mr. Lewis: He can go home and tell the people that. I await his speech with interest, Mr. Speaker.

We regret very much these delaying tactics. This is not a single instance. By tomorrow morning the Senate will have 24 Bills from the House of Commons on hold, 24 pieces of legislation with which the Senate is dilly-dallying and on which it is not going forward. These include the multiculturalism Bill, the official languages Bill, a new immigration Bill, and emergency refugee legislation.

We returned here here on August 12 last year to proceed with emergency refugee legislation, which the House of Commons passed on September 14, 1987. We sent the Bill back to the Senate once again just recently because the Senate has been delaying, delaying and delaying on that important legislation. When Canadians ask what happens when a ship lands with illegal refugees on it and why airplanes can land at Pearson International with people on them eating their passports, Hon. Members opposite can tell them that it is because the Senate has refused to move. That is where the legislation is, and everybody ought to know that. That is the kind of delay we are getting from the Senate.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House that these efforts by the Liberal Senators to delay and derail our legislative package—this one in particular—is an affront to democracy in all of its principles. It is an affront to Members of this House. It is an affront to Atlantic Canada, and it is an affront to the taxpayers of Canada. I ask all Members of Parliament to stand and be counted when this motion is put to the House. At that time my hon. friend will have to ask himself whether he is for the House of Commons and against the Senate for attempting to dictate important principles of democracy in this House. He is either for the House of Commons or for the Senate. My friend will have to ask himself whether he is for the taxpayers of Canada deciding who spends money or for the Liberally appointed Senate.

Mr. Robichaud: Let's have the election right now.

Mr. Lewis: That is the question. I want my friend to have a chance to put a few remarks on the record and we will all await those with interest.

Mr. Gauthier: He will and he has unlimited time.

Mr. Lewis: My hon. friend will have to ask himself in the final analysis whether he is for Atlantic Canada and the principle that people in Atlantic Canada should make their own decisions, or does he want them made on Wellington Street? We say that Atlantic Canada should have the opportunity to make its own decisions as to its future as expressed in ACOA legislation. My friend says, "No, we like it the way it was going under Ottawa's rule".

• (1130)

In conclusion, I say that I hope all Members of the House will put aside partisan interests and get behind this motion which says, first, that we want to do something for Atlantic Canada and, second, we defend the principle that the elected representatives of the House of Commons should decide how taxpayers' money is spent.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not going to quarrel with the Speaker's decision on this matter. It speaks for itself. Nor, as the Hon. Minister said, am I going to say that I am not in favour of the rights of the House of Commons. I do not think that is the major question here. The question before us is the motion presented by the Government.

It was interesting to listen to the speech of the Hon. Minister. He did not once mention the people of Cape Breton or the main objection of the Liberal Party, which I will get to in my speech.

I have unlimited time, so if the Hon. Member for Dartmouth—Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) continues to interrupt because of the insecurity he feels about his Party's position, then I will just wait him out. This is far too important a subject to let it go by without putting the proper points across.

We can, of course, signal the position of this House with respect to its privileges without sending back to the Senate that portion of the Bill it has sent to us. The two things are not connected at all. In saying that I want to refer to a couple of things which have been misinterpreted by my friends opposite in their discussion of the Senate's action.

They say that the fact that the Speaker of the Senate was overruled indicates something important. Of course, the Speaker of the Senate is in an entirely different position than the Speaker of the House of Commons. The Senate Speaker is appointed by the Government. At the first sitting of the Senate he or she announces that he or she has received the appointment from the Governor General to be the Speaker, and that is unchallenged. The Speaker of the Senate remains so at the pleasure of the Government.

The reason that the Speaker's decision can be overruled is that he or she has a vote on all motions before the Senate. The reason for that is that all the regions of the country are to have equal representation in the Senate. The Senate was formed to protect the regions of the country. If the Speaker did not have a vote, then of course one of the four regions would be one vote short. It was decided that this would not be in the interests of any region.

I would like to now go on to what is a very important question and that is, what kind of a Bill do we have here? It has been stated that it is a money Bill. If this is a money Bill, then all Bills of the House of Commons are money Bills except perhaps amendments to the Criminal Code.

What is a money Bill? Do we have a definition? The only reference to the term in the Constitution Act is in Section 53 and Section 54. What do they say? Section 54 says:

It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any Vote, Resolution, Address, or Bill for the Appropriation of any Part of the Public Revenue, or of any Tax or Impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to that House—

There we have the word "Appropriation". Can we really say that this Bill is an Appropriations Bill? Of course it is not. An Appropriation Bill is a Bill that appropriates money for the House of Commons. This certainly cannot be considered an Appropriations Bill under that definition.

Mr. Valcourt: So the Speaker is wrong?

Mr. MacLellan: What about Section 53? It says:

Bills for appropriating any Part of the Public Revenue, or for imposing any Tax or Impost, shall originate in the House of Commons.

Fine, but once again we are talking about the word "appropriating". This is not a Bill appropriating money.

What we have to ask ourselves is this. Is there anything in this Bill which says that we need it in order to fund the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency or the supposed successors of the Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation? There is nothing. The only reference to money is the salary of a vice-president, and we do not need this Bill to appropriate the salary for a vice-president.

Mr. Mazankowski: Why are you against Atlantic Canada?

Mr. MacLellan: Then we have had reference to a Royal Recommendation as if any Bill that had a Royal Recommendation were a money Bill. Yet there is no indication that because a Bill has a Royal Recommendation it is a money Bill and cannot be amended. Bill C-18, for example, I put to the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski), had a Royal Recommendation, but it was amended, as was Bill C-22. Just because it has a Royal Recommendation does not mean a Bill is a money Bill, nor does it mean that it cannot be amended. The question is: What kind of a Bill do we have here? As I said earlier, we do not need this Bill to approve funding. The Estimates are where we approve funding for ACOA, and the Estimates have been passed and the funding is in place.

During the meeting of the committee dealing with this issue in the other place the President of ACOA was asked this question:

But there is nothing in this bill that gives you any funds. In other words, I do not see a dollar bill in it.

MR. MCPHAIL: I was speaking of the Estimates.

SENATOR MACEACHEN: Yes, and your money comes from the Estimates, not this Bill.

MR. MCPHAIL: Yes.

The Minister of State said the Government presented this Bill so decisions could be made regionally. One of the big decisions that was made regionally was on the funding allotted to the Industrial Development Division of the Cape Breton Development Corporation. That was the major feature, that decisions were made by the Board of Directors of the company in Cape Breton and the funding for that division was over $11 million a year. The decisions on that $11 million of funding were made in Cape Breton.

• (1140)

The Deputy House Leader said that they want the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency to be in operation. Well, it is in full operation at the present time. When going through my mail on Friday I found some notices in my "in basket". The letterheads on all four of the notices read "Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency". Evidently the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency has its letterhead and has had it for quite a while. One press release says:

Five Valley Firms to Receive ACOA assistance.

Pat Nowlan, M.P., Annapolis Valley—Hants, announced today that five Valley firms will receive assistance from the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency.

That is dated July 5. The second one reads:

Pictou County Projects Receive Assistance.

Ten Pictou County entrepreneurs will receive $1,076,867 in contributions and loans to carry out expansion development plans that will create 85 permanent jobs.

That announcement was made by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. MacKay). There again is proof that ACOA is in operation. Another release dated July 6 says:

Minister of Public Works, and M.P. for Halifax (said) . . . Halterm Limited will receive $450,000 ACOA contribution . . . Halifax-Dartmouth Industries Limited will (receive) . . . $160,000 . . .

A release dated July 8 says:

The Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency ACOA will provide assistance to four companies to establish, expand and modernize their operations in Dartmouth.

It was none other than the Member of Parliament for Dartmouth—Halifax East who made that announcement. Today, along with other members of the Conservative Party, he is saying that we need this legislation in order to get ACOA in operation.

First, this Bill is not needed for the funding because the funding is provided with the Estimates, and certainly no Conservative Government would ever give the funding if it did not have it. They say they need this Bill in order to get the structure in place so that they can operate. They are already operating and already giving funding, as we have seen.

What exactly is the present state of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency? It is in full operation and the Government is asking today that this House give retroactive approval to the origin of it. That is fair enough, but Members should not be spreading doom and gloom all over Atlantic Canada that there will be no funding for projects unless this Bill is passed, because that will not be the case. Mind you, it seems that the only places where approval is being given is in constituencies represented by government Members. The reason for that, of course, is that they want to persuade opposition Members to change their position and sabotage the Cape Breton Development Corporation and people of Cape Breton.

Mr. Forrestall: You're misleading.

Mr. MacLellan: No, that is not misleading at all. That is exactly the situation.

We must look at exactly what the Government is trying to do. The Senate sent this Bill back, the Speaker has made his ruling, and that is inviolate and is to stand. However, very important questions must be considered. The Government's motion says that:

> —this House believes that in dividing the Bill, the Senate has altered the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of the grants of aid and supplies set out in the Bill, contrary to Standing Order 87, as recommended by Her Excellency the Governor General to this House, and has therefore infringed the privileges of this House, and asks that the Senate return Bill C-103 in an undivided form.

First, the principles and intention of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency have not been infringed upon in any form whatsoever. As a result of the Senate separating the Bill, all of the provisions which relate to the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency are now before the House. Whether the Government or the Speaker feels that the rights of the House of Commons have been infringed upon is another matter. It is up to the House to decide whether or not it wants to adopt the Bill in its divided form. That is in the Speaker's decision.

There is nothing to stop the Government if it is, as it says it is, interested in getting the provisions regarding the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency through. There is nothing to stop the Government approving the provisions which deal with the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. They are before us in the House right now. How can the Government say that the Liberal Party is stalling ACOA? For one thing, ACOA is already in operation. Second, the revisions are before the House right now.

The reasons for the situation which exists in the House now is that the Government is not interested in ensuring the early passage of the Bill implementing ACOA. The Government is more interested in retribution against Cape Breton and the Cape Breton Development Corporation. In the Deputy House Leader's statement he did not mention what will happen to the Cape Breton Development Corporation as a result of the undivided Bill. ACOA is only Part 1 of this Bill. Part 2 relates to doing away completely with the Industrial Development Division of the Cape Breton Development Corporation.

The Cape Breton Development Corporation was set up under a separate Act. If the Government wants to do away with the Industrial Development Division, the way to do that would be through the Cape Breton Development Corporation Act. However, it has chosen to do it as a rider on the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency Bill. It has decided that if it does it that way it will be able to include something unpalatable and economically devastating to the people of Cape Breton in a wider subject of general appeal, thereby catching the people of Cape Breton and Atlantic Canada in a catch-22 situation.

If they want the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency enshrined in legislation they have to do away with the Cape Breton Development Corporation. The people of Atlantic Canada are being told that if they want the legislation to implement this agency passed they have to punish the people of Cape Breton who have had the Industrial Development Division since 1968. In order to get the general benefit of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency they have to turn against the people and the economy of Cape Breton by including the provisions doing away with the Industrial Development Division.

What happens if that succeeds? I am talking about precedents and the rights of Canadians. This would be a precedent because it would give the Government free rein to include such unpalatable provisions for a certain small region of this country in any Bill it wanted to pass if, of course, the Bill was generally acceptable.

In the Bill dealing with the Western Diversification Fund, which this Party supported, there was no provision for any part of western Canada to be detrimentally impacted upon. The people in western Canada did not have to turn on any part of western Canada in order to get the general benefits of the Western Diversification Fund, and therefore this Party approved it, and rightly so.

Why can the people of Atlantic Canada not have the same benefits? Why can the people of Atlantic Canada not have a program to set up the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency without having to cut the economic feet from under the people of Cape Breton? That is the major question right now and that is something the Government does not want to explain to the people of Canada.

The Cape Breton Development Corporation Act was passed in 1967 setting up the Cape Breton Development Corporation which had two divisions; a Coal Mining Division and an Industrial Development Division. The purpose of the Industrial Development Division was to bring in industry to replace the jobs that were being lost in the coal industry at that time. The people of Cape Breton had a reprieve in the early 1970s because the price of oil went up.

• (1150)

However, let us consider the situation in Cape Breton at the present time. There are at least 1,500 less jobs in the coal industry today than in 1967. Employment at Sydney Steel Corporation is less than half of what it was 10 years ago. The Government has closed the two heavy water plants, costing the area between 600 and 700 jobs.

The Government just stated that it is closing the railway in Newfoundland, which supposedly will not hurt the people in the Sydney and North Sydney area. Yet we are told that the containers will be routed through Halifax and Montreal. There is no compensation for the people in that regard.

The special investment tax credit upon which the Government hinged its whole regional development policy on Cape Breton has elapsed. Essentially, everything has been taken from an area that has one of the highest rates of unemployment in this country. The Government knows that the unemployment figures are bogus because there is no way of gauging the true problems in unemployment according to the system the Government has implemented. One no longer has the right to see the councillor in the unemployment office but must simply pick a job from the job board. People in Cape Breton have been unemployed for so long that they simply do not bother going to the unemployment office.

When one also considers the problems of the much older than average population, one can realize the true problems with the economy in Cape Breton. This Bill will not address those problems.

The Government is saying that it does not want to keep the Industrial Development Division that was established by an Act of this Parliament in 1967. It wants to set up a separate Crown corporation called Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation. It is essentially the same name as Enterprise Cape Breton, to be established under the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. The reason the Government is not original in naming the other corporation is that they will eventually be merged, without anyone knowing the difference. That one operation will be a local office of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency.

The President of Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation, which the Government intends to establish, is Mr. McPhail who stated before the Senate committee that the ACOA legislation was not necessary in order to have funding. He is also President of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Enterprise Cape Breton, through its direct relations with the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency.

Essentially, we are dealing with three parts of the same entity. Whether there are three or 300 agencies in Cape Breton, if they operate under the same framework and according to the same system, it is only one agency. It is a complete fallacy to suggest that the Government is replacing the Industrial Development Division with a separate Crown corporation. The people of Cape Breton are gaining nothing whatsoever. They will lose the industrial division of the Cape Breton Development Corporation, with a budget of at least $11 million a year in an area that has one of the highest unemployment rates in the country.

In 1967, this House decided that the people in that area needed this assistance. Today, there are fewer jobs in that area than in 1967. Those jobs are required to develop the economic framework in which people can support their families. The Government is not only taking away the funding, but the ability of the Cape Breton Development Corporation to decide how to apply that funding in the area.

I agree with the Deputy Government House Leader that it is important for people in Atlantic Canada to make their own decisions. That will not be the case in Cape Breton if we lose the Cape Breton Development Corporation. It is wrong to put the people of Cape Breton in that position.

The Government believes that if it can pass this Bill through Parliament without any amendments, or without its being divided, it will be able to eliminate the Cape Breton Corporation Industrial Development Division. That will be a serious blow to Cape Breton.

The Government believes that the general benefits in the broad concept of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency will allow it to include a measure that will adversely affect the people of Cape Breton. It believes that the people in the rest of Atlantic Canada will not bother with what fate befalls the people of Cape Breton, that the greed of the rest of Atlantic Canada will be paramount and win the day. That is not true. The Government has taken a cynical position with respect to the people of Atlantic Canada. The loss of this valuable agency will be devastating to the people of Cape Breton.

While we support the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, it has many problems and is not the complete answer. The political nature of the agency is rampant and could turn into nothing but the biggest pork-barrel in the history of Atlantic Canada.

However, it is the only game in town for Atlantic Canadians, since the Government has decided that this is all it will do. The Government has provided funding to the various regions through the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, the Western Diversification Fund and the Northern Benefits Program in Ontario. However, that is all it is going to give and will refuse any further requests from these areas. Regardless of the need for regional development funds in Atlantic Canada, that is no reason why the people of Cape Breton should be targeted for this clandestine and detrimental action on the part of the Government. I cannot accept that.

The Government's motion is flawed. It states that the House believes that in dividing the Bill the Senate has altered the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of the grants of aid and supplies set out in the Bill. All the Senate is doing is considering further the section that refers to eliminating the Industrial Development Division of the Cape Breton Development Corporation. It wants to study the impact of that on Cape Breton.

I too would want to study what that would do to the Cape Breton Development Corporation in particular. I hope the other place will look at that and realize that the loss of the Industrial Development Division will result in a coal mining company that is just ripe for privatization. That, I would say, is what the other place is maintaining it wants to study. What it has given back to the House are the provisions that relate to the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency without amendment and without any change whatsoever, ready for passage by this House. If the Government is interested in the passage of these provisions with respect to this agency, there is no reason that we cannot deal with that right now. But the

Government wants to play politics with Atlantic Canada. That is the pure and simple reason for not dealing with it, and I think that is a travesty.

• (1200)

I would say to members of the governing Party that if the people in Cape Breton, certainly all Atlantic Canadians, do not know what the Government is doing, they are certainly going to know. I think the people of Atlantic Canada are going to see through this sham.

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this motion by the Minister of State and Deputy House Leader (Mr. Lewis), because I believe we have in this particular case a very special motion. It is perhaps rare that this House must assert its privileges against the Senate. I have been in this House since last August as a new Member of Parliament and I must say it came as a bit of a shock to see some of the traditions in this House. For example, the Black Rod knocks on the door of this Chamber, interrupts proceedings and Members of the House of Commons dutifully go to the Senate to hear some message or pronouncement from the Senate. I was told, of course, that this is a tradition, a mere formality of subservience of the House of Commons to the Senate, and it was a bit of a shock to me to have to participate in asserting our privileges in this House against the Senate.

What the Senate has done with this particular piece of legislation is a disservice to the House of Commons. It has divided a Bill this House passed, albeit with substantial disagreement on particular parts of it from this side of the House, particularly from the New Democratic Party. But we supported the over-all legislation. In dividing this Bill, the Senate, as the Speaker has ruled, has interfered with the privileges of the House of Commons.

We, therefore, must join in with the motion in stating as follows; that we send a message to the Senate stating that this House disagrees with the text of the message made by the Senate to Bill C-103 because the House believes that in dividing the Bill, the Senate has altered the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of the grants of aid and supplies set out in the Bill, and has therefore infringed the privileges of this House, and we ask that the Senate return Bill C-103 in an undivided form. This motion is a very serious one. This House must claim its privileges against the Senate.

I must make a few comments on the Government's attitude toward the Senate in this respect. We have heard the Deputy House Leader rail against the unelected Senate as it carries out its activities in opposition to the House of Commons. The New Democratic Party has opposed the choice of a Senator as a Minister responsible for this Bill. The Government has chosen not to have a Minister in this House be the main spokesperson to report to Cabinet on this legislation. Instead, the Government itself chose a Senator to head the agency and to be the Minister responsible, and we must have someone in this House to answer questions and speak for this agency.

The Government rails against the Senate for interfering with this Bill, but the Government itself has made use of the Senate and instead of having one of its many Members of Parliament in this House act as a Minister responsible for ACOA, it has chosen a Senator. So the Government, I would suggest, is rather hypercritical on this point. It rails against the Senate yet it chooses a Senator. In addition, the hyprocrisy of the Government on this issue is evident by refusing, despite many invitations from this side of the House, to bring in legislation to curb the power of the Senate with respect to what it can do to Bills originating from this House.

We listened to what the Government had to say about the Senate but we do not believe it is sincere in wishing to do something about it. It continually rails against the Senate yet does not take any action despite repeated invitations by this Party to do so.

I should also point out that the very issue on which the Senate has taken action in dividing this Bill is one that was brought up by my Party at the first opportunity in the legislative committee studying Bill C-103. That committee, as you know, Mr. Speaker, travelled to Atlantic Canada, to St. John's, Halifax, Cape Breton, Port Hawkesbury, Prince Edward Island and Fredericton. We heard submissions on this issue.

This issue first came up in Port Hawkesbury where the committee held hearings. Members of the Liberal caucus and Liberal Senators are now taking up the cause of DEVCO, particularly, the Industrial Development Division, but when the committee held hearings in Cape Breton, there was not a Member of Parliament representing that Party even present, nor was there a Member present in Prince Edward Island or in Halifax to discuss the issues of ACOA and to listen to what those parts of Atlantic Canada had to say. It was my Party, and myself on that committee, who first moved amendments to the legislation to delete the entire section of the Bill dealing with the breakdown of DEVCO, hiving off the Industrial Development Division. We listened to the arguments put forth and the comments made by the people of Cape Breton as to what they felt was wrong with breaking up DEVCO and breaking away the Industrial Development Division. I will not go into all the arguments except to say that with DEVCO having both a Coal Mining Division and an Industrial Development Division working together, the DEVCO operation, with certain flaws, of course, has become a model of enterprise. With that operation there has been the ability of the Industrial Development Division to maintain flexibility in dealing with economic circumstances and changes within Cape Breton. It was an agency within Cape Breton that had control, not from Moncton or Ottawa, but from Cape Breton itself.

Within the Industrial Development Division, working with the Coal Mining Division, there was also the capacity of the advice, knowledge and expertise of those involved in the coal

mining operation which could be used to assist other enterprises within the Cape Breton community which were participating in the Industrial Development Division programs. That is very important to the success of many programs. The Industrial Development Division was also able to respond when, for example, there was a fire in a colliery and a particular mine had to be shut down. The assets of DEVCO were able to be used in conjunction with the other aspects of the Industrial Development Division programs to create new opportunities and employment.

After the House voted on amendments to that legislation, and those amendments have been turned down, this House ultimately has the final say in voting in favour of the legislation, so I reject the notion that the Senate can then alter the Bill in a substantial way as it has done. What would stop the Senate, in that case, from taking any Bill passed by this House, no matter which Government, and chopping it up into little pieces because the Bill did not suit the Senate? That would destroy the effectiveness and privileges of Members of this House to carry on their mandate from the people of Canada who elected them to pass legislation and get on with the business of Government.

• (1210)

We in the New Democratic Party supported amendments, both in committee and in the House, which would have separated the Bill. In effect, they would have done the same thing as the Senate has done. We voted on those amendments and they were lost. The Bill, in its original form with certain amendments which were accepted, was passed along to the Senate and has come back mangled. It was changed in a way that perhaps we would have liked to have seen. In fact, if the amendments by Members on this side of the House had been accepted, the Bill would have the same appearance as it has now coming back from the Senate.

We cannot accept the fact that the Senate, having received the wishes of this House, decided to act in so drastic a way, as the Speaker has ruled, to breach the privileges of this House. They are privileges which we must claim as Members of Parliament.

However, I reject with great force the contention of the Government that delay of this legislation will destroy the program as it now exists. The Government, through ACOA, is still spending money. That is something that has been going on for many months. The Government is very much overstating the consequences of a delay of this nature since under the new program of ACOA money has been handed out quite regularly in the form of grants. The details of those grants and criticisms of them are another issue.

It strikes me as very hypocritical when we hear Liberal Members of the House talk about their commitment to regional development. For much of the last 20 years since 1968 when the Industrial Development Division of DEVCO was established we have seen activities by the Government, most of which have been Liberal Governments, which have given Cape Breton an unemployment of 15.3 per cent, as reported today in *The Halifax Chronicle-Herald*. In all of Newfoundland and Labrador there is an unemployment rate of approximately 17.3 per cent. In many parts of Newfoundland and in whole statistical divisions there is an unemployment rate of 28 per cent.

We see a history over the last 20 years of regional development programs of both Conservative and Liberal Governments which have not resulted in any real commitment to changing the unfortunate realities in Canada wherein the unemployment rate in Newfoundland, in Cape Breton and the Maritimes is unacceptably high.

We have seen a program unveiled by the Government which has made some improvements under the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. It has some features that we welcome. There is the feature of flexibility in terms of granting and programs that can respond to the different needs of the Atlantic provinces. Indeed, one of the major defects of existing programs or pre-existing programs was that, although they were designed in Ottawa, they did not take into account the realities of economic and industrial life in the Atlantic provinces. They were not successful. We hope that with ACOA there will be improvements in that rate of success.

Therefore, the measures that were taken in the whole were supported, despite the fact that there were serious flaws. One of the most serious was the destruction of the Industrial Development Division of the Cape Breton Development Corporation, which had been put together and which had worked very well as a model. It was not successful in moving full employment in Cape Breton. It still left an unemployment rate of 15 per cent. However, in terms of the model of the type of activities that could be undertaken on a regional basis within a part of a province of Canada it was a successful model. It did not receive the total commitment of the Liberal Government before this one, and obviously it has no commitment from the present Government which has set out to destroy it.

These points with respect to the attitude taken toward the Senate by the Government are most important. We support the motion which is before us. The reason we support the motion is that we must, as the House of Commons, rise up and claim our privileges against the Senate. We must insist that the Senate respect the privileges of the House, despite the fact that the changes made to the legislation are ones that we ourselves would have made in this House. Those changes, once denied by this House as a body, must not be imposed upon this House by the Senate.

We support the motion. We support the message to be sent to the Senate to claim the privileges of this House against the Senate.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of State for Small Business and Tourism and Minister of State for Indian and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I join the other Members of this House in this debate on the motion which has been made. I would like to start by saying that I listened attentively to the remarks of the Hon. Members for Cape Breton—The Sydneys and St-John's East (Mr. MacLellan and Mr. Harris) about the motion, and I imagine, Mr. Speaker, that I and the other Members of this House have an obligation to regard this debate as a historic event in the history of the Canadian Parliament, because it is the first time that anyone can remember that the Senate has done what it did with this Bill, which aims at promoting the economic well-being of Atlantic Canada.

[*English*]

I guess that when people look at this debate and when they look at what has caused this debate to occur they will realize how desperate the Liberal Party of Canada has become. An explanation for this action by the Senate must be found. Why is it that unelected people in the other place have, on their own, decided to transgress convention, even the powers of this House, by infringing on the privileges of every Member of this House?

What I find astonishing this morning is to see members of the Liberal Party standing up to defend yet again their little cousins in the other place for the very single reason of playing partisan politics. The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan) tried to portray the Government as playing partisan politics here. Who has been playing politics with this issue if not the Liberal Party of Canada represented by the Liberal Senators?

It is a shame to see Members of Parliament from the Liberal Party who are elected standing up to say those things. After all, their cousins in the other place are not elected. We can understand that MacEachen and his gang would try to hold on to power to frustrate the will of the elected people of Canada. What I find astonishing is to see Liberal Members of Parliament defend the other place and the actions of the Liberal Senators.

• (1220)

We should not have this debate this morning. The Senate of Canada should not have divided Bill C-103. In his remarks this morning the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys challenged the ruling of the Speaker. The Speaker said quite clearly that this was a money Bill, but the Hon. Member attempted to explain that it was not a money Bill. By doing what it has done the Senate was infringing the privileges of the elected people of Canada. That is what the issue is about this morning.

The Liberals attempted to justify the gestures of the Senator who leads the Liberal Party in the other place by saying that we were destroying the Industrial Development Division of DEVCO. If it were not for the rules of the House where we have to watch the language we use there are certain terms I could use to describe that Member of Parliament. I will not, because I respect the rules of the House. I think that the smoke-screen that the Liberals are attempting to put over this issue will dissipate, just as in 1984, after 20 years of apparently dealing with regional economic development problems in Atlantic Canada, the smoke-screen has dissipated and people have seen the Grits doing everything in Atlantic Canada from Ottawa. The difference today is that it will not be done by bureaucrats in Ottawa; the Liberals want it to be done by Senators in the other place who are not elected. They know what is best for Atlantic Canada.

The same Senator seems to forget that he was here in the House of Commons for a long time. He was a very influential member of the previous Liberal Government. What has he done for Atlantic Canada? Where was he all those years? He talks of the Industrial Development Division of DEVCO as if this was a solution to the problems of Cape Breton. What has happened to Cape Breton since 1984? What has happened to Nova Scotia and to Atlantic Canada? When one looks at the number of unemployed people in Cape Breton in 1984 and compares that to today, there is a big difference. Many more people are working today in Cape Breton, not because the Government has thrown money at the problem, like the Liberals did, but because the Government in Ottawa has decided and understood that Atlantic Canadians have the stuff to do it themselves. Hence the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency would give the people of Atlantic Canada the very tools that they need to be the architects of their own economic development. That is what ACOA is all about.

In the House today we hear the Liberal Members of Parliament defending the unelected Senators who are trying to frustrate the will of Parliament. That is unacceptable and Atlantic Canadians will not forget. The only Liberal federal representative in Ottawa, the Hon. Member for Westmorland—Kent (Mr. Robichaud), applauded the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys when he stated that there are interim authorities and that the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency can do whatever it wants.

To justify their position on this issue today the Liberals say that, first, we are doing away with the Industrial Development Division of DEVCO, and, second, that the Senate's action does not result in any delay in ACOA bringing forward initiatives to support regional economic development because it is funded.

ACOA is operating under interim authorities that will allow the agency to put in place the action program. The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys was talking about an announcement made for certain companies across Atlantic Canada under the action program. That is only one program and one leg of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency.

The Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys stated in the House on July 8 that Bill C-103 does away with the Industrial Development Division of DEVCO. He called this an affront to

Atlantic Canadians. In fact it is a statement that is an affront to the truth. The Industrial Development Division of DEVCO will remain after the passage of Bill C-103 but with a strengthened mandate as the Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation. The only difference is that currently that division, as part of DEVCO, reports to the Minister responsible for Industry, Science and Technology, the DRIE department. That is where DEVCO has to answer to.

Mr. Forrestall: Here in Ottawa.

Mr. Valcourt: Here in Ottawa, what is proposed in this Bill by the creation of the Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation is to have it report to the Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency.

With the creation of ACOA and a new Department of Industry Science and Technology, IDD as the Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation will report to the new Minister responsible for economic development in all of Atlantic Canada. As a result, Enterprise Cape Breton will not in any way be impeded from doing what the Industrial Development Division has been doing for the past 20 years, contrary to what the Member stated. In fact, it now has a better chance of success because it is now in direct connection with ACOA, which is the lead federal agency for economic development in Atlantic Canada.

There are further provisions in the Bill that prove the absolute hollowness of the Liberal Party's argument. In establishing the Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation, Section 27 gives it its own board of directors separate from ACOA and separate from DEVCO. To me that is an improvement. That means more strength for this important tool for Cape Breton economic development.

Furthermore, Clause 33 lays out the objects of Enterprise Cape Breton. I challenge any Liberal Member to take exception to what I am going to say. Clause 33 lays out in identical terms the powers of the Industrial Development Division of DEVCO to the Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation. The words are exactly the same and they state:

> The objects of the Corporation are to promote and assist, either alone or in conjunction with any person or the Government of Canada or of Nova Scotia or any agency of either of those Governments, the financing and development of industry on the Island of Cape Breton to provide employment outside the coal producing industry and to broaden the base of the economy of the Island.

In other words, the Government remains committed to the original mandate of the Industrial Development Division. No one, not even the not-so-famous Senator in the other place, can take exception to that. It is plainly written in Clause 33.

It is even more important to note that in Clause 34 the powers of the Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation will be the same as those of the IDD, except for some minor technical changes. The Industrial Development Division has been given an extraordinary range of powers that very few, if any, other federal Crown corporations have received. All those powers have been retained for Enterprise Cape Breton Development Corporation. They include the power to provide assistance to a company that is likely to make a substantial contribution to the industrial development of Cape Breton Island through loans with or without security and with or without interest, grants, equity participation, or guarantees subject to Governor in Council approval. The Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation will also retain the power to purchase lands, sell lands for cash or equity, take mortgages on lands sold, and advertise industrial opportunities on Cape Breton.

Clause 38 provides that the head office of that corporation must be in Sydney in Cape Breton, and not in Moncton, as the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys was trying to let the people believe. He was claiming that it would be run from Moncton. Clause 38 clearly provides that the head office of the corporation must be in Sydney. The corporation will be run from Sydney and not from Moncton or Ottawa. That is contained in the Bill. Bill C-103 and the philosophy behind it create very direct links between the ACOA Act and the ECB Act. The Government has set out to establish a new economic development system in Atlantic Canada. It is vital and necessary that Cape Breton should be linked to that system. That is what Bill C-103 accomplishes.

• (1230)

If we listen to the brilliant Senator up there, he would want IDD to remain there linked to Ottawa, not linked to the one agency that has the mandate for the economic development of all of Atlantic Canada. He wants it linked to Ottawa again. Those Liberal Senators like it to be closed. Now that they are in the Senate, they have found a way to keep it closed to Ottawa. They are against the economic development of Atlantic Canada. The Liberal Party has been estranged from the people of Atlantic Canada by this move. To see Members of the House of Commons defend this move is totally unacceptable. I dare say that in the very near future—and I hope that is soon—Atlantic Canadians will have a chance to condemn those Members of Parliament who are denying them the opportunity to develop their own regions with the implementation of this Act. That is what this debate is all about this morning.

For them to defend their unelected cousins in the other place, against the will of the elected people, means that they will go down in history as the people who have done just that. Atlantic Canadians will never accept non-elected people being the master of their economic development. They want to be the architect of their own economic development.

Even the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. Harris), who has not informed himself, says everything is fine. Even if the Senators are playing with Bill C-103, even if they are delaying the approval of the Bill, it does not disturb anything. Money is still flowing. It is the same old attitude and it has not changed. They think that by throwing money at the problem they will solve it. They do not realize that Bill C-103 creates more than just giving money to corporations in Atlantic Canada. These measures cannot take effect until the Bill is passed.

The Hon. Member from Westmorland—Kent—and this I cannot believe—has one of the poorest counties in all of Canada, but yet he is here applauding the Senators who are infringing on the privileges of this House.

[*Translation*]

Mostly Acadiens, Mr. Speaker! And what does the Hon. Member for Westmorland—Kent (Mr. Robichaud) do? He applauds the efforts of Senators who are trying to frustrate the will of the elected representatives of the people. In his riding, which is perhaps the second poorest in Canada, the passage of and Royal Assent to this Bill would make possible, for example, to designate certain parts of New Brunswick, such as the region of Kent, a special region. But to do that, we need legislative authority, and that legislative authority is being denied to us by the Senators. That is the issue.

[*English*]

These Members of Parliament will have to explain to the Member for Westmorland—Kent why he is preventing the adoption of this Bill as it is. That area could be designated a special area under the enabling legislation of Bill C-103. I cannot stress enough the importance of this Bill and the approach of this Government to regional economic development. I am a product of Atlantic Canada. I come from northern New Brunswick. The people who are represented here have been subjected to regional economic development policies of the previous Government for 16 to 20 years.

In 1984, when the people across Canada and Atlantic Canada decided that they wanted to do away with this approach of throwing money at the problem they have spoken loud and clear and we have answered. That is why we have brought in the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. Bill C-103 addresses every problem that they have. Everything is in the Bill. The integrity of the mandate of the Industrial Development Division is protected and it is in the Bill. Instead of reporting to Ottawa it will report to the Minister who is responsible for all of Atlantic Canada's economic development. That is the only difference. I guess I know why the Senators acted as they did. They used to be here making laws.

[*Translation*]

It's pathetic to see that. Imagine the poor Senators over there, who can't come up with any solutions, who can only watch what the government does and try to frustrate the will of the elected representatives of the people.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Liberal Party just have today to wake up and stand up for the House of Commons!

[*English*]

The issue is the powers of the House of Commons versus the prerogatives of the Senators. The Speaker has ruled that this is a money Bill, that they have infringed upon the privileges of each and every Member of the House. I want to see those Liberal Members of Parliament stand up for the right of Canadians who elect their representatives, not the Senators who are not elected.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I want to take the opportunity to address myself to this particular issue before us today on the floor of the House of Commons. It is a great opportunity to follow the Minister of State for Small Businesses and Tourism (Mr. Valcourt), who has made some suggestions and comments with regard to what is taking place in another Chamber and, in particular, what is taking place here in the House of Commons. I failed to hear from Members opposite. Perhaps, as the day progresses, we may hear from them. I failed to hear nor did I receive any specific indications from them as to what parts of this particular Bill they would deem to be a money Bill.

In the motion it says:

> . . . because this House believes that in dividing the Bill, the Senate has altered the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of the grants of aid and supplies set out in the Bill, contrary to Standing Order 87.

I would hope that in the course of our debate Members opposite would clearly spell out, for Members on this side, where that has been a bridge. It is passing strange that government Members have not themselves alluded to their support of the somewhat ill-founded substantive portions here before us today, with any reference to those sections of the Bill.

There is a fundamental problem which members on the government side and, to a lesser extent, my colleagues to the left, the New Democratic Party, do not wish to acknowledge or to address in any substantive way. All of them knew in their hearts that Part I of Bill C-103, notwithstanding the shortcomings and numerous amendments which my colleague, the Hon. Member for Gander—Twillingate (Mr. Baker), made in committee and in the House, would be passed by the House of Commons. But when it comes to the second part they know in their hearts, that what they are doing is fundamentally wrong.

• (1240)

This is a piece of legislation which, by the Government's own admission, and I say to you, Sir, respectfully and sincerely, ought to be treated as two separate and distinct pieces of legislation. Why? First, not I, not members of the New Democratic Party, but government Members in introducing Bill C-103, in referring to it by its short title, said it is the Government Organization Act, Atlantic Canada Act, 1987. The short title in Part II reads Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation Act. There are two distinct, different elements, yet the Government attempts to lob them in as if they were one.

It is interesting to note that when the Bill was introduced in this House, a great deal of time, a great deal of rhetoric was given by the then Minister of Transport, the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), with regard to the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. In checking through *Hansard* it became clearer and clearer that the second part was a throw-

in by the Government of Canada for, in his deliberations, the Minister of the day provided but three or four brief, succinct sentences with regard to Part II of the Bill known as the Enterprise Corporation Act. We have two separate and distinct elements.

Listening to the Minister who preceded me was somewhat reminiscent of watching and listening to the Keystone Kops. Rarely did he talk about the substantive aspects, rarely did he admit what is taking place here, and purposely and intentionally he has attempted, without success, I might add, to brandish the Opposition for wishing to split this Bill as somehow being against motherhood, apple pie, et cetera. I guess the difference between this Party and the other Party at that end of the Chamber is that its Members talk a pretty good game when it comes to assisting and enhancing the economic opportunities in Cape Breton. But when it is put on the line, you get another answer.

I am disappointed, really disappointed, in my colleagues to the left who, for I would believe political gain in their own parts of the world, have not seen fit to support the splitting of this legislation knowing full well as they do that if it were split we in this Party would support it, they would support it and the Government would support it. That does not mean that each and every scintilla of a sentence would be accepted. It does not mean that at all. But I am disappointed for other reasons.

The New Democrats have talked about heart and about sensitivities toward regional economic development. When I hear a colleague from my region, from Atlantic Canada, from Newfoundland, cast aspersions, if you will—and he is free to do that in his choice of words—and say to the people of Canada that no success was ever uncovered with regard to previous regional economic development policy, let me say how shameful, how utterly untrue and how utterly unfair that is. There is no question that my colleagues on the government side as well as in the New Democratic Party would jump to their feet and say, yes, there may have been some successes, but not nearly enough, with which I would concur. But to try to sustain over a period of time that the economic policies of former Governments were not successful in the rebirthing, if you will, or the enlightening of the economy in the Halifax area is utterly untruthful. It is utterly untruthful concerning parts of the city that he represents. Some of those policies worked in Charlottetown and Fredericton. But it goes much beyond the New Democratic Party; it goes to the heart of economic development.

The Cape Breton Development Corporation with its Coal Mining Division and its Industrial Development Division has had some success and some failures. When one tries to address regional inequality, there is no quick fix. There is no panacea. Over its history DEVCO has been able to provide financial assistance to business and to non-profit institutions. It has, however, done more, Mr. Speaker. It has been the leader of a people, because in trying to change the behavioural patterns which comprise an economy, DEVCO has also served the community in lifting its standards. Now the Government comes along and is supported by Members opposite, and particularly the Hon. Member for Cape Breton Highlands—Canso (Mr. O'Neil) who will have to answer in this Chamber as well as elsewhere as to why he would concur with such a decision. The question is this. Will the Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation have the same independence and the same status as the Cape Breton Development Corporation, of which the Industrial Development Division is an integral part?

We heard some pretty unbelievable two-sided arguments from the previous speaker, the Minister of State for Small Businesses and Tourism, as to why he believes it will be the same. I asked this Minister, this fountain of knowledge, this individual who thinks that he has each and all of the answers to regional inequality, why does his own appointed President of the Cape Breton Development Corporation disagree with him? Why does his own appointed Executive Vice-president of the corporation disagree with him? Why, Mr. Speaker? Because of the very fact that it will not have the same independence as the Cape Breton Development Corporation. By a single definition, the Deputy Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency is also made the head of Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation which, accordingly, becomes a subordinate part of a regular government Department or, in the words of the Minister, and I quote, "a member of the ACOA family". That is quite different from the present legislation of the Industrial Development Division which comes under DEVCO.

The Vice-President of the Industrial Development Division of DEVCO was asked by Senator Graham before the Finance Committee:

> So once you have your money approved for the ensuing year, the entire authority as to how that money is spent is up to the Board of Directors?

Mr. Brown, appointed by and reaffirmed by this Government, answered the question by saying, "Yes". You cannot answer in the affirmative when you talk about the Cape Breton Enterprise Corporation. You cannot say that because it becomes an integral part of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, thereby reporting to the Deputy Minister. His head office is in Moncton, he resides in Halifax, and has operations in Cape Breton.

• (1250)

Another aspect of this issue concerns what was said by the Chairman and Acting President of DEVCO, Dr. Theresa MacNeil, appointed by the Government. She said the strength and reputation the corporation acquired in the past 20 years arose in the main from its independent status, its autonomous legal base, which provided the necessary flexibility in dealing with changing circumstances and new situations. She was asked in committee if she had concerns that Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation would not have the same kind of independence that Devco at present enjoys and has enjoyed for the last 20 years. Her answer was, yes, she had concerns.

Those are but two individuals who see many difficulties with the new organization of DEVCO. Yet the Government has intentionally tried to portray the splitting of this Bill as endangering money flowing to ACOA. If there was ever an untruthful portrayal of the facts, it is just that. No Member of Parliament, particularly on the government side, can say that splitting this Bill in any way delays or stops money going to ACOA. Members of the Government do not have to accept my word for that. They should accept the word of their own appointed Deputy Minister, Mr. McPhail. He said in committee that money for ACOA comes from the Estimates. Therefore, when the Minister of State for Tourism tries to portray the Opposition as holding up money for ACOA, I say, with great respect, that this completely and utterly false.

Senator Stewart from Antigonish-Guysborough asked a question of Mr. McPhail in the committee on June 23, 1988. He said:

> Am I correct that you said that you were operating on the basis of the appropriation made for your predecessor organization for the fiscal year 1988-89?
>
> MR. MCPHAIL: No, Sir. There is in the Estimates a separate provision for the agency.

On that same day Senator MacEachen put this question to Mr. McPhail:

> Yes, and your money comes from the Estimates, not this Bill?
>
> MR. MCPHAIL: Yes.

No more smoke-screens. No more false accusations by government Members. No more jumping in bed with the Government by the NDP on this matter.

Mr. Grisé: You don't jump in bed with them, you live there with them.

Mr. Dingwall: Their allegations are utterly false and they know that.

We have heard from Ministers of the Crown, but only one or two Members opposite, about the great things they have done for Cape Breton. They ought to be ashamed, utterly ashamed. It took them four years to conceive a legislative package to institute ACOA. The Prime Minister said in 1984: "Jobs, jobs, jobs". The people in my riding say, "Bull" you know what.

In 1984, when we were in power, the Industrial Development Division received $13.6 million. The Government reduced that to $10.6 million by 1988-89. That is a loss of $12.7 million since the Tories came to power. Don't tell me and my constituents, who are far more intelligent than Members opposite, that the Government has been treating them with equality and generosity. The facts are completely and utterly the opposite. Just the other day a fish plant closed in Glace Bay, throwing in excess of 300 women out of work, and the response of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon) was to bob and weave, weave and bob, not reply to correspondence and not meet with the people concerned.

When we stand in this Chamber as Members from Cape Breton and ask the Government to split a Bill, which it should do based both on precedent and substance, we do it because we speak not only from the heart but from the head. It is clear to each and every living soul on the Island of Cape Breton that this is an affront to the independence DEVCO has enjoyed for a considerable period of time. It is an affront to regional economic development in Cape Breton.

I can say in conclusion only that government Members who support the raping of DEVCO as we now know it, and members of the NDP who support that attack, will answer for it in a general election, and when we are elected we will restore the original mandate to the corporation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments.

Mr. Harris: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member just told us that the NDP wished to destroy the Industrial Development Division of Devco. No one from his Party was in Port Hawkesbury when we first heard about the major concerns with that division. It was an NDP member, myself, who moved the motions in committee to delete that part of the Act dealing with the destruction of the division. We also spoke against it in this House. Therefore, when the Hon. Member says what he says, he is creating a false impression in the minds of the voters of Cape Breton and Members of this House.

What I ask him to tell us is whether or not he supports and is prepared to stand up for the privileges of this House as against those of the Senate.

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, I am in your hands, but I always thought it was unparliamentary to comment on whether Members attend certain functions of a legislative nature. However, if the Hon. Member wishes to raise that concern perhaps we could refer to other situations where he and his Party have not particularly participated in debate on initiatives which have been taken on Cape Breton Island. I could recite for him a litany of those initiatives.

With regard to the substantive question, the motion before us, what he is saying to the coal miners of Cape Breton is that this is the first stage of the Tory Government's move to privatization of DEVCO through which we will see the elimination of the coal industry in Nova Scotia. He is saying that he supports that action by saying we will not split this legislation.

May I call it one o'clock?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being one o'clock p.m., I do now leave the chair until two o'clock p.m. this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

S. O. 21

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

HOUSING

TORONTO—PROPOSED USE OF RAILWAY LANDS

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, the recent $1.2 billion housing proposal by the City of Toronto to build affordable accommodation for 12,000 people offers yet another opportunity for the federal Government to demonstrate a tangible commitment to ease the crisis in affordable housing that has befallen Metro Toronto and other major urban centres.

To date the Conservative Government has failed to respond to proposals to utilize either parts of the Downsview Airforce Base or surplus postal lands for additional and reasonably priced residential units.

Now, in terms of the new St. Lawrence project, which includes 15 acres owned by the Canadian National Railways, a federal Crown corporation, I urge the Government to direct the Canadian National Railway to release these lands and become a co-operative partner in this housing plan.

The Government is quickly running out of time and opportunities. The urban housing malaise demands that the federal Government act swiftly and decisively.

* * *

[*Translation*]

OCEAN RESOURCES

DEVELOPMENT OF HIBERNIA OIL FIELD

Mr. Gérald Comeau (South West Nova): Mr. Speaker, today, all Canadians were delighted to hear the news of the historic decision to proceed with the development of the Hibernia oil site, a project that will involve billions of dollars for the development of this offshore oil field. Thanks to this project, the people of Newfoundland can look to the future with confidence. They can look forward to being on an equal footing with their fellow Canadian citizens, to a future of dignity. While the impact of this megaproject will be felt across Canada the spinoffs will be very substantial for the Atlantic Provinces and Quebec, involving the purchase of supplies, manufacturing and engineering firms. Furthermore, thousand of jobs will be created.

I want to congratulate the governments of Canada and Newfoundland, as well as the members of the consortium who signed this historic agreement, and I congratulate the citizens of the Atlantic provinces who will benefit from this project.

* * *

[*English*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

TRAINING PROGRAMS—IMMIGRANT WOMEN'S ACCESS

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the Conservative Government was given another clear message about its language policy for immigrant women. The largest Roman Catholic women' s group in Ontario, the Catholic Women's League, has called for greater access for immigrant women to government subsidized language training programs. These women add their voices to many more groups that have urged progressive reforms of federal policy in this area.

Despite these numerous calls and despite a legal challenge under the Charter of Rights, the Government continues to ignore the fact that its language policy discriminates against women and keeps immigrants in low-paying, dead-end jobs.

Immigrant women need a fair language policy in order to integrate and contribute best to Canadian society. The Government would be wise to avoid a lengthy and costly legal battle, and start negotiating for better programs for immigrant women.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE LATE CLAUDE BRUNET, C.M.

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, every person, every society needs role models who live exemplary lives and who impress us by their humanism and warmth. Today, we mourn the passing of Mr. Claude Brunet, the founding president of the *Comité provincial des malades* in Quebec, who championed the rights of the chronically ill, who was the moral and political support of the disabled and the apostle of the sick and all those who received medical care.

Mr. Brunet probably did more for the image of individuals who are stricken by illness than the most sweeping reforms of our health care system. Mr. Brunet was a true advocate, not because of any desire for financial gain but for humanitarian and highly laudable reasons. The passing of Mr. Brunet comes as a shock, but even after his death, he remains a symbol of the urge to live.

[*English*]

FISHERIES

ANNOUNCED CLOSURE OF HIGHLAND FISHERIES PLANT IN GLACE BAY, N.S.

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern and, indeed, disappointment with the Government of Canada and its lack of sensitivity toward the former employees of Highland Fisheries in Glace Bay. It should be noted that the people of Cape Breton have had to sustain a number of set-backs since the present Government came to power, but in particular the people of Glace Bay.

Recently Highland Fisheries, owned and operated by Clearwater Fine Foods of Bedford, Nova Scotia, indicated that its plant will be closed because the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon) will not provide that plant or those employees with an enterprise allocation of fish. Some 310 individuals have lost their employment as a result.

I am further advised that the Minister has failed to meet personally with the Premier or senior management to discuss this situation. Almost 3,000 people from Glace Bay and surrounding areas have signed a petition calling upon the Government of Canada to provide the necessary quota of fish in order that this particular operation employing some 310, mainly, if not all, females, would re-open immediately. It is time that the Government of Canada showed some generosity and sensitivity to the workers at the Highland fish plant.

* * *

ENERGY

DEVELOPMENT OF HIBERNIA OILFIELD

Mr. Dennis H. Cochrane (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, today marks the beginning of a historic agreement involving the Government of Canada, the Government of the Province of Newfoundland, and a major oil consortium to develop the long awaited and often promised Hibernia oil project. The dream and promises of past Governments have finally become a reality under the Progressive Conservative Government of Canada.

Hibernia represents the largest single capital investment ever undertaken in Atlantic Canada and will usher in an era of major economic development in Newfoundland. Hibernia will open the door to the development of other energy resources off the shores of Atlantic Canada. The spin-off opportunities will be significant, not only in Newfoundland but throughout Atlantic Canada.

Efforts will be made to achieve Canadian content targets of 50 per cent, to maintain 66 per cent construction phase employment for Atlantic Canadians, and to target 80 to 95 per cent of engineering, design, and project management contracts for Canadian firms.

The Government of Canada's contribution represents an investment in the future of Newfoundland and an investment in the future of Atlantic Canada. Most important, it represents an investment in new jobs, new skills, and new technology for Atlantic Canadians.

* * *

PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS

RESIGNATIONS FROM BRITISH COLUMBIA CABINET

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): The Liberal-Conservative coalition in British Columbia is alive and well but looking for a new leader. Brian Smith from the Conservative wing of the Socreds and brazen Grace McCarthy of the Liberal wing have both resigned from the Vander Zalm Cabinet because Bill Vander Zalm runs a one-man band that always plays off key.

The number one enemy of the continued Liberal-Conservative coalition is no longer the NDP but Bill Vander Zalm, the very person the coalition chose two years ago as their saviour when the Government of Bill Bennett was totally discredited. Bill Vander Zalm hung on to power for the Socreds by running against the Bennett record and by promising reform. Now McCarthy and Smith try to restore their popularity by running against Vander Zalm.

This time the people of British Columbia will not be fooled. Regardless of their style, Bill Bennett, Grace McCarthy, Brian Smith, and Bill Vander Zalm all belong to the same right-wing coalition. They deserve each other. The people of British Columbia deserve better.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

OPENING OF GEOSCIENTIFIC CENTRE IN STE-FOY

Mrs. Suzanne Duplessis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Science and Technology)): Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday in Quebec City I was at the news conference where the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Masse) announced that after an absence of 110 years, the Geological Survey of Canada would be back in Quebec with the opening of a geoscience centre in Ste-Foy, at the INRS.

In five years time, the centre will have a budget of $24.2 million, of which $13 million will be provided by the federal government. Furthermore, there will be 15 new jobs in research and management. Mr. Speaker, the centre will provide for a presence in Quebec of the Geological Survey of

Canada and correct the existing imbalance by promoting increased participation by Francophone scientists in research and science projects.

This is an excellent initiative by our Government, and I want to thank the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources who once again has helped Francophones to take their rightful place in this important field.

The entire scientific community in Quebec was delighted with the announcement, and the Minister, Raymond Savoie, Jacques Desnoyers of INRS and Gilles Boulet, President of the University of Quebec, were enthusiastic.

Once again, our Government has demonstrated its equitable treatment of our country's two language communities.

* * *

• (1410)

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

OPPORTUNITY TO ESTABLISH TEN WEEKS' ELIGIBITY PERIOD FOR RURAL REGIONS

Mr. Fernand Robichaud (Westmorland—Kent): Mr. Speaker, for some months now I have been urging the government to distinguish rural regions from urban regions when statistics are compiled to determine the number of weeks required to be eligible for unemployment insurance. Unfortunately, the Government is continuing to use a system that is not fair to rural residents. The fact that the unemployment rate is actually twice as high in rural areas is not taken into account by the system. In those areas it is much more difficult to find jobs that last more than 10 weeks especially when one considers that many of those jobs depend on fishing seasons.

The Department of Employment and Immigration has just announced that once again for the next 30 days people living in south-eastern New-Brunswick will have to work 16 weeks to be eligible for unemployment insurance.

That is unfair, Mr. Speaker, and once again I beseech the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mrs. McDougall) to act and to see to it that the eligibility period for the people of south-eastern New Brunswick is reduced to 10 weeks.

* * *

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that after considering historic, economic, and political implications, some Canadians want to reject the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement.

After all, Prince Edward Islanders turned down the concept of creating a Canadian nation in 1867, a majority of New Brunswickers voted against it in 1865, and Newfoundlanders rejected the idea several times, all because of the historic, economic, and political implications.

Fortunately for all of us today, including the present free trade opponents, the visionaries, not the timid, prevailed and created Canada. If the visionaries prevail this time the free trade agreement will create a Canada that is economically stronger and politically more self assured than ever before.

* * *

APARTHEID

SOUTH AFRICA—CALL ON GOVERNMENT TO FREE NELSON MANDELA

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the federal New Democratic Party caucus, indeed, I am sure on behalf of all Members of Parliament, I rise to wish Nelson Mandela a happy seventieth birthday, and call on the Government of South Africa to free Nelson Mandela to permit him to take his rightful place in the history of South Africa and play a constructive role in the development of a democratic non-racial South Africa.

This is a day on which all peoples of the world are joining to express their unanimous wish that the South African Government finally wake up to reality, wake up to justice and free Nelson Mandela, and get rid of apartheid to permit the kind of South Africa for which the blacks of South Africa have been working so long, with Nelson Mandela as their leader.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

PROSPECTIVE IMMIGRANTS—CONDUCT OF HEARINGS BY TELEPHONE

Mr. John Oostrom (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, the Federal Court of Appeal has ruled that prospective immigrants overseas have the right to have an immigration hearing by telephone. This added condition will further increase the huge backlog of cases already present in our overburdened immigration system.

Let us consider the ramifications of the ruling. Huge costs will be incurred by the cost of overseas calls, and the amount of overtime that will be incurred due to the time differences between Canada and the rest of the world. Many Third World nations do not have the telecommunication technology and equipment in order to have reliable conference calls. Language will be a major problem. How will translators function over the phone, and what will be the cost?

The application of an oath will also pose legal problems. Thus this ruling will result in a costly nightmare that will create further chaos in our immigration system.

* * *

SMALL BUSINESS

CRITICISM OF GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, I salute the many people who successfully run small businesses across Canada. I share the disappointment of those who have suffered under Tory small business philosophy and policy.

You who have been squeezed through tax increases, through broken promises for a revamped Federal Business Development Bank policy, and through cuts to programs under the Small Business Loans Act, know that I have been listening and I sympathize with your concerns.

The Conservative Government has increased the cost of your telephones. It has reduced loan guarantees. It has begun charging small businesses for the right to borrow this money and it has increased the size of businesses that qualify for small business loans. It seems in the eyes of the Government that you have to be a big business to be considered a small business. That is Tory small business policy.

We need a much more constructive approach, including more streamlined access to a co-ordinated range of government services. I remind small businesses that have been left out in the cold by the Tories, that all hope is not lost. Change is not too far off. Fairness and equity for small business owners and their families are the policy concerns of the Liberal Party of Canada.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

ACQUISITION OF NUCLEAR POWERED SUBMARINES—MEMBER'S POSITION

Mr. Ted Schellenberg (Nanaimo—Alberni): Mr. Speaker, last week in this House the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) produced a report I had written to my constituents in which I related my thoughts on the proposal to purchase nuclear powered submarines. The Member told this Chamber that I had "recently stated" my opinions on the issue, and later suggested to the media that this is a new development.

The Hon. Member was wrong, as he often is. I wrote that piece in June, 1987, when the Defence White Paper was issued. It was published in all of the newspapers in my riding of Nanaimo—Alberni some 13 months ago, which tells us a great deal about the abilities of the NDP research department.

The lengthy debate on this issue also tells us a lot about the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada and our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney). This is a Party of discussion and debate. This is a Party that listens to what Canadians have to say.

The Prime Minister has given this nation single digit inflation, single digit unemployment, and single digit interest rates. Prime Minister Trudeau only gave us the digit in British Columbia.

Trudeau called backbenchers "nobodies". The Prime Minister has allowed us to be called "somebodies". That is why the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada will be leading this nation into the next century.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

[*Translation*]

HISTORIC SITES

IMPORTANCE OF LACHINE RAPIDS

Mr. Claude Lanthier (LaSalle): Mr. Speaker, recently our very able Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) publicly recognized a most noteworthy natural feature of the environment situated in our riding of LaSalle, the Lachine Rapids. In fact, a bronze plaque confirming the importance of that part of the St. Lawrence, both for tourism and from the historical point of view will be put up next August close to that enchanting site.

All the constituents of the wonderful riding of LaSalle—Émard want to seize the opportunity of this unique event which constitutes national recognition of the site to issue a most cordial invitation to all Canadians. We hope that this symbolic action augurs well for the eventual recognition of the LaChine Rapids as a world heritage site.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

ENERGY

DEVELOPMENT OF HIBERNIA OILFIELD—ANNOUNCEMENT OF PLANS

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. This morning in Newfoundland and Labrador, the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland announced with great fanfare and excitement their plans with respect to the development of Hibernia oil.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: The province has not seen such a commotion since former Premier Frank Moores fired off dynamite on both sides of the Strait of Belle Isle commencing a $1 billion hydro tunnel project. Frank Moores was re-elected, but to this day we have not seen the hydro tunnel project.

With this in mind, I want to ask the Deputy Prime Minister what the following words contained in the document released this morning in St. John's, Newfoundland, by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and Premier Peckford, mean:

> The execution of this Statement of Principles by the signatories hereto is not intended to and does not create legally enforceable rights or obligations between the signatories hereto or between any of the signatories hereto and any third parties.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister separate himself from the enthusiasm of this photo opportunity for a moment and explain those words to the House and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I find it rather strange that an Hon. Member from Newfoundland would criticize a very important national and regional project that will be good for Canada, good for the Atlantic region, and particularly good for Newfoundlanders. It will generate some 47,000 person-years of employment in Canada, and almost 35,000 person-years in work for Newfoundland.

What has been announced today is a Statement of Principles. That is precisely what it is. The finite details of this will be worked out in a formalized legal fashion.

• (1420)

DEFINITIVE AGREEMENT QUERY

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister says he finds my reaction surprising. I tell him that my reaction, and the reaction of all Newfoundlanders, is born of experience. We heard Premier Peckford announce this project once in 1979, we heard it again in 1982, each time coupled with the calling of an election.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): What's Turner's position on Hibernia? We know what Trudeau's position was.

Mr. Tobin: On both occasions the hopes of Newfoundlanders were crushed and on both occasions many Newfoundland investors lost sizeable amounts of money. How can the Government this morning in Newfoundland describe the announcement not, as the Deputy Prime Minister just said, as a statement of principles, not as a progress report, not as a report card, but as a firm agreement, when in fact, and I quote again from the document:

> The signatories hereto will use their best efforts to finalize a definitive agreement or agreements—embodying this Statement of Principles as expeditiously as possible but in any event by March 31, 1989.

That is eight months hence, one day before April Fool's Day. What do those words mean? Will the Deputy Prime Minister answer?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious the Hon. Member has never been involved in an agreement of this nature.

Mr. Tobin: I would like to be.

Mr. Mazankowski: This is quite usual. This is the way in which a major project of this nature proceeds. When the Hon. Member suggests that there was disappointment in Newfoundland, I can tell him that there was disappointment in Newfoundland when the province lost two court battles over whether in fact it had any share in the ownership. This Government acknowledged there was a partnership in terms of the ownership of those resources, which was enshrined in the Atlantic Accord.

This has been a positive step by step process, and today Canadians right across the country, but particularly in Newfoundland, are welcoming this announcement because it is a good announcement for Canada, it is a good announcement for Newfoundland, and it is a good announcement for Atlantic Canada.

REQUEST THAT NEWFOUNDLAND INVESTORS BE GUARANTEED AGAINST POSSIBLE LOSSES

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister, who should know better, and ordinarily does, now attempts to drag the decisions of the courts into a partisan arena.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: We are talking about the credibility not only of the Government of Canada but the credibility of the Government of Newfoundland which, for the third time, has trumped up a Statement of Principles and called it a definite agreement.

The Deputy Prime Minister has the document the same as I do. Will he now not admit that this statement that I have quoted, these words I have quoted, are an escape clause allowing any one of the partners to walk away at any time from the so-called Statement of Principles announced this morning? If he is not prepared to admit that, if he is not prepared to admit that unassailable fact, will he give an ironclad commitment today to Newfoundlanders and, in particular to Newfoundland investors, that any money they may lose this time, as they have twice before because of a less than forthright statement by politicians anxious for an election call, those losses will be guaranteed by the Government of Canada? Is the Deputy Prime Minister prepared to say that today in the House of Commons?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the Hon. Member has suggested, I was not criticizing any court action. I was simply criticizing the policy and position of the former Liberal Government which would not acknowledge the fact that the province had any share or potential ownership in the resources.

Mr. Tobin: Will you acknowledge you do not have an agreement? Will you acknowledge that?

Mr. Mazankowski: It was in fact a Liberal policy that was militating against the interests of Newfoundland. That was clearly the case.

What we have here is a definitive Statement of Principles which has been agreed to—

Ms. Copps: Tories with principles?

Mr. Mazankowski: —by the parties; the consortium, the federal Government, and the Government of the Province of Newfoundland. I am sure, as the Government of Canada negotiated the Atlantic Accord with the Government of Newfoundland, as the Government of Canada negotiated the Western Accord with the western provinces, this policy will be implemented on the basis of that, and it is a day on which all Canadians should herald a very major development based on a very definitive and practical policy.

TERMS OF STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Hon. William Rompkey (Grand Falls—White Bay—Labrador): Mr. Speaker, I also want to ask the Deputy Prime Minister about this so-called Statement of Principles which in fact has to be the most unprincipled statement ever put forward because the player with the least gives the most. The companies get billions of dollars and an ironclad guarantee. The Government of Canada gets its duties and its taxes all paid. Yet Newfoundland, little Newfoundland with the highest unemployment rate in Canada, is asked to give up its taxes and to lower its corporate tax and to pay $100 million on top of that. Why is it that the player with the least has to give the most? And isn't this in fact the biggest rip-off since Churchill Falls?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I find the Hon. Member's rationale rather amusing because, under the Liberal policy, the Government and the people of Newfoundland would have gotten nothing, absolutely nothing.

Mr. Rompkey: One hundred per cent of royalties. That was guaranteed.

Mr. Mazankowski: Absolutely nothing. He asks what Newfoundlanders are going to get. Well, 47,000 person-years for Canada and almost 35,000 person-years for Newfoundland. In terms of the macro economic impact of Hibernia for Newfoundland, it will be $11.6 billion in 1987 dollars. In terms of incremental employment, it will be 94,350 person-years of employment. If that isn't good for Newfoundland, I don't know what is.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. William Rompkey (Grand Falls—White Bay—Labrador): Mr. Speaker, first of all, the Liberal offer was 100 per cent of royalties to Newfoundland. That was the Liberal offer. We have been offered jobs before. Under Churchill Falls we sold our birthright for a few menial jobs and we are not doing it again.

An Hon. Member: Who did it?

An Hon. Member: Joey Smallwood.

Mr. Rompkey: On this agreement, which comes to conclusion on April Fool's Day, I say to the Deputy Prime Minister, fool us once, shame on you; fool us twice, shame on us. We are not going to be fooled again, and I ask if this is not simply the greatest rip-off since Churchill Falls.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, we have a clear picture of where the Liberal Party now stands. It is against the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. We saw that demonstrated today. It is against Hibernia. It is against Atlantic Canada.

Mr. Tobin: We are against lies, l-i-e-s.

Mr. Mazankowski: And if what they are saying is they want—

Mr. Tobin: That's what we are against. You wouldn't know that if it jumped up and bit you.

Mr. Mazankowski: If the Hon. members from Newfoundland and Labrador are suggesting that they are going to tear up this deal, well, I guess that will be their position. Let them suffer the consequences.

Mr. Rompkey: We will offer the old deal. We will offer our deal.

REQUEST FOR GUARANTEE PROJECT WILL PROCEED

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, while the people of Newfoundland and Labrador would welcome economic activity if it happens as a result of this Hibernia announcement today, I want to ask the Deputy Prime Minister, in view of the fact that the Statement of Principles signed does not create legally enforceable rights, is not binding on any of the parties unless there is a real agreement reached by March of 1989, what guarantee is there that this is not just a pre-election scheme by both the Canadian Government and the Newfoundland Government? What guarantee is there that this project is going to go ahead at all?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the guarantee is that you have the signature of the Government of Canada, the signature of the Government of Newfoundland, and the signature of the consortium.

ROYALTY PAYMENTS TO NEWFOUNDLAND

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, an examination of this deal shows that Newfoundland is drastically reducing and forgoing enormous royalties to allow its own oil to be developed. This deal provides minimum royalties to Newfoundland, a far cry from the 10 per cent to 35 per cent that Newfoundland was talking about and proposed years ago. Does this deal not end up being just like another Churchill Falls for Newfoundland—only construction jobs, and a long-term role of watching our energy flow out of the province with very little economic return?

• (1430)

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, day after day in this House we hear from Members from Newfoundland talking about the high unemployment level and the fact that there is a desire and a need for regional economic development. Here we find out today about a very major project that has been in the making for some 10 years. While it should be heralded as a major breakthrough, we find Hon. Members criticizing it.

In terms of jobs, as I said, 47,000 person-years direct and indirect will be created, with 35,000 person-years for Newfoundland. In terms of the permanent jobs there will be 1,100 direct jobs in Newfoundland, 2,450 indirect jobs, for a total of 3,500 jobs, after the project is completed. In incremental terms to the Gross Domestic Product it will add some $15.1 billion in 1987 dollars to Canada, $11.6 billion to Newfoundland, 106,900 person-years of work for Canada and 94,350 person-years of work for Newfoundland.

These are not figures that are pulled out of the air. These are figures that have been developed by the Governments and the consortium. The Hon. Member opposite should be congratulating the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada rather than criticizing them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

REQUEST FOR JOB GUARANTEES

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Minister produces figures that he said are developed by the consortium. Even in this non-binding agreement all the provisions related to jobs and procurement for Newfoundland and for Canada are only targets. They are projections. There are no guarantees.

Why has the Government not insisted that the oil consortium guarantee job content for Canada and Newfoundland? Why has it not guaranteed that the goods and services required for production will come from Newfoundland? Why are they just targets? Why are there no guarantees? Does this have something to do with the trade deal?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this is an important project, not only for the economic development fortunes of Newfoundland and the Atlantic region—

Mr. Tobin: An important photo opportunity, but it is no deal.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: If you want a job after the election you better listen to this.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): Are you bribing him? Mr. Justice Tobin?

Mr. Rodriguez: That is unparliamentary.

Mr. Speaker: I do not know whether that was an offer or a threat.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, as I was trying to say, this is not only an important project for economic development and job-creating activities in Newfoundland and the Atlantic region but, indeed, for all of Canada. What is more important is that it is important in terms of security of supply. This will develop between 520 million and 650 million barrels of oil which will help Canada attain and achieve its self-security and, in particular, supply the Atlantic requirements. That should be welcome news for everybody.

The NDP, we know, and the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre, expressed views about the frigate contract going to Saint John, New Brunswick. Now we have a Member right from Newfoundland criticizing the Hibernia project. We can only assume that the NDP are against the Atlantic region—

Mr. Cassidy: Balderdash!

Mr. Mazankowski: This Government is not against the Atlantic region. It is for the Atlantic region. That is why this program is going forward.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

COME-BY-CHANCE OIL REFINERY

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question, likewise, is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. The Deputy Prime Minister says that this deal will help security of supply in Atlantic Canada. That is not true. There is nothing in the agreement that says that any of the oil has to be maintained for refining or use in Atlantic Canada. With the free trade agreement there is no way to ensure that it will.

Also, Come-by-Chance is the only refinery in Canada which cannot sell into the Canadian market. After the free trade

agreement it will be the only refinery in North America which cannot sell into Canada.

Why is the Government not ensuring that some of this oil be processed in the Come-by-Chance refinery and sold in Canada? Why is the Minister not assuring us that at least a portion of this oil will be used to meet the security supply problem in eastern Canada?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I have a little difficulty in following the twisted and distorted logic of the Hon. Member. He knows very well that there is nothing in the free trade agreement that compels the Government of Canada or any province to sell energy to the United States at any given time. That is strictly within the control of the province.

This project is being developed for the security of supply, for job opportunities, and for regional economic development, not only in Atlantic Canada, not only in Newfoundland, but right across the country.

PAYMENT OF ROYALTIES

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, in addition to the fact that it has nothing to do with security of supply, because it is not there, it is not an agreement, it is an agreement to agree. It is a Statement of Principles.

When the Prime Minister was campaigning in the 1984 federal election he said that oil off the shore of Newfoundland would be treated exactly the same as oil inland in western Canada. Yet Newfoundland gets a small fraction of the royalties that are available to the provinces in western Canada.

Why is it that the province in Canada that can give the least economically is paying such a high price for this development project?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I repeat that under the Liberal policy the people and the Government of Newfoundland would have gotten nothing.

Mr. Rompkey: That's not true and you know it.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: You were in Cabinet and you didn't know it.

Mr. Rompkey: Completely inaccurate.

Mr. Mazankowski: This deal is developed consistent with the Atlantic Accord. The Hon. Member knows very well that there have been royalty concessions on projects such as Syncrude and Suncor, and if the provinces which own the resources wish to make a royalty concession, to get the resource developed and to get economic development stimulated, then that is clearly within their prerogative. That is precisely what the Government of Newfoundland chose to do.

The over-all net benefit to the Government and to the people of Newfoundland is clearly a positive one.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

FEDERAL COURT RULING ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister with regard to the historic decision of the Federal Court of Canada last Friday which I regard as a great victory for the men and women who work for the Public Service of Canada.

As the Minister knows, the Federal Court struck down Section 32 of the Public Service Employment Act as being contrary to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, thereby removing the restrictions on political activity by federal government employees.

My question is the following. Will the Government undertake not to appeal this decision to the Supreme Court of Canada?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, naturally, we are looking at the judgment in some detail now, having received it on Friday. We will consider the implications of the decision.

In that regard I think special mention should be made of the Hon. Member for Ottawa West who has given leadership in this House with respect to the question of political rights of public servants.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: It is interesting to note in the course of the judgment that only part of Section 32 was struck down on the basis that there was not sufficient definition of the rules with respect to the Public Service being involved in political activity. All Members of Parliament would share the view expressed by the courts that political neutrality in the Public Service in positions which involve public policy and dealing with Governments is a desirable objective.

We in our Party have demonstrated by our policy that political rights are a priority for us with respect to public servants. We intend to take the appropriate action on this particular issue.

GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the Minister of Justice that he and his Government have consistently opposed efforts made by back-benchers on his side of the House as well as by members of this Party to get political rights for federal employees. They have not lifted

a finger in order to implement the promise they made back in 1984.

I ask the Minister whether the Government still upholds the promise made in 1984 in which the Progressive Conservative Party said that it favoured a general removal of the restrictions on political activity, especially for those public servants covered by collective agreements, and that these restrictions were unnecessary and might not be justifiable under the terms of our Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

• (1440)

Is that a promise that one can trust, Mr. Speaker, or is the Government going to back away from that promise and take this matter to appeal, rather than allowing a good decision to stand?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member were to read the judgment he would find that the court indicated that there is the capacity in the Government to define specifically the limitations with respect to political activity. The Hon. Member would have to agree that we would have to look at the appropriate legislation that should be applied with respect to the public service.

Having said that, I do not think that any Government, in terms of its relationship with the public service, has had more success with Presidents of the Treasury Board than this Government. We have moved forward with respect to five of the six items which we were negotiating with the public service unions.

Mr. Cassidy: Not on this particular issue.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: With this particular issue.

We are now examining it, and especially in light of this decision.

Mr. Cassidy: Only because you have to.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: When the Hon. Member says that we should not look at the court decision, I think he is singing another tune. I am sure the Hon. Member would agree with us that we want to make sure what the law is and what the Charter implications are. I do not rule out the possibility of appeal to make sure that we have the highest court in the land looking at the law with respect to the Charter and public service rights. We have not made a decision. We have not ruled out the possibility of appeal until we have had a chance to look at it.

If we can receive some co-operation from the Opposition we might look at some legislative initiatives that we can pass in short order. Perhaps the Hon. Member could have his House Leader consider that possibility.

REQUEST THAT SECTION 32 OF PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT ACT BE SUSPENDED PENDING APPEAL

Mr. David Daubney (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the same Minister. In his capacity as Attorney General I would like to ask him, if a decision is taken to appeal the Federal Court of Appeal decision to the Supreme Court, would he undertake or give serious consideration to not asking, as part of that application for leave, that Section 32 be considered to be reinstated pending the disposition of the appeal so that the judgment of the court, until it is appealed, will stand?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I reiterate the point that I think all Members would agree with, that it is important to have neutrality in our Public Service. We would not want to have a politicized Public Service in this country.

I can assure the Hon. Member that we will be consulting with him and with other Members. I will be consulting with my colleagues who have responsibility in this regard as to what would be the best policy to give some stability to the system and to allow us to move forward. It may take the form of legislative action, in which case I know the Hon. Member has a very substantial interest because of his leadership and his Bill. He can rest assured that, as far as the Government is concerned, we will be wanting his input in this whole matter.

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SERVANT'S RIGHT TO PARTICIPATE IN POLITICS— GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, many had been rejoicing since Friday, but the news that the Minister is considering appealing has many people worried and shows once again that the Conservative Government is unable to make a decision.

The Government promised rights for public servants four years ago, but it took a court decision to say that they do have rights. Now we hear the Minister saying that he is not sure whether he will appeal or not.

Can the Minister assure this House today that he will not appeal the decision and that he will let the court decision to give full political rights to public servants stand?

[*English*]

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I simply want to remind the Hon. Member and the House of the point that I raised earlier. This decision has been based upon the lack of precision and specificity in the current rules with respect to political involvement. As I understand the court's decision the rules were too broad and were not properly defined.

This court by its decision, and other court decisions, have indicated that the principle of political neutrality is an important position to be taken with respect to the Public Service.

We are examining the decision with a view to establishing an appropriate legislative framework. I have not ruled out any possibilities at this time, and I think that is fair, until we have looked at the whole decision and see the underlying implications. That is not in the nature of a threat. That is simply prudence which any Attorney General would want to take when there is an important decision such as this under the Charter.

I reiterate to the Hon. Member and to all Members in the House that it would be our intention to look at this very carefully to see what the legislative options are for us. That will require the co-operation of the Opposition, because we have a very heavy legislative load. If we receive the co-operation of the Opposition we would want to ensure that we put forward a régime that is fair and consistent with our long standing and well known party position and government position, and I hope that we can count on the help of the Hon. Member.

EMPLOYEES OF CROWN CORPORATIONS AND AGENCIES

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Federal Court of Appeal applies to approximately 214,000 public servants under the Public Service Employment Act.

Many Crown corporations and agencies, with possibly over 300,000 public sector employees, over the years have copied the directives—the restrictive directives, mind you—of the Public Service Commission in regard to political participation.

Given that these corporations and agencies over the past 20 to 25 years have literally given their employees restrictive political rights, will the Minister and the Government be clear and issue directives today to Crown corporations and agencies regarding the political participation of their employees so that we do not create two groups of public sector employees—those who have rights, and those who do not have rights? Will the Minister act on that today?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the Hon. Member, who I think is a fair person, that this Government has moved, in the time that we have been honoured to serve as government, with our relationships with public servants and with respect to the whole question of the organization of Crown corporations.

We have brought a rationale and a responsible approach that were lacking in the previous Government. I know that the Hon. Member was critical of the Liberal Government because of the fact that it did not take steps in these areas. We are moving on those matters. We have committed ourselves to action. We will carry those commitments out. We will need the help of the Hon. Members in the Opposition so that they do not delay the matter and will co-operate with us in the sense of making sure that public servants' interests are served in the proper way.

SPORTS

WORLD JUNIOR TRACK AND FIELD CHAMPIONSHIPS—BROADCASTING FACILITIES

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister, and it is placed in light of the fact that we seem to be enjoying Christmas in July.

The World Junior Track and Field Championships will be held in the great riding of Nickel Belt in northeastern Ontario and the Sudbury region beginning on July 26. To be able to broadcast internationally to the 150 countries that are represented at the games the broadcast facilities needed some $684,000. They are now short by $300,000.

We are pleased with the $115,000 that we did receive from the Government. Would the Government consider digging deep into the bag to see if we could get the other $300,000?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, replying on behalf of the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport, all of us want to thank him and the Department for the sensitivity brought to this issue. We have been trying to have these types of games right across Canada, as the Hon. Member knows. I also thank him for his words of thanks for facilitating the games, together with many volunteers, and I am sure those are the people we should thank first.

The Government of Canada has tried to move those games forward. The Nordic Games in Thunder Bay are another example.

I cannot give the Member any specifics on his request, but I can assure him that I will take it back to the Minister and we will discuss it.

REQUEST FOR EARLY DECISION ON ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, as all Members know, we have all had our sympathies with the Sudbury basin when the price of nickel was down. It is a single industry town. The community has since made great strides in moving forward. This was a great attempt to project the community internationally with all the possibilities that would ensue. In light of the fact that we need to have an answer soon, will the Minister mind getting the machinery moving because the games open on the twenty-sixth?

• (1450)

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is correct. A lot of us, including Members from northern Ontario, were attempting to try to build a broader base than the metal industry; tourism to name another one, and, for example, the whole matter of the arts community and what has been done in Sudbury in that field.

I will look into this matter along with my colleagues. While I cannot give any guarantees, obviously, I can assure my hon. friend that we will see what we can do.

* * *

FISHERIES

HIGHLAND FISHERIES PLANT IN GLACE BAY, N.S.—REQUEST FOR ENTERPRISE ALLOCATION

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. Over 300 employees of Highland Fisheries in Glace Bay have been informed by their owners, Clearwater Fine Foods of Halifax, that their plant is closed and will be closed because the federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans will not give that plant or its trawlers an enterprise allocation.

Will the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans indicate to those employees and to the people of Glace Bay specifically when he received a written request from Highland Fisheries and why he is refusing to grant this enterprise allocation when, in fact, he knows the unemployment situation in Glace Bay is chronic and getting worse as a result of this particular action?

Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member raises a problem of extreme concern to the fishermen and their families of Glace Bay, Nova Scotia. It is a problem of which I have been aware for several weeks. This is not an uncommon problem in some of the communities where there are smaller fish plants which did not receive large enterprise allocations under the enterprise allocation scheme introduced by the former Liberal Government in 1984.

The Hon. Member well knows that Clearwater Fine Foods does have enterprise allocations. In fact, it has uncaught enterprise allocations for the present year. These are dispersed according to a process in which all of the companies and the Atlantic Council of Fisheries Ministers engage each autumn. I cannot violate that process by making a special exceptional allocation to this plant when there are still fish in the water that could be caught. We gave Clearwater additional enterprise allocations in the northern waters this year for vessels between 65 and 100 feet.

The problem arises for other reasons relating to market prices and not to a shortage of fish available to Clearwater Fine Foods.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): That answer, Mr. Speaker, is in direct contradiction to what senior company officials are saying to the employees.

The Minister will know that the chronic unemployment situation in Glace Bay is there now. People need the assistance of the federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. The Cape Breton Advisory Committee has recommended an enterprise allocation for that company, the provincial Minister of Fisheries has agreed with that particular request. Based upon fairness, equity, and because of the chronic unemployment, on behalf of the employees and on behalf of the community, will the Minister not now reconsider his position of some time ago and give an enterprise allocation to that plant and to the trawlers at Highland Fisheries, thereby enabling those workers to have some dignity for themselves and their families?

Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member may not like my answer. I said that we had exercised equity and fairness. We have been bound by an enterprise allocation scheme which his Government created in 1983-84. Under that enterprise allocation scheme, which I have supplemented in the past year, there are still fish waiting to be caught by Clearwater Fine Foods which could be delivered to the Glace Bay plant rather than to the other plants to which it is delivering.

The problem results because of a softening price and demand for fish in the market at the present time, and because Clearwater is not willing to continue to employ these workers, notwithstanding the fact that there are fish available to Clearwater's plant if Clearwater chose to go out and catch them.

* * *

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

CFB PETAWAWA—FORMER TROOPER'S ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

I met on the weekend with a former trooper, Don Laird, of the Royal Canadian Dragoons based in Petawawa, Ontario. He made a series of very serious allegations of misconduct at that base, which included doctors' orders being ignored or disobeyed by field commanders, harassment of injured or ill troopers, acts of brutality encouraged or ignored by NCOs and junior officers, drunkenness while on duty and while operating unsafe vehicles, as well as drunkenness and fighting going on in the barracks, vomiting in hallways, rooms, and in washing machines. Has the Minister caused an investigation to be launched and, if so, what facts have so far come to light?

Hon. Paul Dick (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question. This matter has come to my attention since the newspaper reports and we are very concerned about it. They are serious allegations.

I have asked my officials for a complete report. Further to that, I have ordered that a board of inquiry be established to investigate the facts, to do an adjudication and to render a decision.

REQUEST THAT RCMP PARTICIPATE IN INVESTIGATION

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): I appreciate the answer and what the Minister has done to date, Mr. Speaker. I would like to suggest to the Minister that it would not look right in my view if at Petawawa we have the same people judging the same people, the same officers looking into the same mess in which they may have been involved—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): I am not talking about the wet or the dry mess either.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): I am talking about the problem, and it is a serious one.

Will the Minister engage a third investigative party such as the RCMP to be part of that investigation, so that not only will there be total objectivity but there will be the appearance of objectivity from a third disinterested party?

Hon. Paul Dick (Associate Minister of National Defence): I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that the board of inquiry will be made up of three people. This comes under Mobile Command based in St-Hubert.

I take the Hon. Member's representations and I thank him for them.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—COMMERCIAL BLOOD BANKS

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

Several weeks ago the Minister for International Trade stated when asked questions about the relationship between the free trade agreement and blood banks, "The U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement has nothing to do with blood".

We see today from press reports that the Minister of National Health and Welfare, in fact, confirmed that under the free trade agreement American blood banks for profit will be allowed to operate in Canada.

Who is speaking for the Government on this issue?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, maybe I can clear up the misunderstanding which the Hon. Member has. The Minister cleared it up a few weeks ago but I will just repeat the situation. First, the Government strongly favours the current not-for-profit blood supply system. Second, there is nothing in the free trade agreement that will interfere in any way whatever with the continuation of the non-profit system administered through the Canadian Red Cross, nothing.

The agreement imposes no obligation on Governments regarding the purchase of blood and blood products. Therefore, Governments will remain free to use the Red Cross as the sole supplier to the health care system. The non-profit blood system can be maintained.

[*Translation*]

INCLUSION OF COMMERCIAL BLOOD BANKS IN AGREEMENT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Minister of National Health and Welfare has confirmed that the free trade agreement will allow American commercial blood banks to operate in Canada. To clarify the matter, why did the federal Government put commercial blood banks in the agreement, if it is opposed to the commercialization or sale of blood in Canada? Why did they put commercial blood banks in the free trade agreement?

[*English*]

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, one point which the Hon. Member should keep in mind is that the Canadian Red Cross today purchases about 70 per cent of blood content supplies especially for haemophiliacs from the United States and Europe. There is a use for purchasing offshore—

Ms. Copps: You are commercializing blood.

Mr. McDermid: —and the Hon. Member should keep that in mind. I am sure she would not want to cut that off.

Ms. Copps: Blood for profit now.

Mr. McDermid: Second, the agreement does include commercial blood bank laboratories under its services chapter. This simply means that Canadian and American commercially operated blood banks, where they are allowed to exist, must be treated equally. That is all it says, nothing more and nothing less. The Hon. Member is chasing a pipe-dream with that one.

* * *

• (1500)

IMMIGRATION

PROSPECTIVE IMMIGRANTS—CONDUCT OF HEARINGS BY TELEPHONE

Mr. John Oostrom (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. The Federal Court of Appeal has ruled that prospective immigrants overseas have the right to an immigration hearing by telephone. This new procedure will cause a further delay in the existing backlog of cases. Will the Government appeal the decision to the Supreme Court of Canada?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, we have always said that immigrants and refugees should have, and we have always made real efforts to provide, a fair hearing. The implications of this decision are still being examined by my Department and I will be getting back to the House with an answer as soon as we have gone through all the ramifications.

* * *

ENERGY

DEVELOPMENT OF HIBERNIA OILFIELD—STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister and concerns the Hibernia Statement of Principles released today. This statement does not come into effect as a binding agreement until as late as March 31, 1989. That is after the trade deal will have come into effect if the Government is successful in its efforts.

My question is this. Is it because it comes into effect after the trade deal is in place that there is no binding commitment included in this statement with respect to performance requirements, Canadian content requirements, and the employment of Newfoundlanders on this project?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I should first point out that the document indicates that the binding agreement embodying the Statement of Principles would be implemented as expeditiously as possible, but in any event no later than March 31, 1989. It is anticipated that it will be done much sooner than that since most of the hurdles have been overcome.

The conditions with respect to employment are pretty clearly outlined, as is the degree to which this activity will take place using Canadian supplies. Something in the order of 45 per cent to 50 per cent of the total project will be Canadian supplied. As well, there will be 14,500 person-years of direct Canadian employment. Indirect and induced employment would raise the total impact on Canada to 47,000 person years, almost 35,000 for Newfoundland alone.

It is all contained in the documentation and I would recommend the Hon. Member read it in full because he will then get a clear picture of what the deal is all about.

CANADIAN CONTENT—ABSENCE OF GUARANTEE

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, the document I have in front of me says the project owners estimate that two-thirds of total pre-production employment will be provided by Canadians. "Estimate"! There is absolutely no guarantee.

Can the Minister tell me why there is no guarantee, no commitment, no specific promise to this country and the people of Newfoundland with respect to Canadian content or employment? Is it not because we are unable to do that in the future under the trade deal?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the answer to that last question is no.

Mr. Speaker: I must advise Hon. Members that that concludes Question Period.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

HURTIG ENTERPRISES COURT ACTION—MR. SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: I want to bring to Hon. Member's attention a matter of some importance which was raised on Wednesday, May 4, 1988, by the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields), and commented upon by other Hon. Members on both sides of the House. On that day the Hon. Member raised a question of privilege alleging that his rights and privileges as a Member of the House had been breached as a result of a lawsuit commenced against himself and other parties.

[*Translation*]

I have given this matter serious consideration and carefully reviewed the arguments offered by all the Hon. Members who participated in this discussion and I thank them for assisting the Chair. I have also consulted the relevant authors and precedents on the matter, and I am now prepared to make a determination on the question at issue.

[*English*]

For the benefit of Hon. Members and the public the Chair would like to summarize the facts as they were presented by the Hon. Member in his intervention. On October 14, 1987, the Hon. Member for Athabasca placed on the Order Paper Question No. 207, which reads as follows:

> Since April 1968, have (a) grants (b) loans (c) loan guarantees (d) contracts been provided by the Government to Hurtig Publishers of Edmonton or other Hurtig enterprises and if so, how many and, in each case (i) on what date (ii) in what amount (iii) for what purpose?

In accordance with the rules of the House, the Government provided a written answer on January 27, 1988. Essentially, that answer indicated that certain government Departments and agencies granted various amounts of money to Hurtig Publishers Ltd. for the purposes of training programs, sales and marketing assistance, and feasibility studies, *inter alia*, as reported at page 15125 of *Hansard* for May 4, 1988.

At that point, so that everyone understands this, the Hon. Member had done what he was completely entitled to do. He

had used the written question procedure to ask the Government certain questions. The Government then responded to those questions.

The Hon. Member stated in his argument that, in late February, as a result of the answer tabled in the House, he received a letter from a law firm in Edmonton, acting for Mr. Mel Hurtig, which intended to proceed with a defamation action against the Hon. Member. The Hon. Member further advised the Chair that he then received a second letter in late March from another firm acting for Hurtig Publishers Ltd., stating that their client intended to bring an action against him pursuant to the Defamation Act. There is of course in each province an Act which sets out the law of defamation in that province.

The Hon. Member expressed the view in this Chamber that both letters were based on the information he had received in reply to his question on the *Order Paper* and that these two letters advising him of the intention to proceed with the lawsuit were, and I quote the Hon. Member:

> —a deliberate attempt to intimidate me from seeking further information with regard to grants given by the Government to Mel Hurtig or Hurtig Publishers.

I understand that the Hon. Member has now received a copy of the Statement of Claim in the action referred to, and of course a copy has also been obtained by the Chair.

• (1510)

In his remarks the Hon. Member for Athabasca argued that his "privilege to speak freely without fear" in the House had been violated by the action brought against him which "goes to the very heart of a Member's obligation, a Member's right, a Member's privilege to ask questions in a free and unfettered way in the House of Commons".

The position as put forward by the Hon. Member for Athabasca was supported by the Hon. Member for Peace River (Mr. Cooper) who stressed that freedom of speech is a fundamental privilege and that, in his words, "Hon. Members are also to be free from intimidation or threats that would try in some way to direct their actions".

In the same vein the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) reiterated the principle that, as he said, "Nothing can impede the privilege of a Member to ask questions in the House, either by written deposition or orally during Question Period". The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier quoted from Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 55, which reads in part as follows:

[*Translation*]

> The privilege of freedom of speech is both the least questioned and the most fundamental right of the Member of Parliament on the floor of the House and in commitee. It is primarily guaranteed in the British Bill of Rights . . .

There can be no question as to the relevance and appropriateness of the principles invoked by Hon. Members in their interventions. Indeed, as all Hon. Members very well know, the privilege of freedom of speech is so fundamental that this House could not discharge its constitutional functions without it.

[*English*]

British parliamentary institutions, from which our own system was derived, were afforded the protection of the Bill of Rights three centuries ago. It is interesting that the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is presently celebrating the three hundredth anniversary of the Bill of Rights at Westminster.

Article 9 of that Act clearly states:

> The freedom of speech and debates, or proceedings in Parliament, ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of Parliament.

Careful reading of that provision raises at least one particular concern in relation to the matter now before us. Essentially the privilege of freedom of speech protects "proceedings in Parliament". The question to be answered then is, what constitutes proceedings in Parliament?

This phrase has never been exactly and completely defined by statute, by the courts of law, or by the House itself. In its narrow sense the expression is used to denote the formal transaction of business in the House or in committee. Traditionally it covers both the asking of a question and the giving of a written notice of such question, and also includes everything said or done by a Member in the exercise of his or her functions as a Member of the House, either in the House or in any committee of the House in the transaction of parliamentary business. I refer to May's Twentieth Edition, page 92.

In its wider sense "proceedings in Parliament" is used to include matters connected with or ancillary to the formal transaction of business. Obviously, written questions placed on the Order Paper are to be considered part of proceedings in Parliament. In effect, they are time-saving substitutes for speaking in the House. As stated in May's Twentieth Edition, page 92:

> While taking part in the proceedings of a House, Members, officers and strangers are protected by the same sanction as that by which freedom of speech is protected, namely, that they cannot be called to account for their actions by any authority other than the House itself.

I emphasize again, "while taking part in the proceedings of a House". The insertion of the term "proceedings" in the Bill of Rights of 1688 gave statutory authority to the privilege of freedom of speech, which was later clearly recognized in the law case of *Dillon v. Balfour* reported in 1887, 20, Irish Law Reports at page 600. The judgment stated that words spoken by a Member of Parliament in the House of Commons are absolutely privileged and the court has no jurisdiction to entertain an action in respect of them. I cite *Halsbury's Laws of England*, Fourth Edition, Volume 28, page 52 as follows:

> When Parliament is sitting and statements are made in either House, the member making them is not amenable to the civil or criminal law, even if the statements are false to his knowledge, and a conspiracy to make such statements would not make the members guilty of it amenable to the criminal law.

[*Translation*]

While a member of the House receives absolute protection and is free to speak as he sees fit during a debate in Parliament, subject only to the rules of the House, it is not so when the Member chooses either to speak or to publish his speech outside the House. The same privilege does not extend to statements made outside a "proceeding in Parliament" even if it is a reproduction of what was said in the House.

[*English*]

In the first edition of his book published in 1844, Erskine May expressed that reservation as follows:

> —a Member may state whatever he thinks fit in debate, however offensive it may be to the feelings, or injurious to the character of individuals, and is protected by his privilege from any action for libel; but if he should proceed to publish his speech, his printed statement will be regarded as a separate publication unconnected with any proceeding in Parliament.

The same principle is reiterated in the Twentieth Edition at page 202 where it states:

> —when a matter is a proceeding of the House, beginning and terminating within its own walls, it is obviously outside the jurisdiction of the courts . . . But if a proceeding of the House issues in action affecting the rights of persons exercisable outside the House (as e.g., in the publication of a part of the proceedings of the House . . .) then the person who published . . . will be within the jurisdiction of the courts.

That does not mean, of course, that the person who published may, given the circumstances, be subject to condemnation by the courts. It only means that if published outside, that publication would be subject to the courts but all the defences which would be available to any other citizen would, of course, be available to the Member of Parliament if published outside this place. To make it very clear, when I use the word "publish" I mean either to publish in print or to express verbally to others by way of television, radio, or otherwise.

To expand on this further, in *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, Joseph Maingot states on page 38:

> A member could not come to Parliament for protection if he was sued for having published to the world. One could not question what the member said in the House but publication outside the House was another matter. The protection afforded the member speaking in the House is, in law, spoken on an occasion of absolute legal privilege, that is to say, spoken with impunity to the outside world, but he publishes outside the House at his peril. Parliament protects him when he speaks in Parliament, but when he speaks outside, or publishes outside what he says inside Parliament, Parliament offers no protection; only the common law does, if it is offered at all.

In the case at hand there is no indication that the legal proceedings commenced against the Hon. Member for Athabasca are based on a proceeding in Parliament. From a close reading of the statement of claim filed in the Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta on April 26, 1988, it would appear that these proceedings relate to a newspaper article published in *The Edmonton Sun* and to the comments attributed in that article to the Hon. Member for Athabasca and to written information allegedly provided to employees of the *Toronto Sun* by the Hon. Member.

As this legal proceeding appears in no way to be based upon "proceedings in Parliament", but rather upon events which transpired outside of Parliament, the Chair cannot find, after long and very careful consideration, that the Hon. Member's privilege has been breached.

• (1520)

I want to add some comment to this because it is important. Nothing in this ruling should be taken to indicate whether the Hon. Member for Athabasca has or has not a defence to the defamation action taken against him. This ruling is confined to whether the Hon. Member's privileges as a Member of Parliament have been violated.

There is, of course, under the law of defamation outside this place, a defence of privilege. It is important to understand the distinction and to understand that my ruling in no way intrudes into the law of defamation or into the present action concerning the Hon. Member and others, and in no way affects whatever defences are available to that Hon. Member outside this place.

I want to apologize to the Hon. Member for Athabasca for being so long in returning to this House with this ruling. I have to say that the ruling gave the Chair a great deal of difficulty. I have decided it, I think correctly, but not without a great deal of concern. I thank Hon. Members.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, it may be of assistance to advise the House of the tentative order of business for this afternoon and this evening. We intend to resume debate on the Government's response to the Senate's amendments to Bill C-103. Once that debate is concluded, we will proceed to the Government's response, which is essentially in the affirmative, to the Senate's amendment to Bill C-137, also known as the flow-through shares Bill.

Once that is finished, we would call second reading of Bill C-139, the income tax reform Bill. Pending completion of the speech of the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Hockin) on that Bill, we would call it five o'clock in order to allow for Private Members' Hour to proceed. There are several votes at 6.00 p.m., which will commence at 6.15. Pending success at report stage, we would then proceed, on consent, to third reading of Bill C-82 and Bill C-30, whichever order is most appropriate for those Members involved. Upon completion of those two items of business after the votes, we will call it ten o'clock.

Tomorrow at 11 a.m. we will resume debate on Bill C-139.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ACT, ATLANTIC CANADA, 1987

MEASURE TO ENACT—NON-CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lewis:

> That a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this House disagrees with the text of the Message made by the Senate to Bill C-103, an Act to increase opportunity for economic development in Atlantic Canada, to establish the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts, because this House believes that in dividing the Bill, the Senate has altered the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of the grants of aid and supplies set out in the Bill, contrary to Standing Order 87, as recommended by Her Excellency the Governor General to this House, and has therefore infringed the privileges of this House, and asks that the Senate return Bill C-103 in an undivided form.

Mr. Dennis H. Cochrane (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, today we are debating a motion that should not be debated. Indeed, we are having a debate in the House that should not be taking place at all.

The Senate of Canada should not have divided Bill C-103 because it has neither the right nor the privilege to do so. As the Speaker stated in his ruling on July 11, the Senate has in fact "infringed the privileges of this place", not just the House of Commons as an institution but the privileges of each and every Member of Parliament.

While we take up the valuable time of the House today to debate a motion disagreeing with the action of the Senate, all of Atlantic Canada suffers. That includes Cape Breton Island, whose fate the Senate now holds in the palm of its usurping hand.

One is truly amazed to sit in the House and listen to Liberal Members of Parliament defend the actions of their friends in the other place. Their strong words of support provide aid and comfort to the architects of the old discredited policies and programs of regional development in Atlantic Canada, those whose approach to regional development is embedded not in the belief of the individual entrepreneurs of Atlantic Canada and their ability to create new jobs but in the almighty transfer payment.

It was not the Senate that proposed to Atlantic Canadians the creation of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. It did not, because it remains the last bastion of the old Liberal philosophy of economic development based upon hand-outs. It could not because it would have had to create a money Bill, a Bill which is clearly beyond its prerogative.

Why is the Liberal majority in the Senate now attempting a constitutional end-run on the House of Commons when it has neither the moral nor the constitutional authority to do so? We can only put the answer down to simple partisan politics. Now, in a thinly disguised veneer of caucus unity holding together the Liberal ranks, Liberal Members of Parliament support, in the name of fraternity for all, the action of Liberal Senators.

Bill C-103 was thoroughly debated at all stages by Members of Parliament. The first reading took place on December 18, 1987. Second reading took place in January, and that process took 11 hours, 4 minutes of House time. There were 26 Members who had a chance to speak on second reading, including six Members from the Liberal Party.

At the committee stage, the legislative committee travelled throughout Atlantic Canada because the Government felt it was essential that Atlantic Canadians had input on a Bill that was extremely crucial to Atlantic Canada and the welfare of Atlantic Canadians. That was the first time a legislative committee travelled. There were 34 hours and 20 minutes of hearings in which 73 witnesses had an opportunity to appear before the committee.

When that committee was in Halifax, in Port Hawkesbury and in Charlottetown, two Parties were represented: The Government Party and the New Democratic Party. Where was the concern of the Liberal Members of Parliament then? Where were they in Port Hawkesbury when we had a chance to be on site in Cape Breton to hear the concerns of the people from Cape Breton with regard to Bill C-103 and particularly with regard to the Bill to create the Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation?

It was not, as we have heard since then, a major thrust against the division of Devco. If I remember correctly, there were two major concerns expressed at that time. One concerned the geographic area set aside for Enterprise Cape Breton and the fact that it did not match exactly with the area assigned for the tax credit purposes. The second concern was expressed by the very chairperson of DEVCO, and dealt with the division of the assets and whether the assets were divided appropriately. They did not debate the principles as much as they debated the logistics of how this Bill would be implemented.

Not only did we hear from the people of Cape Breton at that time, but in September, 1985, the Government had an opportunity to hear from the Cape Breton Advisory Committee chaired by Dr. Theresa MacNeil, the lady everyone else now quotes as being against what Bill C-103 does to DEVCO. In that report, the Cape Breton Advisory Committee suggested that several things happened. It identified barriers to development caused by the confusion of a multiplicity of development agencies. It felt that it was a barrier to economic development in Cape Breton. It recommended a new development agency, independent in matters of policy, management and operation from the coal side of the corporation, which is exactly what Bill C-103 does. We split DEVCO, and the Industrial Development Division goes to Enterprise Cape Breton and DEVCO retains its mandate with respect to the Coal Mining Division.

• (1530)

The report further recommends that there should become a one stop shop to the degree possible by encompassing the Industrial Development Division of DEVCO and DRIE. That is exactly what is done in Bill C-103. As a result, we heard from the people of Cape Breton. After that, of course, we came back once again to report stage in this House in March. At that time, four hours and 50 minutes was assigned to debate. Twelve Members of Parliament had an opportunity to speak. Third reading took four hours and 10 minutes, and another nine Members of Parliament had an opportunity to present their points of view. I was shocked when, on May 10, we had the vote on Bill C-103 and as I sat here as an Atlantic Canadian, I watched my colleagues, and I use the term loosely, from the Liberal Party, vote in favour of the Western Diversification Office and against the creation of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. I could not believe that those Members felt differently about the economic development opportunities for western Canada and those for eastern Canada.

The Liberals took a stand in favour of new economic programs for western Canada and a stand against the creation of the very same for eastern Canada. That caused me concern. I think it caused everyone in this House concern because we realized that over the last 20 years, the Liberal regional development policies were concocted in Ottawa and bore no relationship whatsoever to the real needs of Atlantic Canadians. In Bill C-103, the Government gave Atlantic Canadians the opportunity to be involved in the economic decisions facing Atlantic Canada, but the Liberal Party decided it did not want to transfer the power from Ottawa to Atlantic Canada. When we scraped the surface, we found it did not want to transfer the power from the old-line leadership of the Liberal Party to people in Atlantic Canada who were capable of making decisions that would benefit the economy of Atlantic Canada.

The Liberals still want to hold hostage the economic opportunities of Atlantic Canada with a view that "Ottawa knows best". We had 20 years of that kind of rule in this country. We in Atlantic Canada were constantly told that Ottawa knew best. We have heard members of the opposite Party speaking today about the high unemployment rate in the past. They spoke about the lack of economic opportunities in Atlantic Canada. But those were the result of holding in Ottawa all the decision-making ability and power that affected Atlantic Canada.

Now, of course, here in Ottawa, the Liberal Senators, propped up by the Liberal Members opposite, are continuing to foster that point of view. The Liberals continue to be reluctant to let Atlantic Canadians make decisions for the benefit of Atlantic Canadians. Those Members say that what the Senate has done has not affected the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and its ability to function. That is not the case. There are provisions in Bill C-103 that ACOA can use to the benefit of Atlantic Canada which are not available under the existing mandate assigned by the Cabinet and previously given to DRIE. If the Bill is split, Cape Breton would not have the benefits of a Crown corporation directly connected with the federal regional economic development agency that has the primary responsibility and resources for economic development in Atlantic Canada. In order to improve service to Cape Bretoners, the two federal economic development organizations should report to the same Minister and should have the same president. That would not be possible if this legislation is not adopted.

The reorganization that is provided in Bill C-103 will help both organizations be more co-ordinated in order to reduce duplication and confusion. If the ACOA Bill is not passed, Atlantic Canadians will be denied access to some very important economic development opportunities. Specifically, the Minister responsible for ACOA will not have the power to co-finance the projects of other Ministers that will improve the economic base of Atlantic Canada. The Minister will not have the power to designate areas of preferred treatment. ACOA will not have the power to take stock options in certain circumstances. Those are all provisions that are included in Bill C-103 as it is currently drafted.

We would not have those tools to put to work for the economy of Atlantic Canada if the Senate gets its way and this Bill is split. I think all Atlantic Canadians are concerned. The Atlantic Canada Chamber of Commerce has expressed its concern with respect to the tactics we are seeing displayed in this House in defence of the actions of the other place. I do not believe the Liberal Party is explaining to Atlantic Canadians exactly what it is trying to do, because I do not think it can explain what it is trying to do. I do not think it knows what it is trying to do.

There is one gentleman located in the other place who does not believe that anyone would have a new idea with respect to attacking the problems facing Atlantic Canada since DEVCO was created in the 1970s. But people do have new ideas and new solutions to old problems. We have had 20 years of the same kind of policy. We have had 20 years of that Party and that Government. We have had 20 years of those decisions being made here in Ottawa, and at the same time in Atlantic Canada we have had 20 years of high unemployment and limited economic opportunities.

What is the Liberal Party showing Atlantic Canadians? Is it showing that it wants to change the way the Government of Canada assists in regional development in Atlantic Canada? No, it is not showing that. Is it showing it is prepared to resist the status quo nature of the other place? No, it is not showing that either.

Is it showing that it is prepared to pave the way for new ideas for economic development in Atlantic Canada? No, it is not showing that. Is it prepared to show Atlantic Canadians that it is willing to accept new solutions to old problems? No, it is not. It is prepared to show what it has shown all along, contempt for Atlantic Canadians, and lack of faith in the

entrepreneurial spirit of Atlantic Canadians, lack of confidence in the ability of Atlantic Canadians to make decisions good for Atlantic Canada. That is what it is showing the people of Atlantic Canada. The Liberal Party is showing Atlantic Canadians that it is not prepared to accept reality, not prepared to face the fact that what it has done over the years has not worked in Atlantic Canada and that there are chances in Bill C-103 for greater success and economic development in the Atlantic provinces.

I think it is time Liberal Members of the House of Commons stood up to the old-line leadership, coming from the Senate. They should stop playing partisan games at the expense of Atlantic Canadians and their opportunities. They should realize that the division taking place in DEVCO is just what was asked for by the advisory committee in September of 1985. The Industrial Development Division will go to Enterprise Cape Breton. The Vice-President will be located in Sydney, and there will be a separate board, prepared and willing to make decisions to benefit Cape Breton. DEVCO will still retain its mandate with respect to the coal agency and the work it has to do in Cape Breton, work that was done successfully in the past. They have to recognize that this is one stop shopping to avoid the duplication and confusion that exists and surrounds past government policies as they relate to Cape Breton and its economic development opportunities.

I think it is time that the Liberal Members of this House recognized that Bill C-103, with the creation of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and the creation of Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation, is beneficial to Atlantic Canada and to Cape Breton. ACOA is good for Atlantic Canadians. Yet we are hearing today, as we have heard in the past, members of a certain Party standing up and saying that they are not in favour of what is good for Atlantic Canadians. They will have to answer to the people from the eastern part of the country who feel that ACOA offers a number of opportunities for Atlantic Canadians, opportunities for Atlantic Canadians to take advantage of federal government programs to complement the entrepreneurial spirit that exists in Atlantic Canada. They will have to answer to those people. They do not have to answer to members of the other place. They will have to answer to the people of Atlantic Canada when they say: "Why did not the 19 of you support the creation of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency?"

• (1540)

I urge all Members of the House today to join in favour of this resolution to indicate to the other place that we do not accept what it has done, that what it has done is beyond its mandate and that it is not good for Atlantic Canada.

Mr. Binns: Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to listen to the remarks of the Hon. Member for Moncton (Mr. Cochrane) which he made in regard to the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. However, I was somewhat distressed to find that he feels that the Liberal Members of this House were not supporting the agency, and he was questioning why. I am wondering if the Hon. Member could tell me whether he is surprised that the Liberal Members in the House are not standing on their own feet in support of the agency instead of taking their cues from the Senate Leader, Mr. MacEachen.

Mr. Cochrane: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Hon. Member's question. I guess I am surprised, although I know the temptation of that Party to go along with its leadership, which for years cracked the whip and kept its Members submerged under the previous leadership of that Party. However, I am surprised that they were not able to throw off the yoke of the old-line leadership and take away the partisan politics and recognize what is good for Atlantic Canada. They were not able to see beyond their smoke-filled back rooms and their bagmen to recognize that this agency offers Atlantic Canadians an opportunity to take advantage of federal government programs, create employment and allow Atlantic Canadians to capitalize on what the improved economy of the country has to offer.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the Hon. Member for Moncton (Mr. Cochrane) for a very impassioned address. I like to hear Members speak on behalf of the people who elect them, irrespective of what side of the House they are on. I want to congratulate the Hon. Member.

This question really focuses on the other place. It shows that the other place did something that it had no authority to do. It illustrates very definitely what we were trying to correct when I had a motion before the House for the creation of a Triple E Senate.

The present Senate is responsible to nobody. It can do anything that it likes and still get away with it. As the Hon. Speaker said the other day, it acted without authority. It does not have to account to anybody.

This demonstrates very definitely that if we are going to have a Senate, we should have one that is elected and responsible to somebody in that it would have to answer to the people. The present Senate is not doing that.

The second part of the motion which I moved would have given every province equal representation. In other words, the four Maritime provinces would have equal representation in a Tripe E Senate, just the same as any other four provinces. That would have given them protection for something that vitally affects their region.

The action of the Senate in this particular case illustrates very definitely why we need a Triple E Senate.

Mr. Cochrane: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) has said. It reminds me of an old saying which I have heard quoted a number of times with regard to the Senate and its efforts to thwart the efforts of the House of Commons. It is that even a fish cannot get caught if it keeps its mouth shut.

The more we see this type of action taken by the Senate, the more we see Senators defying the elected Members of the

House, the more we hear from Members such as the Member for Bow River, and other Canadians, expressing their concerns about the comfortable pew that exists in the other place.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Speaker, I have a very simple question to put to the Member who has just spoken. Since this morning we have been hearing Government Members tell us that there are people in the other place, that is the Senate, who don't have to report to anyone, and who are not responsible to anyone.

How is it that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) chose one of those persons to direct that Agency?

[*English*]

Mr. Cochrane: Mr. Speaker, I think the reason was the affinity and the closeness of that particular Senator to Atlantic Canada and the fact that a brand new agency with as little political partisanship as possible was trying to be created. We wanted to answer the false accusations that it was a political slush fund. Thus the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) appointed a gentleman who is well experienced in the affairs of Atlantic Canada. More important, he is the Minister responsible for intergovernmental affairs. One of the bylines, one of the main principles behind ACOA, is co-operation between the Government of Canada and the four Atlantic provinces, co-operation, I suggest, that was not available in the last 20 years of Liberal government rule. Members of the Liberal Government did not bother talking and asking the people of Atlantic Canada what they wanted. They did not go to the Premiers of the provinces. They just went out and said: "Here is what Ottawa thinks is best for you, now take it and like it".

I can tell Hon. Members that we did not like it. We did not advance because of it. We were held back because of it. I think of the Mitel plant in Buctouche. All of a sudden there it was, and the Premier of New Brunswick was not even consulted.

The only Government to spend money in the country to take care of that hollow election gimmick was the Government of the Province of New Brunswick. It had to upgrade the sewage system and build new access roads. That plant sits there, and the Hon. Member for Westmorland—Kent (Mr. Robichaud) knows it sits there, as a monument to the failure of the past Government's economic development policies in Atlantic Canada. Thus it was logical to appoint the Minister responsible for intergovernmental affairs to be the Minister who could talk to the Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, to co-ordinate programs, to co-ordinate the expenditure of federal dollars so that we could have a maximum effect, the maximum number of jobs created for Atlantic Canadians. I thank the Hon. Member for the question.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to say a few words on Motion No. 34 before the House. Although I must say that I do not entirely appreciate the wording and the structure of the motion, our Party will support it.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Senate proposal should be refused and that we have a responsibility to refuse it. It is very obvious that there is a very cynical approach to the Senate taken by Members of the Government. They stand up and shout about the bad things that the Senate does. Yet they go ahead and appoint a Senator to be the head of the organization which is supposed to be helpful to Atlantic Canada. They also have appointed a good number of their Members to the Senate. For many years our Party policy has been to abolish the Senate. The basis for our proposal to abolish the Senate has always been that it is not a democratically-elected body.

• (1550)

The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond (Mr. Dingwall) made much of the fact that the New Democratic Party was supporting the position of the Government against the Senate. I know the Hon. Member recognizes that our opposition is based on our principles and belief in democracy and not necessarily in what we think is support of a flawed Bill which has gone through the House. Because of the majority that the Government has in the House it was able to pass it through and did not accept the rather pointed criticisms of people from the Maritimes, the New Democratic Party, and the Liberal Party about what was in the Bill and how it would affect future development in the Maritimes or in the Atlantic provinces.

We have many of the same concerns about ACOA as the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond has, but we do not believe that the other place has the right to operate in this type of legislative or any other legislative area. Consequently, we will not back away from that principle in order to allow it to become a much greater power than it already is.

It is very significant that this particular move by the Senate is a power move. If it were allowed, the precedent thus established would give the Senate, an unelected body, the same ability to develop legislation and decide the direction of legislation as the House of Commons. In this process the Senate has taken a major step in attempting to establish itself as a legislative power. It does not have this power constitutionally. Therefore, it is important that we recognize the direction or what would have happened had the House and the Speaker not made the ruling that he made.

It is interesting to note that the Liberals did not challenge the ruling of the Speaker. The Speaker gave the House the right to reject or accept the Senate ruling, although the Speaker stated specifically that the Senate's doing so without requesting the permission of the House was an infringement on the privileges of the House.

The Speaker ruled that the splitting of the Bill is a matter of privilege, and the other place infringed on that privilege. If we want to allow the Senate to do that, the Speaker ruled that we may go ahead and do so. Consequently, if this resolution is

accepted it will send Bill C-103 back to the Senate to be passed again, hopefully, and established as the law of Canada.

We recognized that this Bill is a flawed piece of legislation, as have many people in the Atlantic provinces and in the Official Opposition. During the period that the Bill was going through second reading and committee stage, our member on that committee made several attempts to rectify some of those flaws. Perhaps it is not so surprising that many of the reasons the Senate gave for splitting Bill C-103 were the same reasons that we had for putting in amendments during the period that the Bill was going through the House.

The idea that DEVCO would disappear in its present form and be replaced by the Enterprise Cape Breton was considered by ourselves and by the President designate of DEVCO, who was an appointee of the Government, as being a move in the wrong direction. It removes the Cape Breton Industrial Development Corporation from a position of independence and puts it directly under the Minister in charge. By the way, the Minister is not a member of the House, and consequently with a certain amount of cynicism I have to point to the position taken by the Government when it states that this is such a great democratic process. Then the Government makes the organization the responsibility of a member who is not elected, who is an appointee, and who resides in the other place.

Therefore, we felt that the legislation needed a considerable amount of work. We tried to make those changes. To some extent, we were happy to see that the Senate also recognizes those changes. The process is unacceptable to us. The Senate is not a democratically elected body and it does not have the authority or responsibility which it has taken unto itself. We do not want the Senate to develop that type of power in the legislative structure of Canada.

We have taken the position that we will support this motion to send the Bill back to the Senate with the request that it pass it in its original form. I think that it is rather sanctimonious of the Government to suggest, as it does in this motion, that the Bill it sent to the Senate was so perfect that it should not have been changed in any way. The Government must recognize, as do the rest of us and many Canadians, that the Bill was anything but perfect, and that it could have used a good number of changes.

We will support the Bill. We will support democracy. We believe that the Senate does not have the authority or the power, and should not have the authority or the power to make the type of changes that it is suggesting in this particular Bill.

• (1600)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have been requested by the Acting Chief Government Whip to defer the vote until six o'clock tonight. Government Orders.

* * *

CANADIAN EXPLORATION INCENTIVE PROGRAM ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND—CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. Doug Lewis (for the Minister of State (Forestry and Mines)) moved the second reading of, and concurrence in, amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-137, an Act to provide for incentives to assist in financing exploration for mineral resources and hydrocarbons in Canada and to amend the Canadian Exploration and Development Incentive Program Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that these are technical amendments which have come back from the Senate. It is not our intention to speak to them at great length, but I understand that other colleagues may have short speeches which they may wish to address to the House. We would then proceed to call the question and directly thereafter move to the first speech on Bill C-139.

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Government House Leader. I have indicated to him that I would appreciate it if this Bill was put back by a few minutes.

[*Translation*]

I would like to briefly comment the amendments and the issue of flow-through shares. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the amendments originating in the Senate are of a technical nature. This morning I had not had a chance to look at them and unfortunately, they were not in the order paper we have in our offices, but as I look at the amendments, I note that their purpose is essentially to ensure that the French version agrees with the English version, and so, generally speaking, we have no objection. But since this is the last opportunity we are going to have to discuss flow-through shares, Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to underline with regret the impact of the Conservatives Government's delays on investment in the mining

sector, on exploration and the development of mining resources attributable to the flow-through share program.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem that the combined effect of two factors resulted in a sharp drop in the issuing of flow-through shares. According to the figures available to me, about 560 million dollars' worth of the shares were issued in Quebec in 1987, but this year it is expected that only about 90 million dollars' worth will be sold. In Canada as a whole, a decrease of approximately $1.2 million in the sale of flow-through shares is forecast, and a drop of up to $500 million is expected for all of 1988. Why, Mr. Speaker?

The answer is simple. On the one hand, last year's October crash had a particular impact on investment in mining exploration projects. That was something the Government could not have prevented.

But in addition, Mr. Speaker, the uncertainty created by the Government's decision in June last year as part of tax reform to abandon any incentive for investment in and development of our mineral resources had a very negative impact on flow-through shares. This was because the Government announced in June 1987 that it was going to give up the mechanism that had yielded so much investment and given such impetus to the economy of regions like Abitibi and Schefferville and many others in Quebec. The Government maintained this position for a long time despite the pressure and representations from all over the mining industry, especially in Quebec but also in northern Ontario.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, after municipalities, exploration companies, stock exchanges, unions, educational institutions and other groups formed a coalition to save flow-through shares, progress started to be made.

[*English*]

It was the same thing in northern Ontario. We will see a very substantial drop in mining investment and exploration under the flow-through share program in 1988. One of the major reasons is the uncertainty which has been introduced into this program because of the Government's decision back in June of 1987, in the context of tax reform, to abandon the whole program of flow-through shares without putting anything else in its place.

As a result of a great deal of pressure coming from this side of the House, from the affected communities, and from the coalitions that were very broad ranging which sought to put these programs back in a way that would be effective and reasonable in terms of public resources and would continue the high rate of development and activity which was prevailing, gradually the Government has come around until we now have their proposals in this Bill.

After a period of more than a year we finally see third reading of this new proposal to replace what was effectively announced as being removed in June of 1987. When it is taken together with the impact of the crash in October of last year, it has resulted in a very sharp, if not disastrous, cut in exploration. This is, interestingly enough, despite the fact that at this time the prices of base metals and of other metals which are sought through mining exploration have in fact risen substantially as part of the economic revival which has taken place within the industrial countries.

I wanted to note that fact while saying at the same time that the New Democrats are prepared to accept these amendments. Now that I have had a chance to look at them, I see that they are in fact technical and they show that, yes, the Senate can play some exceedingly modest but helpful role in an affair like this are.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to, amendments read the second time and concurred in.

* * *

INCOME TAX ACT AND RELATED ACTS

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Tom Hockin (for the Minister of Finance) moved that Bill C-139, an Act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, 1977 and certain related Acts, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to propose the second reading of Bill C-139 today. This debate gives me an important opportunity to review the principles on which the measures in the Bill are based and to remind all Members of the long, deliberate process of consultation and development which preceded the development of the Bill.

[*Translation*]

The primary object of this Bill is the implementation of the first stage of our government's tax reform proposals. It is the most sweeping reform of Canada's tax system in many years, and one of which we can be proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to remember that tax reform is an integral part of this government's program of economic policies laid out in the November 1984 *Agenda for Economic Renewal* issued by the Minister of Finance. Since September 1984 we have been working to achieve the goal of sustained economic growth and the creation of productive jobs for Canadians. Tax reform is part of our larger vision for a dynamic, innovative and competitive Canadian economy.

With the passage of this Bill, Canadians will benefit from a fairer and more efficient tax system—a tax system in tune with the needs of Canada today, and which will assist individuals and businesses in meeting the challenges of a changing more competitive world.

As well as the tax reform measures, Bill C-139 also contains provisions implementing the measures announced in the February budget, as well as other provisions announced separately. I will return to these measures in a few minutes.

The measures that comprise state one of tax reform are not new—they have been before the House and the public for some time. Just over a year ago, on June 18, 1987, the Minister of Finance tabled in this House a White Paper outlining detailed proposals for comprehensive reform of the taxation system.

• (1610)

[*English*]

That White Paper was the result of consultations with Canadians, indeed from the beginning consultation has been an integral part of the whole process of tax reform. In developing the White Paper proposals the Government benefited considerably from the insights and recommendations of parliamentarians, representative associations, business, labour, and individual Canadians. When we tabled the White Paper we again invited interested groups and organizations to examine the proposals and present their views. The standing committees of both Houses of Parliament have undertaken extensive public examination of our proposals. In addition, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) and I and officials of the Department of Finance have met individuals and representatives of many organizations across the country.

Those involved in this process—committee members, representatives of other groups, and individuals—have made a valuable contribution to the consultative process and to the refinement of the reform proposals. This has not been a process in isolation from them but together with them. In their respective reports both parliamentary committees have supported the main thrust of the reforms, and each committee has also suggested a number of specific changes to the proposals. Each of these recommendations, like those we have received from other sources, has been carefully reviewed and weighed against the often stated objectives of tax reform.

One objective is to have a balanced package of measures and a balanced tax system as a result. Another is to ensure that the net fiscal effect of the reform is neutral—a balanced package, a simpler system with a neutral fiscal effect. The December 16 draft of our proposals elicited further comment and allowed us to make a number of changes to the details of our legislation. As a result the detailed notice of Ways and Means motion tabled last month contains an appropriate, well drafted series of proposals.

The process of tax reform is not easy. This House knows that many previous Ministers of Finance have tried to reform the system to a greater or lesser degree and that they have had different degrees of success in their efforts. I believe that the present reform which is the largest one attempted since the reform that followed the Carter Commission report, owes its success to a thorough process of consultation.

Why reform at all, Mr. Speaker? Why did we embark on this large comprehensive process of reform? In the Government's view the urgent need for reform was clear and still is clear. In recent years Canadians have increasingly recognized the need for a fairer system and a more effective tax system. Serious problems have developed since the last major reform. Those problems have affected all parts of the system—the personal tax system, the corporate system, and the sales tax system.

Let me remind Hon. Members of some specific problems of the tax system which have been increasingly recognized in recent years. First, the proliferation of special tax preferences, loopholes, and boondoggles, all of which has put increasing pressure on the equity, the efficiency, and the revenue stability of the income tax system in this country.

Second, in the personal income tax area the growth in preferences, deductions and loopholes has led to an erosion of revenues and has contributed to a growing inequity among taxpayers with similar incomes.

Next, over the decade from 1975 to 1985, there was an increased incidence of high income individuals paying little or no tax. Canadians are not willing to go on supporting a tax system that allows those who are better off to shift the burden to those who are less able to carry it. This cannot and will not be supported.

Next, let us look at what has happened in the corporate income tax world. This was a world profuse with special rate reductions, tax credits, accelerated capital cost allowances, special accounting provisions, and growing tax avoidance. All this extra complex world of corporate tax preferences has not only led to an erosion of the tax base but has also resulted in a substantial variation in effective corporate tax rates across sectors. Some sectors of our country industrially pay very little tax; others much higher. As well, too many preferences have had a considerable distorting influence on investment patterns and business decisions which are too often made on the basis of tax considerations rather than profit potential or economic merit. Business decisions were being deflected from profit potential into taking advantage of tax considerations; in other words, putting the cart before the horse.

Then there is the federal sales tax system. It is antiquated and badly flawed. The problem with the federal sales tax system is that it is narrowly based. It is biased in favour of imports at the expense of Canadian producers. It is complex with high compliance costs and it has a widely different effect on prices. It increases the cost of investment and it places a hidden charge on our exports. It is difficult to think of a sales tax system that could be so badly designed for a country like ours.

Our over-all proposals, then aim to deal effectively with these problems in the tax system. The personal, the corporate, and the sales tax have grown to the point where they seriously compromise opportunities for economic growth, development, and job creation. These problems of the tax system are

increasingly undermining the foundation of equity on which a well functioning tax system must rest.

[*Translation*]

From the outset we knew that to deal with the problems I have outlined, a reform had to meet certain objectives. Canadians want and need, first, a tax system

—That is fair and progressive, that imposes little or no burden on those least able to pay, and that levies similar amounts of tax on individuals in similar economic circumstances; second,

—That has a broader base and lower rates, that encourages individual initiative and in which all high-income individuals and profitable corporations pay their fair share of tax;

—That supports our ability to compete internationally, creates employment, creates employment opportunities and assist our regions to grow and prosper.

Finally, that is more understandable and reliable in producing the revenues needed to finance public programs.

Our reform meets these objectives, Mr. Speaker. Looking just at the personal income tax for a moment, it lowers income taxes for 9.7 million households, over 85 per cent of all households in Canada, and it reduces the taxes of about 850,000 lower-income Canadians to zero.

• (1620)

[*English*]

Tax reform reduces taxes for about 1.3 million of the 1.4 million households with at least one person age 65 or over. Tax reform reduces the variation in taxes paid by persons in similar circumstances and with similar incomes. That is a summary of what is accomplished by tax reform on the personal income side.

In the corporate sector, tax reform means that the number of profitable corporations not paying tax will be more than halved. The financial sector will pay significantly more. Other low rate sectors will see their taxes increased, and very high rate sectors such as the retail sector will see their tax burden reduced modestly. Continued general preferences for the mining sector which promote exploratory activity in many parts of Canada will be maintained.

What is more, the rate of tax on the return from new investment will be reduced and incentives to research and development maintained. This will strengthen the incentive for firms to invest in profitable ventures. The already low rate of tax for small business will be further reduced and remain below that for large corporations.

How have we made these reforms possible? How can this be done? The key to all these improvements is the fact that we are broadening the tax base and lowering the tax rates. This two-pronged attack, broadening the base and lowering the rates, will make our tax system one that encourages initiative and strengthens competitiveness, growth, and job creation.

As we have maintained from the outset, lower rates are the best incentive for Canadians to work, invest, and raise their living standard. They will also support our international competitiveness and increase employment opportunities available to Canadians.

When I speak of the broader tax base, what does that mean? It means there are special tax preferences, fewer loopholes, fewer boondoggles for avoiding the payment of tax. It allows lower rates and ensures that high income individuals and profitable corporations pay their fair share of tax. Canadians will have a fair and progressive tax system where the tax burden reflects more fairly the situation and the ability of the individual to pay. Individuals in similar economic circumstances will be subject to similar amounts of tax.

Reform means, too, that the system will promote the growth and prosperity of all regions of Canada. The reformed taxation system provides a more reliable and broader tax base. It provides a secure source of revenues to finance public programs.

Finally, I want to reiterate that these reforms of the taxation system have been carefully designed to be fiscally neutral. How is this possible? It is done this way. The corporate tax measures contained in this Bill largely pay for the reduction in personal income taxes. When combined with the sales tax measures already passed in Bill C-17, the over-all fiscal effect is neutral. The measures in this Bill will not have to be paid for at some later stage.

[*Translation*]

I want now to go over in very general terms the major provisions of Bill C-139.

One of our goals was to make the tax system fairer and easier to understand. In a move towards such a system, the Bill implements the conversion of personal exemptions and many deductions to credits, and eliminates or restricts other deductions, credits and exemptions. It thereby makes the entire system more progressive.

[*English*]

As a result of these changes, most taxpayers will find that their effective rate of tax is lower than under the existing system. Those who have been using special preferences in the existing system, those who have been taking advantage of all these special preferences, which this Bill reduces significantly, are the ones who will see their taxes increase. There is no doubt about that. I believe that is appropriate.

Restriction or elimination of a number of deductions in the corporate tax means that the corporate tax base is significantly broadened. This means that many more profitable corporations and a higher proportion of their income will now be part of the tax base. This broadening of the base has allowed us to lower rates. It has allowed us to maintain an internationally competitive system. At the same time, it has allowed us to

increase the amount of revenue being raised from the corporate tax system. Other measures will ensure that financial institutions will also pay their fair share of tax.

This Bill also introduces a general anti-avoidance rule to remove the tax advantage of transactions that involve misuse of the tax law. These are carried out not primarily for bona fide purposes but for the simple avoidance of income tax.

Bill C-139 also brings forward a limited number of changes not directly related to the tax reform proposals of last June. First, it contains the income tax changes announced in the February 1988 Budget. The most significant are the increases in the child care expense deduction and the increase of the refundable Child Tax Credit to implement the taxation aspect of the national strategy on child care. I should also mention that the amendments to tighten up the rules used to determine whether corporations are associated with one another for the purposes of the Income Tax Act are also in this Bill.

Second, this Bill includes amendments announced on September 25 and October 1, 1987. The former prevents tax avoidance through the abuse of the rules relating to capital dividend and dividend refunds, and the latter implements changes to the taxation of trusts and their beneficiaries.

[*Translation*]

Bill C-139 is an important piece of legislation. Many measures in it have been in the public eye for over a year. The Bill has benefited from extensive input from the standing committees and taxpayers. An earlier draft of the Bill has been scrutinized by the committees and by tax professionnals to ensure that it was technically satisfactory. This has been an important and useful process, but it is time consuming. The result is the complete and technically sound bill we have before us today.

[*English*]

I do not think I can exaggerate the importance of this Bill to the tax system, the economy and, above all, to the average Canadian. Our tax reform measures as embodied in the Bill now before us will contribute to building a stronger, more just and more vibrant economy. This is comprehensive reform. This is reform for the average Canadian as well as for the economy as a whole. These measures are based on a solid assessment of today's needs and will help us build a better tomorrow.

[*Translation*]

As evidence of the Government's commitment to assist further speedy, thorough examination of the Bill, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) has agreed to appear before the House Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs as soon as possible, to help them begin their final consideration of the measures in the Bill.

[*English*]

I am proud of tax reform. I am proud of the provisions of this Bill. It is historic in its scope. It is vital in what it means to the future of Canada. I call on Members of this House to respond to my own sense of urgency and the urgency felt by hundreds of thousands of taxpayers, both individuals and corporations, and proceed quickly with this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1630)

Mr. Hockin: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it is appropriate to ask for unanimous consent to call it five o'clock. The House Leader said that there may be such a disposition, but I am in your hands in that regard.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre on the same point of order.

Mr. Cassidy: Not on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, on debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe there was unanimous consent among the Parliamentary House Leaders for the Chair to call it five o'clock and to proceed now to consideration of Private Members' Business. All three Parties gave their consent, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I can confirm what the Parliamentary Secretary just said. The Leader of the Government in the House consulted us, and it was understood that once the Minister had finished his comments, the debate on Bill C-139 would be suspended and we would proceed to Private Members' Business because, as you know, Mr. Speaker, the Official Opposition which is supposed to follow the Minister, is according to our custom entitled to forty minutes. I believe that tomorrow, the Government intends to call Bill C-139 at eleven o'clock, to resume debate.

Mr. Grisé: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. As the Liberal Whip, the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier), just said, there is unanimous consent for reverting to the same Bill at eleven o'clock to resume debate, so that the Official Opposition critic will have the same speaking time the Minister had today.

[*English*]

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, that may well have been discussed between the Liberal and Conservative Parties but I, as the Deputy House Leader of the New Democratic Party, was not consulted on calling it five o'clock after the Minister's speech. Not having been consulted on that, we did not agree to it. I assume we are going to continue until five o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps the Member and the House Leader should consult at this time.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that the Hon. Minister was going to speak until very close to five

o'clock. For that reason we thought it would make more sense to call it five o'clock and then, at five o'clock, proceed with Private Members' Hour. The second speaker in the debate, which will be called at eleven o'clock tomorrow, will be the spokesperson for the Official Opposition. I think it would be more appropriate to handle it that way. In that way no one will be inconvenienced.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to call it five o'clock?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS--BILLS

[*English*]

AUDITOR GENERAL ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (**Prince Albert**) moved that Bill C-288, an Act to amend the Auditor General Act, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is the third time I have put this Bill or legislation very similar to it before the House. Under ordinary circumstances I may have given up by now and said that it was not worth the effort. However, when I presented this Bill in the House last April, it was seconded by the Hon. Member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson) and the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway) who are the chairman and vice-chairman respectively of the Public Accounts Committee. I therefore decided that in order to keep this before Parliament and keep it alive it was worth while to present it once more.

This legislation has a long history. On July 18, 1980, the Public Accounts Committee presented a report to the House which suggested that the Auditor General use his power more often to make special reports to the committee so that the committee would be able to examine current issues more often. As a result of the procedure of the Auditor General in reporting only once a year, we often found ourselves dealing on the Public Accounts Committee with subjects which were two and sometimes even three years old, and quite often with audit reports which were more than a year old. We were always after the fact and very rarely dealing with current situations.

In 1981 there was an agreement among all Parties of this House. The then President of the Treasury Board, House Leader of the Official Opposition, and Leader of the New Democratic caucus agreed to allow legislation to come before this House which would do exactly what I am suggesting in this Bill today, that is, allow the Auditor General to report intermittently rather than only once a year. This legislation was submitted to the Government early in 1982 but did not proceed at that time and, consequently, was not passed. Since then I have submitted this Bill in 1985, 1987, and again this year. In each case it was either talked out or did not receive the consent of the House.

The Bill's purpose is very simple and straightforward. It would allow the Auditor General to report intermittently rather than under the present structure of once a year. All that is required is a very small change in the Act. The words "the Auditor General shall report at least annually to the House of Commons" are added as well as some subsequent changes which are required in order that the rest of the Bill will make sense, as is quite often the case in an amending Bill.

This small change in the Auditor General's Act has been recommended by the Public Accounts Committee, as I have indicated, on three separate occasions. It has been recommended by the Auditor General's office and also by a private sector committee which has been advising on accountability in government. In addition, it has been recommended by a cross-section of Members of the House from all three Parties. It would seem, therefore, that we should proceed with it but we have not done so.

In each case that this legislation has been presented to the House it has been talked out and consequently dropped from the Order Paper. This may be my last opportunity to bring the Bill before the House for passage into the committee which can decide whether to let the Bill proceed or be amended to address any government concerns. However, I know that many government Members agree with the Bill in its present form.

• (1640)

It has been suggested that the Government would not be opposed to quarterly reports. Such a policy would not even require a change in the Act and could take place with the changes I have suggested.

The committee could also decide that the Bill is unacceptable in its present form and recommend that it be withdrawn. I would be quite willing to do that.

I would also accept a government Bill instead and would withdraw mine on that occasion. That may be the best way to deal with it. Any of these suggestions are possibilities we should consider.

Why should the changes be made? One of the concerns of the Public Accounts Committee, and other Members of Parliament, is that it cannot deal with current issues. When the Auditor General makes his report in the fall, the Public Accounts Committee must suddenly deal with five or six Departments whose comprehensive audits have been reported in the annual report. As well, a number of audit notes have to be studied along with other areas of concern. We must decide which of these items we will discuss for the rest of the year until the next Auditor General's report is tabled. If this tabling could be made intermittently, we would be dealing with many

more current items in a much more effective order for the Public Accounts Committee.

Governments of many other countries use a continuous or intermittent reporting system as suggested in this Bill. In a 1984 report to the House, the Auditor General said that the Auditor General's office had considered what its counterparts in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia had done. Each of these legislatures receive periodic reports in one form or another. The Auditor General's office is convinced that this is more cost effective, as well as allowing it to report more frequently.

He also stated that until the next legislative changes were introduced it was impossible for the Auditor General's office to report intermittently. It believed it had to retain the schedule that was established by the Act.

While one section allows the Auditor General to make special reports on particular subjects, such reports could only be made in an emergency. This Bill would allow the Auditor General to make a report at the end of each audit, rather than tabling them together in an annual report.

The Governments of the Netherlands, Germany, and Sweden have continuous reports. The British Parliament has a report approximately every week. My suggestion is not new or unusual, but it is highly acceptable and a widely practised procedure. It would improve the accountability of Governments in Canada. I believe this is a possible solution to a serious problem. If this Bill could be sent to committee, we would be taking a step toward that end.

Mr. Lawrence I. O'Neil (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise and speak to Bill C-288, an Act to amend the Auditor General Act. Before commenting on the Bill, I want to reflect for a moment on the importance of this opportunity for Private Members to propose amendments to existing statutes and take initiatives that are of importance to all Members and all Canadians.

The Bill today deals with the functioning of the Auditor General's office, particularly with the frequency with which the Auditor General must make reports to the House of Commons. All Members fully appreciate the important role that the Auditor General plays for Parliament.

The Auditor General is an officer of Parliament who watches the spending habits of Departments. From time to time he calls upon Ministers to explain the spending of Departments and answer questions that pertain to the authorizations for spending and whether the Departments are functioning within the legal limits and guidelines prescribed by Cabinet and by statutes.

Members of Parliament have the services of the Auditor General and the Auditor General's office which has substantial staff and expertise pertaining to the whole question of evaluating the spending of government Departments.

I believe the amendments presented for debate today are largely redundant. The existing statute provides in Section 3(b)(i) that the Auditor General may make a special report to the House of Commons on any matter of pressing importance that in his opinion should not be deferred until the presentation of his annual report. It is very clear that the existing statute fully authorizes and gives the Auditor General total discretion with respect to a matter that should be brought by way of a special report.

I believe it is important that the discretion in these matters stay with the Auditor General. We do not wish in any way to restrict that discretion, to impair the functioning of the Auditor General, given the important role that he plays.

The Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) talked about the need for a special provision that would give greater guidance to the Auditor General. Clearly that is not required under the statute. The Auditor General and his staff can respond in special circumstances. It is important for the staff to know that it has an annual report to make and that the annual report will be comprehensive in providing its evaluation of the respective Departments.

• (1650)

What kind of Parliament would we have if every week a report came sliding into Parliament for parliamentarians to comment upon. One week it could be the Post Office, and the next week it could be the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources.

It is obvious that all these alternatives were considered and the decision was made that the reports should be annual. I believe it also provides the necessary focus to the public servants who work in the Auditor General's office. It is a practical thing. Most Departments, if not all, provide annual reports, and there is accountability of the Departments before the permanent committees of this House. There are other ways, such as daily Question Period, for instance, where the Ministers and Departments are held accountable for the spending within the Departments.

I believe the amendments are unnecessary. I believe they put the Auditor General in a position of perhaps responding to ongoing political climates. If there is an ongoing debate in the House, pressure mounts and demands are made by politicians of whatever Party to the Auditor General to investigate and report immediately to the House of Commons on one matter or another. Perhaps the demand might be tomorrow that the Auditor General should report on the advisability of the very ambitious Hibernia project, to which this Government has committed itself and which is welcomed by Atlantic Canadians, should that dominate Question Period this week.

Should the role of the Auditor General become totally political? Should he be at the disposal of Members of Parliament with all the political pressures that dominate the business of this House? I do not believe so. I believe we have to

maintain the professionalism that has prevailed in the functioning of the Auditor General's office. It is clear that the system is working, and the Auditor General is obviously very pleased with the improved accountability of our Government. His latest report was very supportive of the efforts of this Government to improve the accountability and spending habits of government.

That is not to say that any Government is perfect. No Government can be perfect. However, the Auditor General has certainly given this Government high marks. We want to continue to give the Auditor General that flexibility. The Auditor General's office must know that over a period of a year it has the responsibility to do audits and provide substantial reports on all these Departments, but not to give passing commentaries or short-term analyses about one project or another.

Surely we can understand how in any given week the spending of the Government could become a political and partisan issue. The Auditor General's office could then be put in a position where it might become an agency of partisanship. We do not want that and we do not need it. One week the Opposition might want an audit of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources or the Department of Agriculture. It might want an audit of land claims. The list is endless. We do not want the Auditor General's office subjected to that kind of political pressure.

It was clear today in Question Period how the Opposition is particularly perturbed about the great step forward the Government has taken in Hibernia. There is a substantial commitment by the Government of Canada to the people of Atlantic Canada with respect to developing the Hibernia oil field. We in Atlantic Canada welcome that. We do not want it politicized and made part of a political issue in this House.

Today we saw the Opposition really attempting to make the issue other than a very sound economic decision by the Government of Canada. We do not need the Auditor General pulled in this week perhaps to slow down the process of economic development in Hibernia. I welcome the opportunity to speak on this matter. I congratulate the Hon. Member on his initiative, but on reflection I find that the changes he proposes are constraining on the Auditor General, are unnecessary, would really place the Auditor General's office in a difficult position and perhaps, in the long term, compromise the professionalism of that office.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak to Bill C-288, an Act to amend the Auditor General Act. This is the third time the Hon. Member has tabled in the House an amendment to the Act which would allow the Auditor General to report to the House more than once per year. The purpose of the Bill, according to the explanatory notes accompanying the Bill, is as follows:

> At present the *Auditor General Act* requires the Auditor General to report to the House of Commons annually. The purpose of this Bill is to allow the Auditor General to report annually and as often as he deems necessary.

I was listening to the Hon. Member for Cape Breton Highlands—Canso (Mr. O'Neil) who said that it was not a good idea because the Auditor General would go too far and table a stack of reports that might be embarrassing to the Government and make Government operations excessively transparent. Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with this position, because we know perfectly well that the Auditor General, who is a reliable person, who is accountable to Parliament and an agent of Parliament, would never abuse the powers conferred on him by Bill C-288, namely to report once or several times a year.

I can inform the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) who sponsored this Bill, and who also sponsored Bill C-250 in October 1985, and Bill C-262 in October 1987, and who today is sponsoring Bill C-288, that the idea is a good one. In fact, in the spring of 1984, the principle was approved by the Liberal Government at the time, by the Official Opposition and even by the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, who in his report to the House of Commons had suggested that this initiative be approved by parliamentarians. Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Committee at the time was none other than the Minister of State (Treasury Board) (Mr. Lewis), and Government House Leader in the House of Commons. In his report, and I will read it word for word, because it is rather interesting, and considering that today he is a Minister, one would have thought he would be able to convince his Cabinet colleagues of the excellent motives for introducing this Bill and the need for such a measure.

In the Fifth Report to the House of the Public Accounts Committee chaired by the eminently qualified Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board) and Deputy House Leader, we read as follows:

> Your Committee favours the reporting of comprehensive and other audits on a completion-date basis. This will enable your Committee to deal with the Auditor General's findings in a timely manner and to exert its remedial influence as soon as possible after the audit is completed. The Auditor General endorses this approach because it provides for greater efficiency and flexibility in his reporting to Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, it's fairly simple and it is actually a good idea for the Auditor General to occasionally report more than once a year. It seems to me when one is in the important and complex business of administering a country with $120 or $125 billion annually, one should from time to time ask someone who is objective and independent, and who is accountable to Parliament, whether this business is properly managed. It seems to me that a Cabinet that is thorough and competent would be able to live with this kind of open government and with regular scrutiny by Parliament.

• (1700)

Mr. Speaker, I remember that at the time the Member for Simcoe-North (Mr. Lewis), the Chairman of the Committee, now a cabinet Minister, had attempted to obtain the consent

of all parties not only because he believed that this proposal was a good one, that it would make Canadian public administration much more effective, but also because he felt it would bring an added measure of efficiency to administration as well as greater transparency, through a regular audit of public accounts and expenditures.

In his comments in June 1984, he stated that there was agreement, that the then Liberal Government and the Opposition parties were of one mind on the issue. Unfortunately, an election was called and we know what happened. The Conservative Government that was elected put this proposal aside, and judging by the comments I have heard from Conservative Members on Bills C-250 and C-262, for instance, it seems they think it would be a terrible thing to ask, demand, or allow the Auditor General to table more than one report per year.

As we know, he must table his report before January 31. Custom has it that when the annual report of the Auditor General is published, members of the media study this quite lengthy document carefully, and look for flaws, flagrant examples of unwarranted expenses, and perhaps even stupid expenditures the Government might have indulged in. It is the Auditor General's role to raise them, to direct public attention to them, and to make appropriate recommendations to have these administrative wrinkles ironed out quickly.

As it happens, Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General himself is in favour of this proposal. He feels it would allow him to cut the period up, so to speak, so that instead of having to wait one year, sometimes even two, to read the report on the previous years' activities, we could, in a business-like way and on a regular basis, obtain periodic reports on current issues, major projects, on the administration of federal affairs generally, which to my way of thinking seems like an entirely sensible and reasonable way of doing things.

And I would like to say to the Member for Prince-Albert that I am very impressed by his tenacity and persistence in trying to get this government to understand ordinary common sense.

The fact remains that it is hard to get this Government to move. They always wait for someone else to get the ball rolling. One has only to look at the major questions. Today is July 18, and some major issues have been dragged out for three or four years.

It takes time, but I encourage the Member to continue to be persistent. Perhaps one day the light will dawn on the Conservative dark ages and they will see the simple wisdom of allowing the Auditor General to make regular reports, without abusing the process, with all due respect to the Member for Cape Breton Highlands—Canso, because I do not think that the Auditor General would abuse it; he could then submit regular reports to the House, reports that would help to improve the administration of the country, that would make public servants accountable to the Canadian public, that would be conducive to the openness and transparency we and public opinion are seeking in order to ensure that each tax dollar that is spent is well spent on serious pursuits.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have much more to add except to say to those who are listening that they must read the speeches that were made on Bills C-250 and C-262 to see clearly and realize that this is not a bad idea. It is a very good idea. All we need is some good will and a little action.

In conclusion, I will be supporting this measure, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines): Mr. Speaker, I too express appreciation for the opportunity to make a few comments on the proposal put forward by the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo). I appreciate his sincerity in this matter coming as he does from the Province of Saskatchewan, my native province, and for pointing out that it has been a number of years since he first introduced this proposal.

He does so out of extensive discussions that have taken place over the past number of years before the Public Accounts Committee with respect to the timing of those reports coming forward as they do from the Auditor General. During those discussions very often the topic for consideration by the Standing Committee was dated, the mistakes had been done and corrected, the past performance had been such and remedied. What was left for the committee to do?

Its actions were rather limited. It appears logical, then, that permitting an Auditor General to bring forward a report as often as he or she chose, other than the annual report, would be appropriate. It would render more accountability to the process.

As has already been mentioned, Section 8(1) of the Auditor General Act gives all the powers and authorities to the Auditor General to act as immediately or as promptly as the person in that office chooses to do.

The Hon. Member who spoke just before me referred to "as often as necessary", as stated in the explanation clause in the Bill being proposed. Are those words any different from the existing clause which states that the Auditor General may make a special report to the House of Commons on any matter of pressing importance or urgency that, in his opinion, should not be deferred until the presentation of his annual report? Does this not give him the authority to present a report as soon as he or she considers it necessary?

I want to bring a number of other factors to the attention of Hon. Members of the House which must be taken into consideration as well. I refer to the initiatives taken by the Government to reduce the number of problems that have come before the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. One of the most important initiatives arose out of the great work done by the former Hon. Member for St. John's East through the establishment of a special committee of the House of Commons charged with the responsibility of examining the powers,

the procedures, the practices, the organization, and the facilities of this House. This committee was known as the special committee on the reform of the House of Commons. It performed its work well, and it was valuable work indeed. The committee examined many matters, some of which included matters relating to the Auditor General. I would like to highlight some of those reforms in order that Members of the House will keep them before them when they vote on this issue.

• (1710)

The actions of the committee tended to minimize the number of changes that should be made to the Auditor General Act. These reforms have far-reaching effect in the House committee system and must be considered before any additional change is made as a result of the proposal today. I submit that the Auditor General is fully clothed with the powers requested.

Let me turn to more pertinent changes stemming from the actions of the committee on reform that we so often talk about, that is, those that have an impact directly on the issue of timely reporting and meaningful information in the concept of proactive intervention by Members of the House. These changes made it possible for those of us under those revised rules to take an active part. The changes directly affect the issues that we are dealing with today in that they provided a vehicle by which Members could more easily obtain relevant and timely information. All Members of the House are now able to perform a more meaningful role through increased participation and influence in the formation of policy and legislation. This leads to a more effective House of Commons, a more relevant House of Commons, and reduces the need for the proposed amendment.

The standing committee structure now mirrors as much as is practical the organization of government. A standing committee can now choose to become expert on a particular matter before it, or the activities of a particular Department. It has before it the full departmental policy array of opportunity to review and report, as well as a Department's expenditure plans for its activities, and the achievements of the Department measured against its objectives. The standing committee also has more freedom to review the operations of government Departments and to choose for themselves the matters which they wish to examine closely. Standing committees and legislative committees are now empowered to examine and inquire into all matters referred to by the House and to report back to the House. They may call for the appearance of Ministers, of departmental officials, of outside witnesses, and for the production of department documents and papers.

They have the opportunity to question witnesses, seek details of particular programs, question Ministers with respect to policy, and seek administration information on matters from different officials of each Department, or particularly the Department under examination.

As a result some parliamentary committees have called before them the Auditor General himself to respond to certain inquiries about Part III of the Estimates, such as the departmental performance in achieving its objectives from a value for money perspective. The committee can use this testimony in arriving at its assessment of the assessability and the acceptability of departmental expenditure plans.

Concerns about the need for more timely information for Members of Parliament have surely been reduced by this enhanced role of standing committees and Members of Parliament. Accountability has been improved through the automatic referral of annual reports to Departments, Crown corporations, and agencies to the standing committees concerned, and the Public Accounts Committee found that the lack of timely information had been greatly alleviated.

Recently the Public Accounts Committee has been focusing on the adequacy of actions taken in response to the Auditor General's recommendations and has instituted regular follow-up reporting. This is a positive approach and recognizes the need to ensure that improvements are effected. I am just as interested as any other Member in more timely, more effective, and more relevant information on which to base assessments. I agree with the initiative to see that each and every one of those goals should be attained. However, I believe the way to do it is through the reform already implemented by Members of the House and by Parliament and through urging the Auditor General to use the powers vested in him if an earlier reporting is necessary.

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to say a few words in support of Bill C-288. I would like to make a few brief points. First, I would like to thank Your Honour for the respect you are showing for Private Members' Hour by recognizing me at the present time. You have a list of speakers in front of you, Mr. Speaker, and I do not happen to be on that list. The list was submitted to you by the Government. Notwithstanding that this is Private Members' Hour, I am not on the list because I indicated that I would be speaking in support of this Private Members' motion, and apparently the Government does not appreciate that.

Second, the focus of this Bill is to allow the Auditor General to report to Parliament more frequently than he is doing now. At the present time he reports on an annual basis. Some Members have attempted to make the point that the Auditor General does not have to report more than once a year because there is some logic, some routine, or some magic to reporting only once a year, if he reports only once a year, he does a more thorough job than if he were to report on a more frequent basis. Other Members, like my friend, the Hon. Member for St. Catharines (Mr. Reid), seem to be under the conception that by the time the Public Accounts Committee gets the report of the Auditor General all the mistakes have been corrected and there is nothing for it to do.

As you are well aware, Mr. Speaker, and as the Hon. Member for St. Catharines is well aware, if he had not been only looking at a speech prepared by the staff of the President of the Treasury Board (Miss Carney), that is a far cry from the facts. It is important that the reports of the Auditor General are submitted to Parliament, to the Government, and to the Public Accounts Committee long before they are now.

What happens at the present time is that the Auditor General and his staff start preparing these reports perhaps two years before they finally see the light of day in the House. That is far too long when the primary objective surely is to cut out government waste. Surely that is the objective of everybody in the House, whether it is the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner), a member of the back bench, or a member of Cabinet. Nobody wants to see public funds squandered and wasted. That is what the reports of the Auditor General are all about. Surely what we should be doing is trying to get the reports of the Auditor General before us more promptly in order that we can ensure taxpayers' money is spent efficiently, effectively, and not wasted flagrantly. That is what the whole process is about.

Reference has been made to the fact that the Auditor General already has the authority in the Act to report more frequently than once a year. Quite frankly, I too believe that is the case, but for some strange reason the Auditor General and the lawyers who advise the Auditor General have come to a different conclusion. They feel that unless it is an emergency, unless the Parliament Buildings are burning down or something of that nature, the Auditor General does not have the power in the Act to report more frequently than once a year. That is the reason the Auditor General states: "No, I cannot do this unless I have specific authority".

• (1720)

In the questioning before the Standing Committee on Public Accounts a few weeks ago, the Auditor General stated that he did not have the authority either to do international auditing but that that did not stop him. Here too the Auditor General claims he does not have the authority to do this, but in fact it does stop him. That presents a big question mark as to why, if he does not have the authority in one case, he would go ahead and do it anyway but if he feels he does not have the authority in another case he will not go ahead and do it anyway. Regardless of who is right, who is wrong, and what are the legal opinions on this, the Auditor General made it quite clear that unless he gets authority to report more frequently he is not going to do it. That leaves it up to this House, up to Private Members like you and I and all other good Private Members in the House who do not want to see public funds wasted. We are here and are elected to make sure that they are not wasted and to do our best to help the Auditor General to get those reports before the House as frequently as he possibly can.

Does it make sense that he should have the right to do this? They do it in the United States. The government accounting office in the United States does it all the time. They do it in the United Kingdom; the Auditor General of the United Kingdom does this all the time. They do it in the Netherlands; the Auditor General in the Netherlands, the President of the Court of Audit there as it is called, does it all the time. They do it in West Germany; the President of the Court of Audit in West Germany does it all the time. The Auditor General or the President of the Court of Audit in Sweden does it all the time. What is so revolutionary about doing it in Canada when they do it already in the States, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, West Germany, and Sweden, to name just a few? It is certainly not revolutionary.

In discussing this matter with the current President of the Treasury Board, it has been indicated to me that she thinks that there might be some merit in allowing some sort of more frequent reporting as long as it does not come too frequently. There is a feeling that maybe four times a year, when the President of the Treasury Board and her officials could know in advance that something was going to drop on them from on high, would be all right as long as the dates were known. In fact, after I took that back and had a little chat with the Auditor General about the same issue, he said: "Gosh, four times a year. I would be happy to do it even three times a year".

It is clear that there is some room for movement if there is goodwill on the part of both sides. What I am left with, however, is a feeling that perhaps there is no real commitment to goodwill, commitment to seeing that the taxpayers' money is going to be looked after very carefully, as we are all here to do, and not wasted or squandered. In fact it has been suggested to me by staff of the current President of the Treasury Board that this is not a priority item.

Surely, it should be a priority item for you, for me, and for every Member of this House to make sure that taxpayers' money is spent as effectively and as efficiently as possible and not wasted.

The only way we are going to do that is to make sure the Auditor General can report to us as frequently as he possibly can to get the facts before us and to cut out that waste which I am sure the Prime Minister wants to cut out, which I am sure the President of the Treasury Board wants to cut out, and which I am sure you and I and every other Member of this House wants to cut out. Heaven's, let us all support this Bill!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Claude Lanthier (LaSalle): Mr. Speaker, it was very interesting to hear what was said in the House about when, and especially how, the Auditor General should report the results of his audits. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I myself had some problems with the tabling of certain investigations by the Auditor General, but on the whole, I would say that in 1980, the previous Government, lethargic though it was, supported the Public Accounts Committee which had recommended that the Auditor General report more frequently.

Between 1980 and 1984, nothing happened, owing to the lethargy of the previous Government, as I just said.

Since then, however, our Government made recommendations in 1984, in 1986 and even this year, in 1988, to improve the situation. We are not afraid of the Public Accounts Committee or the Auditor General's reports. In fact we support them. However, the Auditor General himself, Mr. Kennet Dye, recommended on several occasions that the Auditor General's Act should be amended to allow him to report immediately on certain specific audits, right after completion. He made the point that this would speed up work in his office and improve efficiency. At various times, all parties represented in this House supported at least the principle that amendments were necessary to authorize the Auditor General to report more frequently and on a completion basis.

The reasons in favor of such changes were that tabling of reports immediately upon completion of audits would give the Public Accounts Committee and parliamentarians a better chance to discuss the issues involved while they were still very current and thus corrective action could be taken far more quickly and more effectively.

I would like to point out that the purpose of this Bill is not to table reports on very urgent matters. The Auditor General may at any time make such reports, Mr. Speaker. There is no limitation on the subject matter of such reports. Today, however, we are talking about questions that are not judged by the Public Accounts Committee to be of vital importance or extremely urgent.

It is claimed that this change advocated by this Bill would have the advantage that the public servants called to testify before the Public Accounts Committee would more likely be those involved when the Auditor General made his observations. That is true, Mr. Speaker. However, I sincerely do not believe that the turnover is significant enough for this Bill to apply. It is believed that all these changes will make the Government more accountable to Parliament and thereby to the taxpayers, which is an objective that we all support.

Nevertheless, it is obvious that in spite of the support expressed for changes that at first seem simple and uncomplicated, there has not been unanimous support in this House for the changes proposed to the Auditor General Act. As with many issues brought up in this House, I believe that this question is more complex, much more complicated than people seem to think. Personally, I see some negative effects that could result from it and far outweigh the advantages described.

As I see it, the question we must really ask is what the impact of these changes will be on the Auditor General's effectiveness. I would not want to support changes that would in any way compromise the effectiveness of the Auditor General's Office by imposing on him a host of complications that would make his work more difficult.

The issue of the efficiency with which the Auditor General's Office can produce its reports is in reality secondary. The cost is relatively insignificant compared to the fantastic savings that result from the Auditor General's work. We would not want to compromise his effectiveness for relatively unimportant savings. It has been recognized for a long time that the Auditor General should have the resources he needs to do his job effectively and freely.

Mr. Speaker, in my mind there is no doubt that the Auditor General and the Public Accounts Committee do important work. In fact, when this matter was discussed in the House last October, the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Holtmann) pointed out quite rightly that the Auditor General's findings have become more encouraging and that he recognizes that progress has been made in solving the problems described in previous reports. Mr. Speaker, it clearly follows that our Government is responding well to the recommendations of the Auditor General and the Public Accounts Committee. And before anyone accuses me of being partisan—I certainly am not and I hope I did not give that impression—I think Hon. Members should compare the present tone of the reports to those tabled in the early eighties.

Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General has never been as laudatory in his comments as he has been since this Government came to power in 1984. Previously, the Auditor General's reports were a catastrophe for all Canadians. Our policies have been revamped, and we welcome his reports instead of hiding from reporters when the reports are tabled, which was the case between 1980 and 1984, Mr. Speaker.

I think the system works very well, and in fact it is improving, and that is what we are here for. I agree that completion-based reporting would make it possible to obtain the conclusions several months earlier. However, that alone would not resolve the problem of timeless, if there is such a problem. It is a fact that in many cases, carrying out a comprehensive audit within a department may take up to two years.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, in Parliament and in the departments, we welcome the Auditor General's comments which make it possible for us to improve the situation as we go along, without having to wait for the final results several years later. Mr. Speaker, this new approach to government is that of a businessman who has been involved in politics and not of politicians who think they can do business, as was the case with the previous Government.

We must not forget that audit results are discussed with management as they are drafted. In government, managers must deal with problems on a priority basis as soon as they are brought to their attention. They cannot wait until the final report. Corrective action is generally taken well before the annual report is tabled.

Mr. Speaker, this is a new approach. It is ongoing management and no longer disaster management as was the case before.

Under the new system of increased departmental authority and responsibility established by Treasury Board, ministers and senior officals are even more strictly accountable for the measures they take to correct deficiencies in the management of taxpayers' money, and for doing so as they are detected, instead of letting them go on for a couple of years and waiting until the final report to apologize for past mistakes, after officials have left or politicians have been replaced. That was the old way which our businessmen's government cannot accept.

There already are mechanisms to ensure that attention is given quickly to matters of a pressing nature raised by the Auditor General. In fact, the Auditor General, as I said earlier, already has the authority to bring urgent questions to the attention of the House, and to do so at any time. He is not prohibited from speaking out before he tables his final report. He may, at any time, draw the attention of the Prime Minister and Parliament to any matter he deems appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I believe nevertheless that it may not be advisable to table audit results automatically, upon completion. It is reasonable to suppose that the Auditor General would be given a short-term investigative function that could be used to fuel the controversies of the day. The risk would increase if Bill C-271, allowing standing committees to ask the Auditor General to examine specific questions, were adopted. The Auditor General might then have to investigate some questions that would impede him in carrying out his heavy responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General must still have the right to choose what he considers pertinent to investigate and not simply accede to all the frivolous requests from sensation-seeking Opposition parties.

Mr. Speaker, we have a high quality audit bureau that reports to Parliament and it seems to me that we should look very closely at the consequences of the proposed changes to the Auditor General Act before implementing them. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Bill is unacceptable because of the lack of measures in it to preserve the Auditor General's independence.

Mr. Speaker, in this whole matter, we must judge the operations of the Auditor General on the basis of the powers conferred by our party since we took power and the responses we make to the deficiencies that he has discovered in our system. We do not wait four or five years or two years or for an election before realizing that things are not right. We correct them as we go along and we intend to continue to do so like the good businessmen we have always been.

• (1730)

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 42(1) the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

Air Canada

SITTING SUSPENDED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The sitting is suspended until six o'clock p.m.

At 5.35 p.m. the sitting of the House was suspended.

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 6 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order! It being 6.00 p.m., the House will now proceed to recorded divisions on Bill C-121, C-110, C-92, C-82, C-30 and on the message received from the Senate concerning Bill C-103.

Call in the Members.

* * *

AIR CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Thursday, July 14, consideration of the motion of Mr. de Cotret that Bill C-129, an Act to provide for the continuance of Air Canada under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares thereof to the public, be read the third time and passed.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

[*English*]

(*Division No. 476*)

YEAS

Members

Andre	Duplessis	Hnatyshyn
Attewell	Edwards	Hockin
Bernier	Ellis	Horner
Binns	Epp (Provencher)	James
Bosley	Ferland	Jepson
Bouchard (Roberval)	Fontaine	Jourdenais
Brightwell	Forrestall	Kempling
Caldwell	Fraleigh	Kilgour
Champagne (Champlain)	Fretz	Landry
Chartrand	Friesen	Lanthier
Clark (Brandon—Souris)	Gagnon	Lawrence
Cochrane	Gormley	Lesick
Comeau	Graham	Lewis
Corbett	Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
Crosby (Halifax West)	Grisé	MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Darling	Hamelin	MacKay
Desjardins	Hardey	Mailly
Domm	Hicks	Mantha

Martin
Mazankowski
McCuish
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McKinnon
Minaker
Mitges
O'Neil
Oostrom
Paproski
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Schellenberg (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin)
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Siddon
Taylor
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Tupper
Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Warner
Winegard—92

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Angus
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Boudria
Copps
Dewar
Dingwall
Finestone
Gauthier
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Harris
Heap
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Isabelle
Kaplan
Keeper
Langdon
MacLellan
Manly
Nystrom
Riis
Robinson
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29

● (1820)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

ELDORADO NUCLEAR LIMITED REORGANIZATION AND DIVESTITURE ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Thursday, July 14, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mazankowski that Bill C-121, an Act to authorize the reorganization and divestiture of Eldorado Nuclear Limited and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please rise.

During the taking of the vote:

Mr. Gauthier: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Since we have already started, we will proceed with the vote.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Mazankowski), which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 477*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Andre
Attewell
Bernier
Binns
Bosley
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boudria
Brightwell
Caldwell
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cochrane
Comeau
Copps
Corbett
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Epp (Provencher)
Ferland
Finestone
Fontaine
Forrestall
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gauthier
Gormley
Graham
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Hamelin
Hardey
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Hopkins
Horner
Isabelle
James
Jepson
Jourdenais
Kaplan
Kempling
Kilgour
Landry
Lanthier
Lawrence
Lesick
Lewis
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacKay
MacLellan
Mailly
Mantha
Martin
Mazankowski
McCuish
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McKinnon
Minaker
Mitges
O'Neil
Oostrom
Paproski
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Schellenberg (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin)
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Siddon
Taylor
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Tupper
Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Warner
Winegard—103

NAYS

Members

Angus
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Dewar
Harris
Heap
Hovdebo
Keeper
Langdon
Manly
Nystrom
Riis
Robinson
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell
Young—18

● (1830)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL TRADE TRIBUNAL ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Thursday, July 14, consideration of the motion of Mr. Hockin that Bill C-110, an Act to establish the Canadian International Trade Tribunal and to amend and repeal other Acts in consequence thereof, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall I dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Hockin), which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 478)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Attewell
Bernier
Binns
Bosley
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boudria
Brightwell
Caldwell
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cochrane
Comeau
Copps
Darling
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Ferland
Finestone
Fontaine
Forrestall
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gauthier
Gormley
Graham
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Hamelin
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Hopkins
Horner
Isabelle
James
Jepson
Jourdenais
Kaplan
Kempling
Kilgour
Landry
Lanthier
Lawrence
Lesick
Lewis
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Mailly
Mantha
Marin
Martin
Mazankowski
McCuish
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McKinnon
Minaker
O'Neil
Oostrom
Paproski
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Schellenberg (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin)
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Siddon
Stevens
Taylor
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Tupper
Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Warner
Winegard—100

Canadian Wheat Board Act

NAYS

Members

Angus
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Cassidy
Dewar
Harris
Heap
Hovdebo
Keeper
Langdon
Manly
Murphy
Nystrom
Riis
Robinson
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell
Young—20

● (1850)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Friday, July 15, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mayer that Bill C-92, an Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, be read the third time and passed.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Mayer), which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 479)

YEAS

Members

Attewell
Bernier
Binns
Bosley
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Caldwell
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cochrane
Comeau
Corbett
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Desjardins
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Ferland
Fontaine
Forrestall
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gormley
Graham
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Hamelin
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Horner
James
Jepson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Kilgour
Landry
Lanthier
Lawrence
Lesick
Lewis
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacKay
Mailly
Mantha
Marin
Martin
Mazankowski
McCuish
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McKinnon
Minaker
O'Neil
Oostrom
Paproski
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Schellenberg (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin)
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Siddon
Stevens
Taylor

Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Tupper
Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Warner
Winegard—92

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Angus
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Boudria
Cassidy
Copps
Dewar
Dingwall
Finestone
Gauthier
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Harris
Heap
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Isabelle
Kaplan
Keeper
MacLellan
Manly
Murphy
Nystrom
Riis
Robinson
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell
Young—30

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

• (1900)

LOBBYISTS REGISTRATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Friday, July 15, consideration of Bill C-82, an Act respecting the registration of lobbyists, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on Bill C-82, an Act respecting the registration of lobbyists, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee. We will vote on the deferred motions as listed on the Order Paper. The first question will be on Motion No. 4. Mr. Rodriguez moved:

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-82 be amended in Clause 5 by striking out lines 11 and 12 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"may be;

(e) the fee charged by the individual for performing the activities described in subsection (1); and

(f) such other information relating to the".

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall I dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Rodriguez), which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 480*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Angus
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Boudria
Cassidy
Copps
Dewar
Dingwall
Finestone
Gauthier
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Harris
Heap
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Isabelle
Kaplan
Keeper
MacLellan
Manly
Murphy
Nystrom
Riis
Robinson
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell
Young—30

NAYS

Members

Attewell
Bernier
Binns
Bosley
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Caldwell
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cochrane
Comeau
Corbett
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Desjardins
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Ferland
Fontaine
Forrestall
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gormley
Graham
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Hamelin
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Horner
James
Jepson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Kilgour
Landry
Lanthier
Lawrence
Lesick
Lewis
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacKay
Mailly
Mantha
Marin
Martin
Mazankowski
McCrossan
McCuish
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McKinnon
Minaker
O'Neil
Oostrom
Paproski
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Schellenberg (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin)
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Siddon
Stevens
Taylor
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Tupper
Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Warner
Winegard—93

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you would find consent to the following proposal, that the vote just taken be applied to Motion No. 6 in the name of the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez), Motion No. 7 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) and Motion No. 8 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt. I will deal with concurrence after that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the suggestion of the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The next question in on Motion No. 6. Mr. Rodriguez moved:

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-82 be amended in Clause 6 by striking out line 30 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"graphs 5(1)(a) to (f), that employee shall,"

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Rodriguez), which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 481)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Angus
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Boudria
Cassidy
Copps
Dewar
Dingwall
Finestone
Gauthier
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Harris
Heap
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Isabelle
Kaplan
Keeper
MacLellan
Manly
Murphy
Nystrom
Riis
Robinson
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell
Young—30

NAYS

Members

Attewell
Bernier
Binns
Bosley
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Caldwell
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cochrane
Comeau
Corbett
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Desjardins
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Ferland
Fontaine
Forrestall
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gormley
Graham
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Hamelin
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Horner
James
Jepson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Kilgour
Landry
Lanthier
Lawrence
Lesick
Lewis
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacKay
Mailly
Mantha
Marin
Martin
Mazankowski
McCrossan
McCuish
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McKinnon
Minaker
O'Neil
Oostrom
Paproski
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Schellenberg (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin)
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Siddon
Stevens
Taylor
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Tupper
Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Warner
Winegard—93

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost. The next question is on Motion No. 7. Mr. Boudria moved:

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-82 be amended in Clause 6 by striking out lines 38 to 41 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"(a) the name of the employee;

(b) the name and address of the person or organization by whom the employee is employed; and

(c) the proposed subject matter of the meeting or communication, as the case may be."

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Boudria), which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 482)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Angus
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Boudria
Cassidy
Copps
Dewar
Dingwall
Finestone
Gauthier
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Harris
Heap
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Isabelle
Kaplan
Keeper
MacLellan
Manly
Murphy
Nystrom
Riis
Robinson
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell
Young—30

NAYS

Members

Attewell
Bernier
Binns
Bosley
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Caldwell
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cochrane
Comeau
Corbett
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Desjardins
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Ferland
Fontaine
Forrestall
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gormley
Graham
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Hamelin
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Horner
James
Jepson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Kilgour
Landry
Lanthier
Lawrence
Lesick
Lewis
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacKay
Mailly
Mantha
Marin
Martin
Mazankowski
McCrossan
McCuish
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McKinnon
Minaker
O'Neil
Oostrom
Paproski
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plamondon
Porter
Redway

Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Schellenberg
(Nanaimo—Alberni)
Schellenberger
(Wetaskiwin)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Siddon
Stevens
Taylor
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Tremblay
(Lotbinière)
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Warner
Winegard—93

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 8. Mr. Rodriguez moved:

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-82 be amended in Clause 6 by striking out line 41 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"employed;

(c) the proposed subject matter of the communication; and

(d) the summary of the costs incurred by the person or organization while performing the activities described in this subsection."

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Rodriguez) which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 483)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Angus
Benjamin
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blaikie
Boudria
Cassidy
Copps
Dewar
Dingwall
Finestone
Gauthier
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Harris
Heap
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Isabelle
Kaplan
Keeper
MacLellan
Manly
Murphy
Nystrom
Riis
Robinson
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell
Young—30

NAYS

Members

Attewell
Bernier
Binns
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Brightwell
Caldwell
Champagne
(Champlain)
Chartrand
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Cochrane
Comeau
Corbett
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Darling
Desjardins
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Ferland
Fontaine
Forrestall
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gormley
Graham
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Hamelin
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Horner
James
Jepson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Kilgour
Landry
Lanthier
Lawrence
Lesick
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacKay
Mailly
Mantha
Marin
Martin
Mazankowski
McCrossan
McCuish
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McKinnon
Minaker
O'Neil
Oostrom
Paproski
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Schellenberg
(Nanaimo—Alberni)
Schellenberger
(Wetaskiwin)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Siddon
Stevens
Taylor
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Tremblay
(Lotbinière)
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Warner
Winegard—93

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved that the Bill, as amended, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall I dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 484)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Attewell
Bernier
Binns
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Boudria
Brightwell
Caldwell
Champagne
(Champlain)
Chartrand
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Cochrane
Comeau
Copps
Corbett
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Darling
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Ferland
Finestone
Fontaine
Forrestall
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon

Gauthier	MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)	Ricard
Gormley	MacDougall (Timiskaming)	St-Julien
Graham	MacKay	Schellenberg (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	MacLellan	Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin)
Grisé	Mailly	Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)	Mantha	Scowen
Hamelin	Marin	Shields
Hardey	Martin	Siddon
Harvey	Mazankowski	Stevens
Hicks	McCrossan	Taylor
Hnatyshyn	McCuish	Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Hockin	McDermid	Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Hopkins	McDougall (St. Paul's)	Tupper
Horner	McKinnon	Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Isabelle	Minaker	Valcourt
James	O'Neil	Vankoughnet
Jepson	Oostrom	Vézina
Jourdenais	Paproski	Vincent
Kaplan	Pennock	Warner
Kempling	Peterson	Winegard—104
Kilgour	Pietz	
Landry	Plamondon	
Lanthier	Porter	
Lawrence	Redway	
Lesick	Reid	
Lewis	Reimer	

NAYS

Members

Angus	Heap	Rodriguez
Benjamin	Hovdebo	Skelly
Blackburn (Brant)	Keeper	Waddell
Blaikie	Manly	Young—19
Cassidy	Murphy	
Dewar	Nystrom	
Harris	Riis	
	Robinson	

• (1910)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

When shall the Bill be read a third time? At the next sitting of the House?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Benjamin: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make it abundantly clear to the House that the front benches of the NDP caucus are not on both sides of any issue and that the vote of the front bench of the NDP caucus will apply to the second time we voted.

Mr. Mazankowski: How many votes do you think you get for a nickel?

* * *

NATIONAL PARKS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Friday, July 15 consideration of Bill C-30, an Act to amend the National Parks Act and to amend an Act to amend the National Parks Act, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on Bill C-30.

Mr. Angus: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. During the debate taking place on the report stage amendments to Bill C-30 on July 15, as shown at *Hansard* page 17631, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Government House Leader indicated that the Government was prepared, with unanimous consent which was given, to set aside the issue of Motion No. 10 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman) in order to give the Government time to consider the process. Is the Government prepared to accept that very specific amendment relating to the Carmanah watershed area?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my hon. friend giving me notice of his intention to raise this point of order. He is correct in his comments with respect to what the Parliamentary Secretary said he would do. I would reiterate that it is the feeling of the Government that Motion No. 9, which was approved, gave broader coverage than Motion No. 10. We feel it has the same effect but would not foreclose on the option of the province taking all or any responsibility for preserving the valley. For that reason we will hold with Motion No. 9.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The first question will be on Motion No. 3. Mr. Caccia moved:

Motion No. 3:

That Bill C-30 be amended in Clause 3 by adding immediately after line 18 at page 2 the following:

"(2) Immediately following subsection 3.1(5) of the said Act the following is added:

"3.2(1) The Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Minister, designate a site containing a unique or rare natural feature of phenomenon, or a site of high scientific value and public interest, whose protection is feasible as a Canadian Landmark.

(2) The Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Minister, establish criteria for the selection, administration and management of Canadian Landmarks."

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 485*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand	Dewar	Hopkins
Angus	Dingwall	Hovdebo
Benjamin	Finestone	Isabelle
Blackburn (Brant)	Gauthier	Kaplan
Blaikie	Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)	Keeper
Boudria	Harris	MacLellan
Cassidy	Heap	Manly
		Murphy

Nystrom
Riis
Robinson
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29

NAYS

Members

Andre
Attewell
Bernier
Binns
Bosley
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Caldwell
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cochrane
Comeau
Corbett
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Desjardins
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Ferland
Fontaine
Forrestall
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gormley
Graham
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Hamelin
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Horner
James
Jepson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Kilgour
Landry
Lanthier
Lawrence
Lesick
Lewis
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacKay
Mailly
Mantha
Marin
Martin
Mazankowski
McCrossan
McCuish
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McKinnon
Minaker
O'Neil
Oostrom
Paproski
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Schellenberg (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin)
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Siddon
Stevens
Taylor
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Tupper
Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Warner
Winegard—93

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Gauthier: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think you will find there is a disposition to apply the vote just taken to Motions Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8 and 13. I understand that if there is a negative vote on Motion No. 6, that it would necessarily have to be negatived also on Motion No. 8. Although we would be affirmative on all these questions, I take it the Government would maintain its position.

Mr. Lewis: Always.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the proposal made by the Hon. Member.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 4. Mr. Caccia moved:

Motion No. 4:

That Bill C-30 be amended in Clause 3 by adding immediately after line 18 at page 2 the following:

"(2) Immediately following subsection 3.1(5) of the said Act the following is added:

"4.(1) The Governor in Council may set apart any land the title to which is vested in Her Majesty, as a National Wilderness Park."

"(2) National Wilderness Parks shall be administered, managed and controlled in a manner consistent with sections 5(9) and 5(10) of this Act, and with preservation of the wilderness character of the Park as the only priority."

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 486*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Angus
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Boudria
Cassidy
Dewar
Dingwall
Finestone
Gauthier
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Harris
Heap
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Isabelle
Kaplan
Keeper
MacLellan
Manly
Murphy
Nystrom
Riis
Robinson
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29

NAYS

Members

Andre
Attewell
Bernier
Binns
Bosley
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Caldwell
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cochrane
Comeau
Corbett
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Desjardins
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Ferland
Fontaine
Forrestall
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gormley
Graham
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Hamelin
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Horner
James
Jepson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Kilgour
Landry
Lanthier
Lawrence
Lesick
Lewis
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacKay
Mailly
Mantha
Marin
Martin
Mazankowski
McCrossan
McCuish
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McKinnon
Minaker
O'Neil
Oostrom
Paproski
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Schellenberg (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin)
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Siddon
Stevens
Taylor
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Tupper
Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Warner
Winegard—93

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The next vote is on Motion No. 5. Mr. Caccia moved:

Motion No. 5:

That Bill C-30 be amended in Clause 8 by striking out lines 7 to 14 at page 12 and substituting the following therefor:

"The Governor in Council may, by order, amend Schedule III to designate a portion of Banff National Park in the vicinity of Mount Norquay a commercial ski area, but that schedule is not subject to subsequent amendment by the Governor in Council."

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 487*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand	Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)	Nystrom
Angus	Harris	Riis
Benjamin	Heap	Robinson
Blackburn (Brant)	Hopkins	Rodriguez
Blaikie	Hovdebo	Skelly
Boudria	Isabelle	Waddell
Cassidy	Kaplan	Young—29
Dewar	Keeper	
Dingwall	MacLellan	
Finestone	Manly	
Gauthier	Murphy	

NAYS

Members

Andre	Grisé	Pennock
Attewell	Hamelin	Peterson
Bernier	Hardey	Pietz
Binns	Harvey	Plamondon
Bosley	Hicks	Porter
Bouchard (Roberval)	Hnatyshyn	Redway
Brightwell	Hockin	Reid
Caldwell	Horner	Reimer
Champagne (Champlain)	James	Ricard
Chartrand	Jepson	St-Julien
Clark (Brandon—Souris)	Jourdenais	Schellenberg (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Cochrane	Kempling	Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin)
Comeau	Kilgour	Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Corbett	Landry	Scowen
Crosby (Halifax West)	Lanthier	Shields
Darling	Lawrence	Siddon
Desjardins	Lesick	Stevens
Domm	Lewis	Taylor
Duplessis	MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)	Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Edwards	MacKay	Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Ellis	Mailly	Tupper
Ferland	Mantha	Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Fontaine	Marin	Valcourt
Forrestall	Martin	Vankoughnet
Fraleigh	Mazankowski	Vézina
Fretz	McCrossan	Vincent
Friesen	McCuish	Warner
Gagnon	McDermid	Winegard—93
Gormley	McDougall (St. Paul's)	
Graham	McKinnon	
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Minaker	
	O'Neil	
	Oostrom	
	Paproski	

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The next vote is on Motion No. 6. Mr. Caccia moved:

Motion No. 6:

That Bill C-30 be amended in Clause 8 by adding immediately after line 14 at page 12 the following:

"10. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any existing aboriginal or treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada under section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, or any rights conferred by land claim settlement with aboriginal peoples within a National Park."

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 488*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand	Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)	Nystrom
Angus	Harris	Riis
Benjamin	Heap	Robinson
Blackburn (Brant)	Hopkins	Rodriguez
Blaikie	Hovdebo	Skelly
Boudria	Isabelle	Waddell
Cassidy	Kaplan	Young—29
Dewar	Keeper	
Dingwall	MacLellan	
Finestone	Manly	
Gauthier	Murphy	

NAYS

Members

Andre	Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	McDougall (St. Paul's)
Attewell	Grisé	McKinnon
Bernier	Hamelin	Minaker
Binns	Hardey	O'Neil
Bosley	Harvey	Oostrom
Bouchard (Roberval)	Hicks	Paproski
Brightwell	Hnatyshyn	Pennock
Caldwell	Hockin	Peterson
Champagne (Champlain)	Horner	Pietz
Chartrand	James	Plamondon
Clark (Brandon—Souris)	Jepson	Porter
Cochrane	Jourdenais	Redway
Comeau	Kempling	Reid
Corbett	Kilgour	Reimer
Crosby (Halifax West)	Landry	Ricard
Darling	Lanthier	St-Julien
Desjardins	Lawrence	Schellenberg (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Domm	Lesick	Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin)
Duplessis	Lewis	Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Edwards	MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)	Scowen
Ellis	MacKay	Shields
Ferland	Mailly	Siddon
Fontaine	Mantha	Stevens
Forrestall	Marin	Taylor
Fraleigh	Martin	Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Fretz	Mazankowski	Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Friesen	McCrossan	Tupper
Gagnon	McCuish	
Gormley	McDermid	
Graham		

Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Warner
Winegard—93

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The next vote is on Motion No. 8. Ms. McLaughlin moved:

Motion No. 8:

That Bill C-30 be amended in Clause 13 by adding immediately after line 42 at page 13 the following:

"(2) Nothing in this Act or the National Parks Act in any way derogates from or abrogates the aboriginal and treaty rights that are already constitutionally recognized in subsection 35(1) of the Constitution Act, 1982."

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 489*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Angus
Benjamin
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blaikie
Boudria
Cassidy
Dewar
Dingwall
Finestone
Gauthier
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Harris
Heap
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Isabelle
Kaplan
Keeper
MacLellan
Manly
Murphy
Nystrom
Riis
Robinson
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29

NAYS

Members

Andre
Attewell
Bernier
Binns
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Brightwell
Caldwell
Champagne
(Champlain)
Chartrand
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Cochrane
Comeau
Corbett
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Darling
Desjardins
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Ferland
Fontaine
Forrestall
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gormley
Graham
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Hamelin
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Horner
James
Jepson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Kilgour
Landry
Lanthier
Lawrence
Lesick
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacKay
Mailly
Mantha
Marin
Martin
Mazankowski
McCrossan
McCuish
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McKinnon
Minaker
O'Neil
Oostrom
Paproski
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Schellenberg
(Nanaimo—Alberni)
Schellenberger
(Wetaskiwin)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Siddon
Stevens
Taylor
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Tremblay
(Lotbinière)
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Warner
Winegard—93

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The next vote is on Motion No. 13. Mr. Caccia moved:

Motion No. 13:

That Bill C-30 be amended in Schedule III thereof by adding to the description under Banff National Park immediately after paragraph 1 at page 41 the following:

"(b) The whole of Parcel DD according to Plan 67271 in the Canada Lands Surveys Records at Ottawa, a copy of which is filed in the Land Titles Office for the South Alberta Land Registration District at Calgary under number 8011493, said parcel containing 918 hectares, more or less."

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 490*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Angus
Benjamin
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blaikie
Boudria
Cassidy
Dewar
Dingwall
Finestone
Gauthier
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Harris
Heap
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Isabelle
Kaplan
Keeper
MacLellan
Manly
Murphy
Nystrom
Riis
Robinson
Rodriguez
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29

NAYS

Members

Andre
Attewell
Bernier
Binns
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Brightwell
Caldwell
Champagne
(Champlain)
Chartrand
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Cochrane
Comeau
Corbett
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Darling
Desjardins
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Ferland
Fontaine
Forrestall
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gormley
Graham
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Hamelin
Hardey
Harvey
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Horner
James
Jepson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Kilgour
Landry
Lanthier
Lawrence
Lesick
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacKay
Mailly
Mantha
Marin
Martin
Mazankowski
McCrossan
McCuish
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McKinnon
Minaker
O'Neil
Oostrom
Paproski
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reid

Reimer
Ricard
St-Julien
Schellenberg
(Nanaimo—Alberni)
Schellenberger
(Wetaskiwin)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Siddon
Stevens
Taylor
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Tremblay
(Lotbinière)
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Warner
Winegard—93

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (for the Minister of the Environment) moved that the Bill be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the Bill be read the third time? By unanimous consent, later this day?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the deferred division on the motion concerning the Message to the Senate in relation to Bill C-103.

* * *

CANADIAN ORGANIZATION ACT, ATLANTIC CANADA, 1987

MEASURE TO ENACT—NON-CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lewis:

That a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this House disagrees with the text of the Message made by the Senate to Bill C-103, an Act to increase opportunity for economic development in Atlantic Canada, to establish the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts, because this House believes that in dividing the Bill, the Senate has altered the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of the grants of aid and supplies set out in the Bill, contrary to Standing Order 87, as recommended by Her Excellency the Governor General to this House, and has therefore infringed the privileges of this House, and asks that the Senate return Bill C-103 in an undivided form.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 491*)

YEAS

Members

Andre
Angus
Attewell
Benjamin
Bernier
Binns
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blaikie
Bosley
Brightwell
Caldwell
Cassidy
Champagne
(Champlain)
Chartrand
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Cochrane
Comeau
Corbett
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Darling
Desjardins
Dewar
Domm
Duplessis
Edwards
Ellis
Ferland
Fontaine
Forrestall
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gormley
Graham
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Hamelin
Hardey
Harris
Harvey
Heap
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Horner
Hovdebo
James
Jepson
Jourdenais
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
Landry
Lanthier
Lawrence
Lesick
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacKay
Mailly
Manly
Mantha
Marin
Martin
Mazankowski
McCrossan
McCuish
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McKinnon
Minaker
Murphy
Nystrom
O'Neil
Oostrom
Paproski
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
Riis
Robinson
Rodriguez
St-Julien
Schellenberg
(Nanaimo—Alberni)
Schellenberger
(Wetaskiwin)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Stevens
Taylor
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Tremblay
(Lotbinière)
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Waddell
Warner
Winegard
Young—112

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Boudria
Dingwall
Finestone
Gauthier
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Kaplan
MacLellan—10

• (1920)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the Parties and I want to put those discussions on the record. The Government will now call Bill C-30 at third reading. When the debate is finished, if there is a division requested, it will be deferred until 6 p.m. tomorrow and the House will call it ten o'clock.

* * *

NATIONAL PARKS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Doug Lewis (for the Minister of the Environment) moved that Bill C-30, an Act to amend the National Parks Act and to amend an Act to amend the National Parks Act, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Barry Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gauthier: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) supports this Bill very enthusiastically, as he does everything I do in the Government and in the National Capital Region. He is a great credit to this region. He is going to work for me in the next election.

I am pleased to have been chosen to speak on behalf of the Government on this extremely important and timely piece of environmental legislation. As you know, Sir, I am one of the legislative committee chairpersons and I have a personal policy of not wanting to get involved in debates on any Bill I had chaired or was going to chair. However, as a former National Parks employee I am making an exception because I am intensely proud of that past and our expanding National Parks system. Also, the legislative committee proceeded in a very non-partisan way on what we all agree is a very non-partisan but important national issue.

A short time ago the Canadian Environment Protection Act was the first comprehensive federal environmental legislation in this country's history to be passed by Parliament. On behalf of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) and his Parliamentary Secretary, I have the honour of speaking to another tremendously significant environmental initiative as it comes before this House for third reading, namely, the long overdue amendments to the National Parks Act.

In 1974 the Act was amended in a minor way. The Act which was originally created in 1930 by this Parliament is now being amended in a significant way, 58 years after it first came before this House.

The Environmental Protection Act is aimed at safeguarding us in our homes, our businesses, our industries, and our urban areas. In short, it protects the people of Canada where we live and work.

The National Parks Act is aimed at safeguarding special islands in an urban sea for the times we leave our normal surroundings and wish to revive our spirits—places where we surrender control and manipulation of our environment and let nature itself dictate the terms of our visit.

I am sure you will agree, Sir, that we all need and deserve clean, unpolluted surroundings for the enjoyment of our everyday lives. We need and deserve the refreshment of nature when we depart from our routines. This is what the quality of life in Canada is all about. How many times have you told yourself that you want to get away to somewhere quiet, somewhere clean?

Canada is often called the country of the great white north. God bless the great white north. Let us keep it strong and free. These revisions to the National Parks Act will significantly enhance those opportunities, not only for our people but for those around the world who visit our great system.

CEPA and the National Parks Act will work side by side to keep the quality of life in Canada one of the highest in the world. In the case of the national parks, even those unfortunate people who have never visited one must take pride that this nation has the sensitivity to preserve such magnificent examples of our national heritage. Last year over 19 million individuals, mostly Canadians, visited the national parks system in our country.

The National Parks Act amendments are strong simply because they must be strong. It is a great credit to the legislative committee members who reviewed Bill C-30 that they recognized this need and worked long and hard to reshape and add to the original proposals. I commend the opposition Members on the committee whose reasoned analyses of the issues led to many important changes being adopted in the report.

Over 30 individuals and groups who made consistently thoughtful and insightful oral or written presentations on behalf of their specific interests are also to be commended for their input to Bill C-30.

Participation ranged from environmental organizations such as the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society—and here I wish to congratulate Kevin McNamee, the conservation director for that society, for the tremendous work that he and his society did toward helping us making this a better Bill—to groups representing the native peoples of Canada and tourism-oriented agencies such as the Chamber of Commerce in Jasper.

• (1930)

All of their very thoughtful presentations included some suggested changes to the Bill. We could not accept all of them, but we certainly satisfied many of the requests they brought forward to make it a stronger and better Bill. Through that process of consultation, this committee can be very proud of the work it did.

One of the most significant changes to the original Bill concerns the addition of the legislated requirement to produce management plans for each national park. It was evident from the committee hearings that the wide range of viewpoints and the passionate concerns of interest groups must inescapably be considered in preparing such plans. The parks service has a very good record in conducting consultation, but the committee decided that a greater accountability was needed.

The committee therefore proposed that all plans be tabled in the House, that such plans be reviewed every five years and retabled in the House with any changes. That proposal was accepted. Through that process of consultation, the framework of the actual purpose of the national parks which is outlined in Clause 4 can and will be maintained clearly and consistently. Clause 4 states:

> The National Parks of Canada are hereby dedicated to the people of Canada for their benefit, education and enjoyment... and shall be

maintained and made use of so as to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

It reminds me of when I worked in Africa at the national parks in Tanzania. The sign at the entrance of the Serengeti National Park read: "Here the world is still young and fragile, held in trust for your sons and ours". We can apply a similar philosophy to the national parks in our great country.

A significant amendment that was accepted by the committee was put forward by the Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia). It links directly to the importance of having those management plans tabled and approved in Parliament. His amendment read:

Maintenance of ecological integrity through the protection of natural resources shall be the first priority when considering park zoning and visitor use in a management plan.

Another important amendment states that the Minister of the Environment will table a document in the House every two years reporting on the state of the parks and progress toward establishing new parks.

Other changes made as a result of the process of consultation on Bill C-30 relate to the additional protection in a second schedule of certain wildlife species. We also incorporated at report stage reference to national marine parks, the first one being on the Bruce Peninsula in Ontario.

This new national marine park reference signals the start of an ambitious program of conservation aimed at protecting significant examples of the salt and freshwater environments.

The Minister will use this new found authority to push on with important initiatives related to establishing marine parks in South Moresby, the Saguenay and many other parts of Canada.

Another provision of the Bill which has been requested since the first Act was proclaimed in 1930 is the change to penalty provisions that were drastically out of date. Bill C-30 has now established the highest fines in the world for the protection of endangered and trophy species in our national parks. For example, fines of up to $150,000 can now result from convictions of those killing threatened species such as polar bear and bighorn sheep. Fines could be up to $10,000 for persons convicted of killing protected species such as wolf or elk in our national parks.

In order for the parks employees to enforce these new measures of protection, they will need more help from the Ministry of the Environment. I encourage the Government and the Minister to allocate the help that the enforcement officers will need to catch those who are destroying our wildlife.

Bill C-30 will also ensure continued protection for wilderness areas. Within Banff and Jasper National Parks in particular, it will give a clear rationale for defining limits to commercial and urban development.

Aside from the Bruce Peninsula National Park and the National Marine Park amendments introduced at report stage, Bill C-30 will establish Ellesmere Island National Park Reserve and give proclamation authority for Grasslands National Park in Saskatchewan.

I am proud to be speaking on behalf of the Government. I congratulate the Minister and, particularly his Parliamentary Secretary who worked long and hard and showed excellent leadership in ensuring that Bill C-30 has come to pass. The committee did an excellent job. Most important, the officials and the staff who helped us throughout our deliberations did a superb job. I congratulate all of them.

Parliament will have its final say on behalf of our people and our parks. This is a very proud moment for me because I first went to our national parks system as a labourer. Now I am speaking as a legislator.

In 1967, when I went to Banff National Park to work as a labourer, I recognized the magnificence and beauty of that park. I know the Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) is proud to say that that part of his wonderful province has been entrenched in law for over 100 years. I recall that Jack Nicol was director general of Parks Canada and Jean Chrétien was Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development at that time. I give him credit for initiating new national parks during his mandate.

Pierre Lesaux, presently one of the commissioners at the Public Service Commission of Canada, worked for the parks system. Pierre Desmeules was involved in the resource inventory task force. All of us worked hard to make sure that our parks systems would continue to grow.

It is my honour, looking back over 21 years of national parks interest, service and dedication, to have this last word before our National Parks Act is amended and greatly strengthened by this Parliament.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate on Bill C-30, an Act to amend the National Parks Act. First, I want to congratulate my distinguished colleague, the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) for the excellent work he has done in this area. We know that the Member was an excellent Minister of the Environment and is someone who really cares about environmental issues. Unfortunately, he cannot be with us today because he is representing our country at an international conference on environmental issues. Again, he has our interest at heart.

The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Carleton (Mr. Turner) described this Bill as a major piece of legislation. While our national parks system is a major issue, this legislation itself does not qualify as the type of legislation described by the Member for Ottawa—Carleton. After all, this is a Bill that was introduced in a previous Parliament, by the Hon. Member for Davenport when he was Minister of the Environment. Since the previous Parliament dissolved in July, 1984, one wonders why the new Minister of the Environment waited until December, 1986, to reintroduce what is essentially the

same Bill. One cannot help but wonder why the Bill was allowed to gather dust all that time. Nevertheless, the Hon. Member for Davenport and I are very pleased the Bill is proceeding now. After all, it was a Bill he introduced.

• (1940)

As I indicated moments ago, the Bill was introduced in this House in December of 1986. One would have assumed the Government would have dealt with it expeditiously, trying to advance the legislation and make progress so that it could wind its way through the different processes. However, interestingly enough, the Bill which has just been described as landmark and super important by the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Carleton was not even touched by the Government for 16 months. Sixteen months after it was introduced in the House in December of 1986, remembering that it had gathered dust for 30 months before that, the Government began to proceed with second reading debate.

During those 16 months there were urgings by Members of this House, particularly the Hon. Member for Davenport, that the legislation proceed and be enacted into law. Nevertheless, there was a considerable delay. One could ask why there was a delay. According to the *Edmonton Journal* of December 5, 1987, Bill C-30 was "held hostage by the Tory Alberta caucus". The ransom demanded for allowing Bill C-30 to go through Parliament was the expansion of tourism and resource development in national parks, particularly the four mountain parks in British Columbia and Alberta. Those, of course, are Yoho, Banff, Jasper and Waterton.

According to R.V. Rasmussen of the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society in Edmonton, the Minister of the Environment had the people of Alberta on his side. In a letter dated January 10, 1988, to all Members of Parliament, Mr. Rasmussen wrote:

> The Alberta caucus is very much out of touch with Albertans on this issue.

I have a copy of that letter in front of me, in fact.

> Letters and editorials are unanimously against the development stance. In fact, there has not been a single letter (to the editor) supporting the stance of the Alberta caucus.

With the public on his side, we all hoped that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. MacMillan) would stand up to some of those Members of Parliament, and I do not know whether the Member opposite is one of them. I can only report the information we received from the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society. Instead, the Minister retreated. He supported the removal of the boundaries of the Sunshine Valley Ski Village from Bill C-30 instead of leaving it to Cabinet to decide on the degree of expansion to allow for the ski area.

In other words, the original proposal would have called for Parliament to decide on the boundaries of this particular ski village. That decision can now be taken by Cabinet. We feel this was a watering down of what otherwise could have been stronger legislation. This was the price the Minister agreed to pay in order to get the co-operation of some of his colleagues in getting Bill C-30 through Parliament.

I would like to speak briefly about the improvements to Bill C-30. Witnesses in front of the legislative committee put forward some excellent suggestions to improve the Bill. The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Carleton has referred to some of those. The committee accepted a number of amendments proposed by the Hon. Member for Davenport and others to make Bill C-30 a better piece of legislation. The Canadian Heritage Fund was dropped. This scheme proposed to solicit money from individual Canadians to improve national parks, but the fund would be spent at the direction and discretion of the Minister. There had been no consultation with non-government groups who were seen as the instruments to collect the money for what appeared to be little more than funds that could be used for political motives.

Fortunately, the committee was convinced to remove this measure from the Bill and we urge the Minister of the Environment to take up the offer of the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society and immediately initiate discussions with all interested parties to determine how best to set up a co-operative funding scheme that would be acceptable to all parties concerned and, most important, lead to the development of a capital fund for the acquisition of new parks in Canada.

Ecological principles will be made the first management priority for national parks as a result of an amendment to Bill C-30. This important amendment was suggested by the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society so that the National Parks Act would reflect the principles laid out in the 1979 Parks Canada policy. Believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, government members on the committee initially refused to support this amendment which legislated parks policy until interventions were made by interested parties. In other words, government members refused to go along with this proposed amendment.

Overnight, a number of people, particularly the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, lobbied and convinced the Minister that this amendment was worth while. Overnight the officials of the Department redrafted the same amendment—with a few different words, of course—and when government members came into the committee room the next day, and looked at the brand new amendment, they noted how much better it was than the previous one. Of course, it was exactly the same but with different words. The amendment passed unanimously.

Another amendment adopted by the committee will require the Minister to prepare and table in the House a park management plan for new parks within five years of their proclamation. There is now also a requirement for public participation in the preparation of management plans, as appropriate.

The Minister will also be required to report to Parliament every two years on the status of the national parks system and the progress made toward establishing new parks. That again

was referred to previously today by the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Carleton.

We all know the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Carleton is indeed an expert in this area. As he indicated, he has been a park warden both in this country and abroad. I have often chatted with him about such issues and I can indeed attest to the fact that he is very knowledgeable in the area of the functioning and management of parks.

There are still things missing in Bill C-30. We voted about an hour ago on amendments to Bill C-30 which would have made the legislation far better. The Canadian Landmarks program was approved in principle in 1979 when the present Speaker of our Parliament was Minister of the Environment. The 1984 land claims settlement of the Inuit of the western Arctic established the pingos of Tuktoyaktuk as a Canadian landmark to be managed by the Minister of the Environment under the National Parks Act. For those who are not familiar with "pingos", they are a very unique feature. It is a form of outcrop coming from the land which is caused by heaving. It is similar to what we might find in our driveway in the spring with the exception that they are much higher. I am told they can be 60 to 70 feet high. They are a very unique and distinctive formation. They are indeed something that is very special. They have been identified as a landmark.

• (1950)

The present Act makes no reference to Canadian landmarks, even though there was an amendment proposed to have those landmarks identified. Parks Canada is having some difficulty in finding a way to carry out its mandate with respect to the pingos of Tuktoyaktuk. The Hon. Member for Davenport put forward a motion to include the Canadian landmarks in the Act. The Minister wrote back to my colleague, the Hon. Member for Davenport, saying what a great idea this is. As a matter of fact, I have a copy of a letter undoubtedly written by officials in the Minister's Department. There are a few handwritten notes in which the Minister tells my colleague, the Member for Davenport: "P.S. Charles, you can count on my full support of the idea. I'm eager to pursue it with you. Might we discuss how the program could be launched in a way that will work and that won't violate the fiscal rules to which I am subject . . . " The Minister of the Environment responded to my colleague, suggesting that it was a neat idea to identify and protect the landmarks. "I am glad you are putting up this amendment. Isn't this great. Don't know what I can do about it, but I am glad you are bringing it up. Why don't we meet and discuss it sometime".

The interesting thing is that Canadian landmarks are already part of the Parks Canada policy. In other words, the Parks Canada policy which governs the Minister's own Department covers the landmarks. Seemingly the Minister did not know about this when he wrote that letter to my colleague.

I have a copy of "Canadian Landmarks" component of Parks Canada policy. Page 59 of "Canadian Landmarks" states:

> Parks Canada Objective for the Canadian Landmarks System. To foster protection for all time of exceptional natural sites of Canadian significance in a co-operative system of Canadian landmarks, and to encourage public understanding and appreciation of this natural heritage so as to leave it unimpaired for future generations.
>
> 1.0 Proposed Criteria for Inclusion in the Canadian Landmarks System.
>
> 1.1 Canadian landmarks must be exceptional natural sites of Canadian significance identified according to the following criteria:
>
> i) the sites must contain a natural feature or phenomenon which is unique or rare in Canada or the world, or the sites must be the best example of a particular natural theme component in Canada; and
>
> ii) the sites must have experienced minimum modification by man or, if such modification has occurred, the main feature must be unaffected and the sites must have potential for restoration to a natural state.

There are pages here describing the landmark system.

You will recall what I just quoted from the handwritten note of the Minister saying what a great idea it is to talk about these landmarks, and what could we do to promote it. One can now attest to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister did not seem to be too much *au courant* of the policy of his own Department, the policy which is supposed to govern what he does, by the way.

I want to talk briefly about the non-derogation clause. A little earlier this evening we voted on the amendment which was proposed by the Hon. Member for the Yukon (Ms. McLaughlin). The Tungavik Federation of the Nunavut brought to the attention of the committee that there was a potential for conflict between the National Parks Act and Section 35 of the Constitution Act dealing with aboriginal rights. The Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society and the Prairie Treaty Nations Alliance supported and reinforced the submission of the Nunavut. As a result, the offending clause of Bill C-30 was amended. However, Professor Brad Morse of the University of Ottawa Law School pointed out that there could be a conflict between Section 6(1) of the National Parks Act which is not affected by Bill C-30, and section 35 of the Constitution Act. For this reason he suggested that a non-derogation clause be moved at report stage to protect the rights of aboriginal peoples in the event of a conflict between Bill C-30 and the Constitution. That essentially is the amendment that we were voting on tonight as proposed by the Hon. Member for Yukon.

Interestingly enough the Government chose to vote down that amendment. What bothers me is the fact that we pass legislation on a fairly frequent basis relating to resources or lands that contains a clause identical or fairly similar to the one proposed by my Hon. colleague, the Hon. Member for Yukon. If the Government states that that one was not appropriately worded, why did it not propose one of its own, so at least the Bill would have contained that non-derogation clause which we should include more and more in legislation,

particularly when we are dealing with resources or with land issues.

Finally, I want to talk about the Sunshine ski area in Banff. I have been to that area. As a matter of fact, like most Canadians, I probably see the national parks in the context of making a short visit to Jasper or Banff, as I did last year. My family and I skied at Sunshine Village. It is a very beautiful area in which to ski. I am sure all Canadians want us as a country to have those facilities in that beautiful setting in Banff. I believe that is in the constituency of the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor). I am sure he must be very proud of that area. It is absolutely beautiful. It was the first time that I visited the Sunshine Village. I am sure the Hon. Member and all his constituents must be very proud of it. Of course, all of us want that type of enterprise to succeed, and we want to attract tourists. We favour the proper development of that type of an area.

There boundaries of the ski area were agreed to in 1979, following a number of years of public consultation. That is the way in which it should be done. There should be public consultation. We must always ensure that the ecological concerns are taken care of before developing or increasing the size of a development. The commitment was made then to legislate these boundaries so that only Parliament could, in its collective wisdom, expand the boundaries of the ski area. It was the reneging of this commitment by the governing Party that resulted in the situation that we now have where Bill C-30 has changed that wherein in the future Cabinet unilaterally can make that type of change. We believe that the Bill would have been far better had the Government stayed the previous course of having that type of change made by the House of Commons.

[*Translation*]

So, Mr. Speaker, to conclude, we, for our part, support Bill C-30. As I indicated earlier, this Bill was delayed by the Government for a very long time. As I said, the Bill was put on the back burner for about two years, and was then introduced to the House and stayed on the shelf for another long while. We, however, do not want to delay the Bill's possible adoption in any way. I do regret, as does my colleague the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) that the Government has decided to amend the Bill with regard to the Sunshine Village Ski Area in Alberta, as I said earlier.

Nevertheless, I support the Bill. The others members of my party intend to support it, and there would be no advantage to delaying this Bill tonight.

I will conclude with that, Mr. Speaker, and I do hope that the House, that Parliament, will pass the Bill shortly.

• (2000)

[*English*]

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to make a contribution to the closing moments of the debate on Bill C-30. I want to start by indicating that I, like the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Carleton (Mr. Turner), have a fairly lengthy background in parks but not to the same exotic degree as has the Member for Ottawa-Carleton. He has been involved in parks outside Canada, outside this continent. My experiences are primarily within municipalities and within the Province of Ontario.

I give the Government credit for what it is doing today. It is taking that next step in our growth as a nation, in our understanding of the importance of our wilderness areas and of the important aspects of our history from the point of view of human beings as well as geological and marine to ensure that we provide the necessary protection of our natural environment.

On the one hand it is there for the purposes that we need it for and, second, it is there for all of us, whether we be Canadians or visitors to this country, to enjoy nature at its best. Whether it is parks in or close to the urban settings of this country or parks that are long distances away from people, it is extremely important to do.

I want to speak for a moment about the myth that we so often hear about. I hear it in my constituency. There was a newspaper report this morning talking about an attack on a wilderness park operated in the Province of Ontario by people who basically believe that if we cannot cut it, if we cannot dig it out of the ground, if we cannot sell it, it has no value. That myth has no basis in reality. There are some things that we cannot buy or sell. There are some things that should not be cut, some places that we should not dig up. Part of what Bill C-30 does is provide that protection. It also provides the ability to expand that protection. I will come back to that in a moment.

In terms of the wilderness park, there are some who believe that wilderness parks are only there for an exclusive group, be they physically able or financially able to travel to distant points to access these wilderness parks or the national parks. In terms of a mental attitude just because they do not want to use them does not mean that they are important. They forget that there is another value, the real value about parks in general but wilderness parks specifically. On one hand they operate as a bench-mark. I use the term "bench-mark" because I used to be an employee of the Ontario Department of Highways, as a surveyor. My hon. colleague from Bow River will know of what I speak when I talk about a bench-mark being a point of reference, a point that one can measure up or down. Our wilderness parks provide that. They provide it in an ecological sense, so that we can measure the changes in wildlife, the changes in our vegetation, the impact of acid rain, and any other atmospheric pollutants or water pollution. We can measure it and compare it with what the natural should be. That is one important issue of wilderness parks.

The more trees we cut down, the less oxygen we are producing and the less carbon dioxide is being absorbed. This is becoming more and more crucial every day. We are getting

into a crisis point because of the greenhouse effect, because of the attempt by the so-called industrial world, the so-called leaders of the economy of the world who are now encouraging those with rain forests to cut them down, to eradicate them. What we are doing, over time, is destroying life on earth as we know it.

Wilderness parks are an extremely small component of the land mass and the vegetation of this world, not only this country. I am sure that if we put all national parks that exist in Canada today in northwestern Ontario from where I come from, we would barely be able to see them. In fact, they probably would not be any bigger than Lake Superior, one of the largest freshwater lakes in the world. They would disappear. It is not as if we are going out there and destroying the economy of the Rockies or northern Ontario or Atlantic Canada; we are protecting something for the future, and it is extremely important that we continue to do so.

It also provides for those that we share this earth with, those so-called less intelligent beings, and I know there are some who will dispute who the most intelligent is.

Mr. Benjamin: The animals are.

Mr. Angus: We have done a pretty good job of screwing up the earth. They have not had that chance. As we look at them and see how they operate, we know that the fur bearing creatures and feather creatures are in sync with the environment, whereas man, the so-called intelligent species, seems to go out of his and her way to destroy. In fairness, I think we have to say that most of the blame has to be passed on to the males of history, because they are the ones who made the decisions, the mistakes. We have gone out of our way to destroy what existed and what should exist.

The wilderness parks, the national parks, provide an incubator—again another bench-mark—which on the one hand allows us to see the changes elsewhere but on the other hand ensures that those species that we have come close to eradicating for trophies on walls, for souvenirs, or even for food, have a chance to come back. I think of the buffalo in western Canada. I think of the American eagle in the United States.

Mr. Benjamin: The Golden Eagle.

Mr. Angus: The Golden Eagle. I think of ducks and the fine work being done by Ducks Unlimited, in the sense of restocking. It is not just ducks, but geese. In the area where I live we had not seen geese for years. Now, thanks to Ducks Unlimited, they have been transplanted and we have a very large flock based close to my place in Thunder Bay. It is great to see them. Wilderness parks provide a place for them to live and survive, to grow, to re-establish their species; for another reason, it is important to set that area aside.

Now we can move on and appreciate one of the amendments that was put forward by the Government at the late stages of report stage debate providing for the marine parks, the water component. Whether it is in the County of Bruce or elsewhere, we can take a look at our undersea neighbours, our underwater neighbours, to ensure that their species can be protected.

• (2010)

There are things we would have liked to have seen changed in the Bill to make it better and to make it less sensitive to the commercial instincts which the market-place tends to place on us. Unfortunately, the Government did not see the wisdom of the proposals. We also wanted to ensure that the aboriginal peoples, the first people of this nation, in no way were infringed by any element of this piece of legislation so that nothing in the Bill could take away something that by treaty, by agreement, was made between the Government of Canada and their nation. Again, it is unfortunate that the Government did not feel it appropriate to provide that specific override in the legislation. There will come a time when we will ensure that this legislation is improved that much more. Just as we build a nation we will build and develop our parks. I use the term "develop" very loosely. I am not talking about ski resorts or major commercial entities. I am talking about the development of the boundaries to ensure that there are boundaries and about the protection that is necessary to ensure that sites are protected for as long as we are here and for our children, our grandchildren, our great-grandchildren, and so on.

I want to speak to another specific element of the Bill which provides yet even more growth—the ability for us as a Parliament of Canada and for the Cabinet of the day no matter which Party is the governing one, no matter whether it is this year, 10 years or 20 years from now, to have the power to designate national parks. We did that on Friday for four areas of this country: the rural municipalities of Val Marie and Old Post in the Province of Saskatchewan, the County of Bruce in the Province of Ontario—we have also provided specific reference to marine parks in that case—the District of St. Barb and Humber West in the Province of Newfoundland, and the District of Thunder Bay in which I reside. That one, of course, is appropriate to my area and is of specific interest to myself.

I live at the tip of a mountain range. It is a mountain range in northwestern Ontario but you have to appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that it may not be the same size as the ranges in the neighbourhood of the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor). This mountain range is called the Nor'westers. It has been a dream for years that that range, which runs along the edge of Lake Superior and stretches down to the Pigeon River where the Voyageurs went from Lake Superior up to Lake of the Woods and into western Canada, could be protected forever from development by declaring it a national or a provincial park. This amendment brought forward by the Government, and I do thank the Government for it, was as a result of an initiative taken by the City of Thunder Bay Parks and Recreation Department.

About six years ago, when I was still there as a park planner, we entered into a master planning process to see

where we should be going in the next 10, 15, or 20 years in parks and recreation planning. An item that came out of that study and an analysis of the needs and wishes of the people of Thunder Bay was the need for a wilderness park type facility along the Nor'westers. The report went to the council and it was recommended that we look at it. The City of Thunder Bay wrote to the legislative committee asking to be heard. It saw Bill C-30 as a part of the process which would allow the City of Thunder Bay at the very least to ensure that at some point should the citizens of Thunder Bay agree with the proposal that they would have the opportunity to be heard. Regretfully the committee decided what it wanted was outside the scope of the Bill and declined to invite them to appear. Because they had raised the matter with the committee on my suggestion, it came to the attention of the Government and through the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Browes) a motion was brought forward which included the District of Thunder Bay in that opportunity. It does not mean that the District of Thunder Bay will get a national park. It may not. At some point, even if the community decides or the community of communities decides to make an approach, the Government may say: "I am sorry, we cannot afford it". But it opens the door for the process to begin.

There are some very good restrictions in the process. The land has to be owned by the Government of Canada. This means that private land holders who exist within the broad stretch do not have to fear that somebody will draw a park boundary line which all of a sudden includes their land, preventing them from doing with their land what they have done with it for years. It requires notification so that people have an opportunity for input. It gives the City of Thunder Bay the opportunity to begin discussions with its neighbours to the south and east, the Fort William Indian Band, with its neighbours to the south and west, the Municipality of Neeming, and perhaps even farther away to the Municipality of Paipoonge.

We can now begin to talk about how that could work and whether or not there is agreement to bring forward a specific proposal to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) that is well thought out, well supported with a clear idea of the finances involved, letting the Government of the day react. The ball is now in the court of the parks and recreation department of the City of Thunder Bay. What we have done with Bill C-30 is to make sure that the City of Thunder Bay knows the door is open. It is an important step.

The same thing can apply to Newfoundland, to Saskatchewan, to Bruce County, and elsewhere in Ontario because those places too now have that door open to them. They do not have to worry about how to convince Cabinet to bring in a separate Bill to do this when it has a loaded agenda. If it is four years from now we will be bucking against a possible election with people trying to go home for the summer, maybe! This is a good tool. It really does make it easier for representatives of those four areas to put forward their concepts.

It also does not preclude the powers that be in Thunder Bay from saying: "No, it doesn't make sense. We were wrong. However, we might want to make a deal with the Province of Ontario and turn Sibley Provincial Park, which has the famous sleeping giant, into a national park. Everything is wide open within the District of Thunder Bay as a planning tool. That is extremely important, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank Members for the opportunity to participate at third reading on Bill C-30. I know at least one of my colleagues wants to speak about the proposal for the Grasslands Park in Saskatchewan. Perhaps other Members might want to speak.

We will be supporting this Bill. It is good legislation. It could have been better, but we will have our turn to make it even better at some future date.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, I was looking at the Bill and I could only find one small reference in it as it pertains to the Prairies, leaving out the references to Banff, Jasper, Elk Island, and a park in Manitoba.

I want to remind the House that it is now about 15 or 16 years ago that I was invited by the then federal Minister of the day and the provincial Minister of the day to a great ceremony and celebration which was held in the City of Regina. Officials were there from the Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta and the States of Montana and North Dakota.

• (2020)

All the wildlife and naturalist people from western Canada were there. Authors and artists were there. Two or three hundred people attended that celebration because it was the announcement of agreement on the Grasslands National Park. My good friend, the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor), will appreciate that because he has a lot of grasslands in his riding.

Once that had been accomplished, then all the naysayers took over. Every Government since, provincial and federal, of the three different Parties, have procrastinated, waffled, horsed around, delayed, and found every excuse imaginable to avoid having that park proclaimed and instituted.

On the last page of the Bill, in the second last subclause, I saw the rural municipalities of Val Marie and Old Post in the Province of Saskatchewan are mentioned. Those two municipalities, of course, could be part and parcel of a much larger area which will be the Grasslands National Park. Maybe the coming of another drought and the terrible difficulties that our grain and livestock producers are going through will produce over the next several years some great good, because hundreds of those people have already left the area. There is no doubt that hundreds more will do so. Sad to say, what is left of some of the communities in that area are dying. So I suppose it is somewhat ironic that a large area of the Prairies could be returned to mother nature to turn it back into its natural state. Tens of thousands of acres of marginal or submarginal lands that should never have been farmed or ranched in the first

place, but thanks to the Hudson's Bay Company and the CPR and a few others like them, they were settled and farmed.

It has always been next year country in that part of my province, if not my whole province. The grasslands is a heritage fast disappearing in Canada and the U.S., the Soviet Union, and parts of Asia where they have vast tracts of grasslands. Yet in those other parts of the world they have much denser populations. There is a unique opportunity here for Canada, if we move fast enough, to allow nature to restore in its natural habitat and environment a truly great prairie grasslands national park. I know my hon. friend from Saskatoon West has been down in that part of the province a lot of times and he knows something about it.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I know it like the back of my hand.

Mr. Benjamin: If you have never been there, Mr. Speaker, you should go. It is the kind of area where farsighted people come from. You stand on a small hill and you can see straight ahead for three days.

It is not only a question of preserving the grasslands and the wildlife. I want to list a number of species of wildlife that I came up with in my own amateurish manner. All but a couple of them are endangered species whose natural habitat is the Prairies. They are not going to restore themselves unless we make certain there is a territory for them to do it in.

There is the kit fox, kangaroo rats, prairie dogs, sage grouse, sharp-tailed grouse, prong-horned antelope, and the prairie buffalo. That is not the wood buffalo. The prairie buffalo are the big ones. Even elk. Most people do not know that the elk are not native to the mountains. The elk were and are native to the Prairies and if you ever took the trouble to read the journals of the northwest fur traders and the Hudson's Bay fur traders, the ones who went up the North and South Saskatchewan Rivers in their canoes and rafts and came out above the river valley and on to the Prairies, they talk about the tens of thousands of elk and deer and antelope and buffalo that roamed those Prairies. Yet people are surprised when you mention the word elk in connection with the Prairies. They are native to the Prairies, not the mountains. We forced them up there.

Then we have, would you believe, things like cactus? Would you believe even rattlesnakes? I know we have had trouble with rats and snakes there from time to time. It is like trying to get rid of the Liberals and Tories. I am just teasing my good friend from Bow River.

So we have cactus and rattlesnakes, hawks and eagles, burrowing owls, and a host of wildlife and plants and flowers that were always natural to that area. Over the last 20 to 25 years, Sir, we have allowed that wildlife and that natural growth to be devastated with herbicides and pesticides. We have continued to cultivate submarginal land that should never be cultivated. We have continued to allow it to be overgrazed. If there is any one argument that I have had with ranchers it concerns overgrazing. They would overgraze their land all year, through the spring, summer, and fall. They would cut hay off the bottom land and then would come running to the provincial Department of Natural Resources, either in Alberta or Saskatchewan, and demand special permits to shoot the elk and moose and deer that came down into their haystacks. What else were those poor beasts supposed to do? I watched elk being slaughtered up in the Crowsnest Pass country when ranchers got their way and got a special permit. They would even run cattle and sheep and horses up above the timber line and graze the meadows down to nothing. As soon as there was a little bit of snow the wildlife came down and got into the haystacks and the ranchers got permits to slaughter them. That is unforgivable. I have no time or patience for those who run livestock and misuse the vegetation or the wildlife. If they are going to keep domestic animals, they have a responsibility to look after them rather than leaving them to fend for themselves at the expense of the wildlife and, later, the expense of the taxpayers.

• (2030)

We have a great opportunity to allow nature to restore to the state it was in when we came here one of the few grasslands areas left in the world. The Indian people moved with the wildlife. When grass and water was in short supply, the wildlife moved and the Indian people moved with them. The area they left was able to restore itself. This grasslands national park must be big enough to allow an element of that to happen.

The Indian people never took more than what they needed for themselves. The white man, who came mostly from Europe, in order to make a buck failed to conserve. I think my friends opposite cherish the word "conserve". If there is one crime which society as a whole has committed, it is our failure to conserve the national elements of our country and, in this instance, our beloved Prairies.

If I had my way on the issue of proclaiming and developing national parks, and I do not know if my own Party would agree with me, I would not let the private sector in on it at all. I wouldn't mind if they put up a couple or three motels and a couple of the chintzy hotdog stands they have in so many of our parks outside the park border, but beyond that they would not be allowed to do anything else. Their primary purpose is to make some dollars and they, like so many of us, want to make dollars at the expense of the natural environment and the wildlife.

The Queen Charlottes, the grasslands, our streams, Rocky Mountains, and rocks in northern Ontario are things which we have no right to leave in a mess for our children and grandchildren to clean up, if possible. There should be no question about the purposes for a national park for our people and for nature and wildlife. Those who are selfish and thoughtless and oppose this sort of thing should be able to have their say. However, unless they can present an overwhelming case, we must proceed with this anyway.

I wish to invite all of my colleagues to spend an evening camping on the Prairies and to get up before dawn. They will hear a meadow lark sing and a gopher squeak. They will see some hawks and eagles. They will hear a coyote howling from a hill nearby. They will hear the beat of a sagegrouse or sharp-tailed grouse. They will watch the beauty of a herd of antelope galloping at speeds up to 60 miles an hour. I invite you, Mr. Speaker, and all my colleagues to experience that. If you do so, I expect that we will get an even bigger and better grasslands national park than we are presently envisaging.

I hope this legislation will allow whoever is governing this country to implement this initiative. We will support it in the hopes that that will be accomplished. I hope that Hon. Members will not think only of the Queen Charlottes, northern Ontario, Atlantic Canada, or northern Canada, as beautiful and as great as they are. The most sadly neglected area has been our Prairie grasslands and there is not much time left for it to be rejuvenated. I hope the present Government and all governments succeeding it will ensure that it it preserved.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I would like to support my colleague and friend, the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), in the splendid speech he made on grasslands. His remarks reminded me of the first school district in which I was engaged to teach. I was raised in the hills of Drumheller. Around the hills there is a lot of prairie grassland. However, not as much as there was at Lake McKee.

One morning I got up and looked out of the old granary which was serving as a teacherage. I saw about 15 prairie chickens doing I did not know what. I watched them in fascination. They were going through various movements as if they were in a dance or a drill. That lasted for about 15 or 20 minutes. I have never seen anything like it. I wish I had had a camera to take pictures of those prairie chickens which I believe are now extinct on our Prairies.

They are extinct because we destroyed their habitat and also because they were so patient. I remember a friend of mine taking a shot at a prairie chicken when I was just a boy. He missed but the patient prairie chicken gave him a second chance. It sat there and let him shoot it. That is another reason it is extinct.

I love hunting but I have never shot a duck when it was sitting on the water because the very thought of my friend shooting that helpless prairie chicken which was patient enough to give him a second chance always brought horrors to my mind.

I want to support this matter of the grasslands. They are a beautiful thing. During a terrible flood in the Drumheller Valley a nurse came to help us out with some of the tragedies which were taking place there in 1940.

• (2040)

I took her up to the top of a hill to show her the beautiful view of the Nacmine area which the Hon. Member for Regina West would know well. You could survey the whole valley. I asked her if she did not think it was a beautiful sight, even though it was flooding. She thought it was weird, not beautiful. I said: "Sister, you do not know what beautiful is". Every hill, every blade of grass is beautiful as far as I am concerned. People ask what we see in the grasslands. I will not try to duplicate what the Hon. Member for Regina West said, but everything he said about the grasslands is true.

As a Member representing Banff, where the first national park was formed in Canada, I want to say a few words about how Bill C-30 affects that area. National parks and protection are synonymous and must be kept that way. The meaning of national parks is protection.

The Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan (Mr. Angus) mentioned wilderness areas. I too am very fond of wilderness areas and believe they should be protected in their natural state. National parks exist for people to enjoy wilderness areas. Many people enjoy walking, others enjoy riding horses, while others enjoy driving.

People said in the early 1900s that it would be horrible to let a car enter the Banff National Park. While it may have been necessary to cut down some trees for railway lines and roads, without those roads or railway lines it would have been impossible for hundreds of thousands of people to enjoy the beauties of the national park. Today, some people question the necessity of an airstrip in Banff National Park, which has been there for some 15 or 20 years. It has not killed any animals. It is a safety feature for airplanes that get lost in the mountainous area where weather changes rapidly. It brings people in so that they may enjoy the national park.

I agree that national parks need protection, but I think we have to realize that in order for everyone to enjoy the national park there must be means for them to get there, whether it be by train, by car, by horse, by walking, or even by airplane. That is why I would support keeping the airstrip at Banff National Park.

Recently a vote was held in the townsite of Banff. The people voted by a large majority to have local government. Since its inception, the people of Banff have been governed by a "mayor" living 2,000 miles away, the Minister of the Environment. He has had to contend with municipal problems like sewers, roads, snowdrifts, water lines and so on. The people of Banff have not had the privilege of governing themselves.

Now they will have that opportunity and I want to thank the Minister and his staff, as well as the superintendent in Banff and his staff, the school board and their staff and many others in that area who worked together in order to obtain self government. Some may say that an elected council will operate in a way that is not in harmony with the protection provided by national parks. I do not believe there is anyone more anxious to preserve and protect the national park than the people of Banff who live there. It is their livelihood and their joy. It is their life. Consequently, I am sure that no council in Banff will do anything to hurt the national park.

There will be two administrations: The town council and the park administration. I believe the two will work together in harmony to solve any problem that may arise in the interest of protection of national parks.

Some people do not favour tourism, but tourists have made Banff National Park what it is today. We want people to continue to enjoy Banff National Park. This means different things to many people. A skier needs a place to ski, and the ski hills must have competitive facilities to attract the skiers. The Hon. Member mentioned Sunshine Village. It is a wonderful site, and unless those facilities are equal to those found south of the border or in British Columbia, people will not visit.

I agree that national parks means protection. We must also make sure that we provide facilities for the people who visit. I do not want a Coney Island in the town centre of Banff, nor do I think anyone in Banff wants that. However, they want facilities that will attract people and let them enjoy the scenery.

Occasionally Banff has closed off trails and hostels. We must be very careful about that. For instance, Shadow Lake is a place to visit for people who are unable to walk very far. They can travel part way up the mountain by car and walk a mile or two to a beautiful place called Shadow Lake. Many people are unable to walk 12 or 14 miles up a mountain. However, I have seen aged people and crippled children travel the last mile and a half to Shadow Lake where they could see Mount Eisenhower and the beautiful scenery which is thrilling to anyone who sees it. I do not want to deny that to the aged or handicapped who cannot travel far. We should provide those facilities so that they may enjoy the scenery as well.

Many of our youth have visited our hostels in Banff. I have received a mass of letters because one hostel is being closed. The facilities must be competitive as well as in harmony with the parks. The people of Banff are just as anxious to achieve that as anyone else.

I want to say a few words about the people who live in Banff. They often feel like second class citizens who cannot enjoy the same rights under the laws of Canada as Canadians who do not live in a national park. Sometimes this is true.

I recently sent a letter to the President of the Treasury Board (Miss Carney) because civil servants and RCMP in Banff are required to pay rent and live in houses that belong to the Government. The fact is that the rent for houses in Banff is the highest of any park in Canada, some three or four times the rent paid in eastern Canada or central Canada, and twice as much as they pay in Jasper.

These people are citizens of Canada. Some may say they should save enough to buy a house but there are no houses for sale in Banff. They live in a different community because the national park must be careful about how much land it uses for developing single houses. The rents are excessive, and I have been asking the President of the Treasury Board to consider this problem. These people should not be treated that way, and I think we will solve these (ground rents) through the town council and an arrangement with the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan). I think that is an essential item as well. Some of the commercial operations are being taxed excessively. They all want to pay their taxes but not in such excessive amounts that they cannot even make a living. These are the things I think we have to look at very carefully.

• (2050)

There are many, many things in Banff that we could talk about which would be interesting and worth while, but I want to say that I have found the people of Banff to be protective oriented. They want to protect the environment, but they also want the same rights as every other Canadian citizen, and I want them to have the same rights as citizens of Calgary, Drumheller or Toronto. They are citizens too. They should not be penalized because they live in a national park.

We want to bring more and more people to these parks. I wish every person in Canada could enjoy the beauty described by our Liberal friend a few moments ago. I want to thank the Members who worked on the National Parks Act, those who are protecting our environment and our habitat and, most of all, making our national parks—and I am thinking of Banff because that is the one in my riding—a place where people love to go and return to again and again because they enjoy the scenery and the excellent facilities.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to the arrangement made earlier this day, we will call it ten o'clock. This House stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at eleven o'clock.

The House adjourned at 8.57 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, July 19, 1988

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to 29 petitions numbered as follows: 332-4838, 332-4839, 332-4844, 332-4846, 332-4864, 332-4868 to 332-4882 inclusive, 332-4889, 332-4890, 332-4904 to 332-4906 inclusive, 332-4909, 332-4920, 332-4922 and 332-4923.

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

* * *

[*English*]

CANADA WATER PROTECTION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-309, an Act to protect water in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the Hon. Member have leave to introduce the said Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have an opportunity to introduce this Bill. This Bill is cited as the Canada Water Protection Act. Because it appeared that the trade deal allows at least for the possibility of interbasin water transfers to the United States, this Bill, particularly Clause 9, dealing with interbasin transfers, says that no person shall export water from Canada by interbasin transfers. Essentially, the Bill would prohibit any consideration of moving Canadian water into the United States.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PRESENTATION OF COMMITTEE REPORTS

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, there have been the usual discussions between the Parties. I think you will find consent to the immediate putting of these motions. Therefore, I move:

That, notwithstanding the usual practices of this House, if the House is not sitting, reports from the Standing Committees, Standing Joint Committees and Special Committees be deemed presented to the House on the day such reports are deposited with the Clerk of the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

REFERENCE OF BILL C-142 TO STANDING COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORT

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): The second motion I wish to move reads as follows:

That, the order for second reading and reference to a legislative committee on Bill C-142, an Act to establish the Transportation Accident Investigation Board and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, standing on the Order Paper, be changed to read second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Transport.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

• (1110)

REFERENCE OF BILL C-139 TO STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): The last motion reads:

That, the Order for second reading and reference to a legislative committee of Bill C-139, an Act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal

Arrangements and Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, 1977, and certain related Acts, standing on the Order Paper, be changed to read second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I take it that there has been the usual consultations with the opposition Parties on this matter. With the usual co-operation that the Opposition shows, the Minister has its concurrence.

I take it that he can give us the assurance that these matters have been cleared with the House Leaders?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you and the finance critic for the Official Opposition that the usual consultations have taken place, and everything is go.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

PETITIONS

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present on behalf of a number of constituents.

On the first, the petitioners believe that the federal Government lacks a mandate from the people of Canada to conclude a free trade deal with the United States and they believe that the trade deal would deny Canada the policy freedom to determine its own economic future and as well undermine Canada's ability to build a society distinct from that of the United States. They have a number of concerns, but basically they are asking Parliament to dissolve now to allow the people of Canada an opportunity to accept or reject the proposed trade deal during a national general election.

IMMIGRATION—SPONSORING OF RELATIVES

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I have a second petition which reminds us that the previous Minister of Immigration promised that unmarried sons and daughters of all ages would be considered as members of the family class for immigration purposes and that married children and brothers and sisters in the assisted relative class would get 15 points as opposed to the 10 points they would normally receive.

Hundreds of petitioners are drawing that to our attention and they call upon the House of Commons to ensure that the Government fulfil its promises on these issues.

EQUALITY OF CHOICE IN CHILD CARE

Mr. Paul Gagnon (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition with 271 signatures on it from Calgary, Edmonton, Wainwright, Strathmore, Lethbridge and the Raymond areas of Alberta. Whereas it is becoming increasingly common to learn of government encroachment upon the parental responsibility of child care decision making and government child care incentives do not consider the validity of parental care as a viable alternative to out-of-home child care, and whereas parents are in the best position to determine what is the most appropriate and beneficial form of child rearing, wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to act upon the problem of this limitation in choice for child care, and restore to the system fairness and justice, by opposing any form of national child care policy which does not provide equality of choice, thereby leaving the child care decision-making process with the parents where it belongs.

This was organized by Mrs. Brenda Ringdahl, President, Kids First Lobby Group. This is one of a number of petitions that I have had the honour and privilege to present.

[*Translation*]

OPPOSITION TO CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition today, along the same lines as the one I tabled before, concerning the Reagan-Mulroney Free Trade Agreement. The petitioners, who come from Ontario, would like the House to censure the Government for this proposal. They submit and humbly declare that the Mulroney Government has sold out Canada without getting anything in return, that Canadian industries are still not protected from American trade laws, that the United States obtained everything they wanted, in all important areas, in particular agriculture, energy, automobile trade, financial services and investments, that the jobs of thousands of Canadians are threatened and that the Conservative Government has not planned any adjustment assistance for Canadian workers.

For these reasons . . .

Mr. Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Member, but he well knows the rules on presenting petitions.

Mr. Gauthier: I wanted to read the petition briefly for you, Mr. Speaker.

I conclude by saying that these people humbly ask Parliament to censure the Government for signing the Mulroney-Reagan trade agreement.

[*English*]

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Gerald Comeau (South West Nova): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present two petitions from members of congregations in my constituency regarding the Supreme Court's decision to allow abortion on demand.

The first one is from members of Reverend Wendell England's congregation. They humbly pray and call upon Parliament to pass into law legislation that will protect the life of the unborn child from conception and at all stages of development, with the exception of the extremely rare case in which an abortion is performed in order to save the life of the mother. And as in duty bound your petitioners will humbly pray.

The second petition is from members of Reverend Horace Gardner's congregation. The petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to formulate and legislate a law to protect life from conception, a law which seeks to save the life of both mother and child and as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST FOR RETENTION OF 10-WEEK QUALIFYING PERIOD FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Fernand Robichaud (Westmorland—Kent): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty again today to present to you petitions from residents of my riding, more particularly people from Sackville, Midjik, Ogden Mill Road, Bouctouche, St. Maurice, St. Norbert, St. Pierre, Ste Anne de Kent, and other petitioners from Sackville, Midjik and Aulac.

The petitioners deplore the decision of the Department of Employment and Immigration to again change the qualifying period for unemployment insurance from 10 to 16 weeks.

They say that the Department has not considered the high rate of unemployment in rural areas and they humbly ask Parliament to rectify the situation by restoring the qualifying period to 10 weeks.

[*English*]

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and responsibility to register according to Standing Order 106 a petition from citizens of Edmonton, Alberta and surrounding area. These citizens point out that the Conservative Government had no mandate from the Canadian people to conclude a free trade agreement with the United States and that the trade agreement negotiated by the Government threatens the very fabric of Canadian political and economic sovereignty by removing the power of the Canadian Government to control effectively foreign ownership to develop Canadian energy resources in the best interests of Canadians or to equalize opportunities between the regions.

The undersigned, the petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to dissolve and allow the people of Canada the opportunity to accept or reject the proposed trade agreement during a national general election.

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 371 and 377.

[*Text*]

GRANTS AND/OR LOANS BY CANADA DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Question No. 371—**Mr. Redway:**

Since September 4, 1984, did The Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation make grants and/or loans to persons or corporations, non-governmental organizations and governments within Metropolitan Toronto and, if so, to which ones and, in each case, in what amount and for what purpose?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): The Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation has, since September 4, 1984, made the following loans pursuant to agency agreements which provided for the orderly wind down of these insolvent member institutions within Metropolitan Toronto:

Date of Loan	Member Institution	Amount
September 30, 1987	Greymac Trust Company	$35,000,000.00
November 2, 1987	Greymac Mortgage Corp.	35,000,000.00
November 30, 1987	Greymac Trust Company	35,000,000.00
December 21, 1987	Greymac Trust Company	3,750,000.00
December 21, 1987	Crown Trust Company	3,750,000.00
December 31, 1987	Greymac Trust Company	60,806,232.88
December 31, 1987	Greymac Mortgage Corp.	15,927,260.27
February 8, 1988	Crown Trust Company	96,550,000.00
April 29, 1988	Seaway Trust Company	56,672,708.64
April 29, 1988	Seaway Mortgage Corp.	44,931,631.16

USE OF PESTICIDES AND FUNGICIDES

Question No. 377—**Mr. Althouse:**

1. Has the Department of Agriculture investigated the use of pesticides and fungicides at the Strathbourne, Nova Scotia, tree nursery and, if so, in the period investigated, (*a*) what are the recommended maximum rates (*b*) what were the actual rates of use per hectare for each of (*i*) ROVAL 50 (wettable powder) (*ii*) CAPTAN (*iii*) RIDOM 16 (*iv*) FURDAN 10 (*v*) BASUDIAN (drazanone) (*vi*) BENLATE (*vii*) SEVIN?

2. In each case of any difference between recommended and actual rates of application is there a particular reason for the difference and, if so, what is it?

3. Was any of these pesticides or fungicides, as well as CHLORDANE and POAST, used (*a*) under conditions (*b*) in ways not recommended for its use and, if so, which ones and, in each case (*i*) under which conditions (*ii*) for what reasons (*c*) what amount of CHLORDANE (*i*) was used (*ii*) is still in stock and in each case, for what reasons?

4. Who is responsible for application rates?

5. Are precautions or warnings provided to workers concerning the effects or dangers, or both, of exposure to overdoses of these chemicals?

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture): 1. Yes, an investigation of pesticide use has been conducted at the Strathbourne Nursery in Nova Scotia.

(a) Recommended use rates for products are as follows (where product names given were not registered, closest approximations are provided): (i) Rovral 50 (wettable powder)—750 g of the active ingredient iprodione per hectare. (ii) Captan—10 kg of the ingredient captan per hectare. (iii) Ridomil—1.13 kg of the active ingredient metalaxyl per hectare. (iv) Furadan 10—5.5 kg of the active ingredient carbofuran per hectare. (v) Basudin—3.6 kg of the active ingredient diazinon per hectare. (vi) Benlate—1.5 kg of the active ingredient benomyl per hectare. (vii) Sevin—1.5 kg of the active ingredient carbaryl per hectare.

(b) Actual use rates are not yet available as further investigation is ongoing.

2. This information is not yet available. It is expected that this type of information will emerge during the course of the ongoing investigation.

3. This information should be available at the conclusion of the investigation.

4. The user must ultimately be accountable for application rates. The Pest Control Products Act states that no person shall manufacture, store, display, distribute or use any control product under unsafe conditions.

5. Individual product labelling provides precautions, warnings and other relevant information regarding the product and its application. These labelling requirements are set down in the Pest Control Products regulations and are intended to provide users with use directions, precautions and others information that will provide for safety in storage, display distribution and use of products.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if questions Nos. 347 and 380 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled imediately.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The questions listed by the Honourable Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Is it the pleasure of the House that questions Nos. 347 and 380 be deemed to have been made orders for returns?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES IN CONSTITUENCY OF CHURCHILL

Question No. 347—**Mr. Murphy:**

1. Between February 18, 1980 and September 4, 1984, did any government departments or agencies spend money or provide grants in the constituency of Churchill, and if so, by what departments or agencies and, in each case (*a*) on what dates (*b*) in what amounts (*c*) under which programs was the money spent?

2. Since September 4, 1984, have any government departments or agencies spent money or provided grants in the constituency of Churchill, and if so, by what departments or agencies and, in each case (*a*) on what dates (*b*) in what amounts (*c*) under which programs was the money spent?

Return tabled.

PRIVATE RENTER HOUSEHOLDS

Question No. 380—**Mr. Young:**

1. In 1986, in the metropolitan census area of Halifax, what numbers of private renter households were there with (*a*) under $5,000 (*b*) between $5,000 and $9,999 (*c*) between $10,000 and $14,999 (*d*) between $15,000 and $19,999 (*e*) between $20,000 and $24,999 (*f*) between $25,000 and $29,999 (*g*) between $30,000 and $34,999 (*h*) between $35,000 and $39,999 (*i*) between $40,000 and $44,999 (*j*) between $45,000 and $49,999 (*k*) between $50,000 and $59,999 (*l*) $60,000 and over in annual income in households comprising (i) one person (ii) two persons (iii) three persons (iv) four persons (v) five persons (vi) six or more persons?

2. In 1986, in the metropolitan census area of Montreal, what numbers of private renter households were there with (*a*) under $5,000 (*b*) between $5,000 and $9,999 (*c*) between $10,000 and $14,999 (*d*) between $15,000 and $19,999 (*e*) between $20,000 and $24,999 (*f*) between $25,000 and $29,999 (*g*) between $30,000 and $34,999 (*h*) between $35,000 and $39,999 (*i*) between $40,000 and $44,999 (*j*) between $45,000 and $49,999 (*k*) between $50,000 and $59,999 (*l*) $60,000 and over in annual income in households comprising (i) one person (ii) two persons (iii) three persons (iv) four persons (v) five persons (vi) six or more persons?

3. In 1986, in the metropolitan census area of Toronto, what numbers of private renter households were there with (*a*) under $5,000 (*b*) between $5,000 and $9,999 (*c*) between $10,000 and $14,999 (*d*) between $15,000 and $19,999 (*e*) between $20,000 and $24,999 (*f*) between $25,000 and $29,999 (*g*) between $30,000 and $34,999 (*h*) between $35,000 and $39,999 (*i*) between $40,000 and $44,999 (*j*) between $45,000 and $49,999 (*k*) between $50,000 and $59,999 (*l*) $60,000 and over in annual income in households comprising (i) one person (ii) two persons (iii) three persons (iv) four persons (v) five persons (vi) six or more persons?

4. In 1986, in the metropolitan census area of Winnipeg, what numbers of private renter households were there with (*a*) under $5,000 (*b*) between $5,000 and $9,999 (*c*) between $10,000 and $14,999 (*d*) between $15,000 and $19,999 (*e*) between $20,000 and $24,999 (*f*) between $25,000 and $29,999 (*g*) between $30,000 and $34,999 (*h*) between $35,000 and $39,999 (*i*) between $40,000 and $44,999 (*j*) between $45,000 and $49,999 (*k*) between $50,000 and $59,999 (*l*) $60,000 and over in annual income in households comprising (i) one person (ii) two persons (iii) three persons (iv) four persons (v) five persons (vi) six or more persons?

5. In 1986, in the metropolitan census area of Edmonton, what numbers of private renter households were there with (*a*) under $5,000 (*b*) between $5,000 and $9,999 (*c*) between $10,000 and $14,999 (*d*) between $15,000 and $19,999 (*e*) between $20,000 and $24,999 (*f*) between $25,000 and $29,999 (*g*) between $30,000 and $34,999 (*h*) between $35,000 and $39,999 (*i*) between $40,000 and $44,999 (*j*) between $45,000 and $49,999 (*k*) between $50,000 and $59,999 (*l*) $60,000 and over in annual income in households comprising (i) one person (ii) two persons (iii) three persons (iv) four persons (v) five persons (vi) six or more persons?

6. In 1986, in the metropolitan census area of Vancouver, what numbers of private renter households were there with (*a*) under $5,000 (*b*) between $5,000 and $9,999 (*c*) between $10,000 and $14,999 (*d*) between $15,000 and $19,999 (*e*) between $20,000 and $24,999 (*f*) between $25,000 and $29,999 (*g*) between $30,000 and $34,999 (*h*) between $35,000 and $39,999 (*i*) between $40,000 and $44,999 (*j*) between $45,000 and $49,999 (*k*) between $50,000 and $59,999 (*l*) $60,000 and over in annual income in households comprising (i) one person (ii) two persons (iii) three persons (iv) four persons (v) five persons (vi) six or more persons?

Return tabled.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grisé: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Grisé: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We will deal this morning with Bill C-139 until one o'clock. We will then move to Bill C-136. We will have three speakers on that Bill from 3 p.m. to approximately 5 p.m. After the third speaker we ask that you call it five o'clock.

It is my understanding that the Private Member's Motion has been dropped. We will adjourn from five o'clock to 6 p.m. From six o'clock to 10 p.m. we will return to debate on Bill C-139, and if there is any vote on this Bill it be deferred to Wednesday at six o'clock p.m.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I was listening to the Parliamentary Secretary, and I want to thank him for giving us the agenda for the day. However, I want to say to the Government that I would not want the Canadian public to get the impression there has been a full day's debate on Bill C-139 when we only had a few hours, yesterday and today. This is just a warning against any attempt to have the public believe we had two days of debate on Bill C-139.

Mr. Grisé: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier). Yesterday, there was only one speaker on this Bill, and today there will be two speakers for the Opposition parties, while this evening we will continue the debate on the same Bill.

• (1120)

[*English*]

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, we appreciate having the line-up presented this way so we have a clear understanding, at least today, about what the business will be.

Since we are discussing tax reform, or as my hon. friend from Ottawa Centre indicated, tax deform, and this is very important legislation which touches the lives of every Canadian because it has serious implications for their future taxes, we would like to see a thorough and complete debate. We do not want to see the Government trying to rush it through. I am not suggesting that that is what he is doing, but just so there is no misunderstanding, this is important legislation and should not be rushed by anyone.

Mr. Grisé: Mr. Speaker, as I just said, there was only one speaker yesterday. There will be the two speakers for the Opposition today and then we will resume debate later this evening. It is not the intention of the Government to force or speed up this Bill. It is a very important piece of legislation for all Canadians, as the Hon. Member said, so I am sure we will have the full co-operation of both opposition Parties.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has listened carefully to the proposal made by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary. It is a matter for the three Parties to agree on, of course, but there is one small problem concerning Private Members' Hour. The Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) would have to withdraw his motion, either at five o'clock, or notify the Chair earlier, that it is his intention to do so. Normally he would need unanimous consent to withdraw the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grisé: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will abide by your decision.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

INCOME TAX ACT AND RELATED ACTS

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Monday, July 18, consideration of the motion of Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) that Bill C-139, an Act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements, and Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contribution Act, 1977, and certain related Acts, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would just like to remind the House that when the motion was moved originally it was that the Bill would go to a legislative committee. By unanimous consent this morning it was decided it would go to the Standing Committee on Finance, and Economic Affairs.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Garneau (Laval-des-Rapides): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-139 before the House today contains more than 500 pages of legislation, does not even have an index and is a collection of extremely complex clauses. Curious though that may seem, Mr. Speaker, while the White Paper was tabled in June 1987 and amended in December 1987, this is the first opportunity the House has had to debate this reform in this Chamber.

Granted, the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs has considered the question for a number of weeks. It also heard witnesses. However, this is the first time the debate on tax reform will take place in the House. This reform has aroused considerable concern. The Finance Committee alone

received more than 400 letters and briefs and heard thirty witnesses from all parts of the country and all levels of our society. What do these Canadians have to say to the Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs and to parliamentarians? Basically, they don't like this tax reform. Families don't like it, middle-income taxpayers don't like it, R & D firms don't like it, mining regions are disenchanted, and insurance companies, self-employed workers and farmers came here to explain their dissatisfaction with this legislation.

In fact, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) has the satisfaction of getting a unanimous response to his Bill, since everyone agrees it is unacceptable. More specifically, Canadians came to tell the Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs:

First, that the tax reform is merely a smoke screen because it is an attempt to camouflage four years of massive tax and income tax increases.

Second, these people came to tell the Committee that this reform is incomplete because it postpones the most important part, sales tax reform, until after the election.

Third, people came to tell us that this reform does not simplify our taxation system and in many ways makes it more complex.

Fourth, Canadians told us that the reform does not make the tax system more progressive, more equitable or fairer for private citizens.

Fifth, they told us that the reform hits hardest at middle-income taxpayers.

Sixth, the reform is entirely unfair to families.

Seventh, it discourages the building of capital.

Eighth, it makes businesses, especially in the manufacturing and research and development sectors, less competitive.

And ninth, the reform makes life more difficult for self-employed workers.

But before analyzing this reform in greater detail, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain the broad principles that should have served as a guide to the tax reform proposed by the Minister of Finance.

[*English*]

The thrust of the Minister's reform centres on removal of incentives from the tax system and lowering of the tax rates. This general thrust, if I may say so at this point, is in sharp contrast to the position the Minister originally took upon coming into office, in his first three Budgets. You will probably remember that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson), in his previous Budgets, introduced extremely costly tax incentives such as a capital gains exemption, and on a number of occasions he increased the tax burden, mainly by partially deindexing the tax system and imposing surtaxes. Now the Minister has recognized the error of his ways and has repented, at least on these issues. This change of heart is a death bed repentance and I do not think Canadians will be fooled by the eleventh hour conversion. The pre-electoral timing is just too blatant.

In these various political games that the Minister of Finance plays he has completely neglected to reach the key objective of tax reform, that is to have a tax system which is equitable, redistributive, and fair. Equity and fairness must be achieved in ways which do not lower work incentives either at the lower or at the upper end of the income scale.

Clearly, this reform has in no way improved the progressivity of the tax system. This has been illustrated vividly by at least three different studies which show that middle-income Canadians are hardest hit by this reform. Those studies were done by the Institute of Research on Public Policy, the Senate Committee on Tax Reform, and the Thorne Ernst Whinney analysis. In other words, this is not real tax reform since it neglects to institute what Canadians value the most, namely fairness.

• (1130)

Concerning the role of incentives in the economy, as a general principle we in the Liberal Party favour a move toward a reduction of incentives. We also favour the use of this new room to manoeuvre to lower the tax rates. Tax incentives, when they are blindly piled up on top of each other, can represent—and I emphasize "can"—an inefficient way of encouraging a type of economic activity. They can also distort progressivity in the personal income tax system and can hide the real cost of those programs.

This general principle, however, has to be balanced against other government policies. For instance, if drilling in the mining sector drops off, or if research and development in Canada lags behind other countries, there are legitimate arguments in favour of tax incentives over other forms of government tools such as direct government grants. Tax incentives tend to reduce the role of government bureaucracies and their ability to make discretionary choices.

Pragmatic as always, Liberals believe that governments should, under certain circumstances, use tax incentives to shift the short-term direction of the economy or to solve structural problems for a better long-term allocation of resources or a fairer balance of economic development among regions and sectors.

One must not minimize the enormous challenges the Canadian economy faces if it is to grow at rates necessary to meet the income and employment demands of our people. We should not underestimate the structural weaknesses of our economy. There seems little doubt that in an economic context where high income countries need to be at the cutting edge in research and development based industries, a strategy based purely on the free market or on foreign-centred firms will not be successful.

It is obvious to me, as it is to many business people, that tax reform will not meet this new challenge. It puts our manufacturing sector at a competitive disadvantage. It puts our research and development firms at a disadvantage. It puts our small businesses at a disadvantage. It puts our entrepreneurs, our risk takers, at a disadvantage. Ultimately, this will only reduce growth and jobs.

One way to settle the dilemma that the Government faces by keeping useful tax incentives that run counter to progressivity is to set a limit on the total amount of deductions an individual can claim. A "box" of deductions could, for instance, be set up. An individual would not be allowed to claim more than a certain amount or proportion of his income in regard to that box. This box would be a more effective tool to ensure that every taxpayer pays a fair share of taxes. In other words, it is a minimum tax that can replace the complex and ineffective so-called alternative minimum tax of the Tory Government.

I also think that all new incentives, as well as all the existing ones, should be accompanied by a three to five-year revision clause and be subject to parliamentary scrutiny. I emphasize that I am not speaking here of a sunset clause that would automatically kill an incentive after a given period of time, but of a revision clause.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, instead of proceeding with the kind of tax reform I just described, the Minister of Finance, a bit like his Prime Minister, preferred to make this reform a political game. For instance, in a pre-election move that did not deceive anyone, the Government announced that as of July 1988, the tax reform would result in a slight drop in source deductions on the paychecks of many taxpayers. Whatever the Mulroney Government cares to think, this respite is merely a smoke screen, a pre-election move to make us forget four years of tax increases unprecedented in this country's history.

The tax reform as tabled is merely the latest in a series of increases in personal income tax, sales tax and excise tax. If we look at studies made by independent agencies, the tax measures introduced by the Conservative Government in the past four years have been both regressive and unfair.

In a report published recently, the Institute for Research on Public Policy calculated the impact on the taxpayer of all changes in personal income tax made by the Conservatives since they came to power. To those figures we must add the additional burden on taxpayers as a result of numerous increases in indirect taxes, such as the increase in federal sales tax from 9 to 12 per cent and the 5 cent per litre increase in the excise tax on gas. There are three points one can make as a result of these calculations, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that these three points reflect the main deficiencies of the tax reform proposed in Bill C-139 before the House today.

First, in 1988, even after the tax reform, all taxpayers will pay more income tax then they did in 1984, with one exception: taxpayers with an income exceeding $117,000 a year. The average tax saving for this privileged group, which represents only 1 per cent of Canadian families, is about $3,500 annually.

Mr. Speaker, this means that all taxpayers will pay more income tax except those privileged members of our society with an annual income of more than $117,000.

Second, middle-income families, for instance a family with an annual income of $32,000, will pay $1,200 more in taxes than in 1984.

On this side of the House, when we talk about the unfairness of the Conservative Government's tax reform, the following example is eloquent. The rich, people with an annual income of $117,000 or more, stand to gain over $3,500 per year as a result of the tax reform, while middle-income families with children will pay an additional $1,200 per year.

If we look at the federal Government's total revenues, if we consider the projections made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) in his last Budget, and we compare these with the Government's revenue in 1984-85, we realize that corporate income tax increased by only 28 per cent, while personal income tax, including sales tax and excise tax, has increased by 62 per cent, which means 62 per cent more for workers and only 28 per cent more for corporations.

In other words, Canadians will not be fooled by the Government's attempt to gloss over four years of massive tax increases, which took place despite promises made to the Canadian people by the present Minister of Finance and the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) when they were campaigning in September 1984.

So despite promises by the present Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance that they would not increase taxes, the list of tax increases has grown steadily in the past four years.

Mr. Speaker, I shall mention the main increases. First of all, federal sales tax has increased by 3 per cent: from 9 per cent to 10 per cent in October 1984, just after this Government was elected, and then to 11 per cent on January 1, 1986, and to 12 per cent on April 1, 1986.

This decision by the Finance Minister and the Conservative Government means that just on the basis of these rate increases, in 1988 Canadians are going to pay over $3 billion more in sales tax.

Mr. Speaker, sales tax was extended to candy, soft drinks, health care products and dental instruments on July 1, 1985, which brought in an additional $400 million. All candy and snacks were taxed, which raised $60 million more for the Government, on an annual basis.

The sales tax on paint, wallpaper and toys was increased from 8 to 12 per cent. The excise tax on gas was increased four times, Mr. Speaker. First, two cents a litre more on September 3, 1985, then one cent per litre more on January 1, 1987, another cent on Febuary 17, and another cent again on April 1, 1988. This adds up to a total of 5 cents a litre or more than 23 cents a gallon. The sales tax on leaded gas was raised to

bring the price to the same level as that of unleaded gas. There was a progressive increase in the air transportation tax, and excise tax and duties on alcohol and tobacco were increased four times between May 24, 1985 and January 1, 1988. Mr. Speaker, one tax I find outrageous is the 10 per cent tax on long distance calls which became effective on January 1, 1988. The hardest hit are those living in remote areas who must call long distance to reach their doctor, their accountant, their general store, and so forth. This tax will raise an additional one billion dollars and will have a negative impact on regional development across this country. These tax increases were all introduced by the Conservative government since 1984.

And what about income tax? First, the tax tables were partially de-indexed, which increased the tax burden on Canadian families by $635 million then and there. Since the $635 million applies to the first year, January 1986, it means that in 1987, it was twice that and in 1988, three times, Mr. Speaker. This means that in 1988, Canadian taxpayers are paying over two billion dollars more in income tax because of the Finance Minister's decision.

Tax exemptions have been eliminated: $650 million. The deduction for registered home ownership savings plans was eliminated $100 million. The temporary 5 per cent and 10 per cent surtax and then the general permanent surtax of 3 per cent were introduced. Changes were made in the tax treatment of dividends. Married exemptions were changed. Mr. Speaker, all these tax increases were introduced by a Government that made a solemn promise to Canadians that it would not increase taxes.

If we add it all up, Mr. Speaker, you know how much this represents? It works out to $26.7 billion in new taxes, for a Government that promised not to increase taxes for Canadian taxpayers. And when after that they tell us, as the Finance Minister did last week, that the deficit will be $28 billion instead of $29 billion, what kind of an attitude is that on the part of a Finance Minister who just increased taxes by $26 billion! And pleased as punch because he managed to reduce his deficit by $1 billion!

Mr. Speaker, I will get back later to the deficit. For some days now, in fact some weeks, billions of dollars have been spent left and right. Have we had a progress report from the Minister of Finance? How can this Government give away billions and billions of dollars without ever giving the House a statement of revenues and expenditures for the next five years? It's easy, Mr. Speaker. Every time they give away another billion, they charge it to future budgets so that the current year is not affected. The following year will be marginally affected but later on, the bills will start coming in, and then this Government which is so proud of reducing its deficit will have to come clean or take the consequences.

• (1140)

[*English*]

As a result of those measures, "tax freedom day" as calculated by the Fraser Institute has occurred later and later each year since 1984. It now occurs on July 10, which means that the average family works more than six months just to pay its federal, provincial and local, direct and indirect, visible and hidden taxes. The Government has done nothing to reverse this trend. At least these taxes could be collected fairly, but unfortunately that has not been the case. Furthermore, this is only current taxation.

If one considers that the deficits are nothing else but deferred taxation, the average taxpayer will work from January 1 to August 12 merely to pay taxes.

[*Translation*]

The answer to this question: Why has the Government done nothing? I will say, Mr. Speaker, that when you look at the tax increases brought in by this Government, when you look at what has happened over the last few years, you see that this Government is just deceiving the Canadian electorate.

[*English*]

In spite of these numerous tax increases, public finances remain extremely vulnerable to any downturn in the economy. The Government brags of its success in reducing the deficit, but the reality is that it has not prepared the Canadian economy for the inevitable downturn which many economists fear will come as early as next year.

In spite of six years of strong growth, thanks to the global economic picture, and in spite of four years of massive tax increases, the deficit is still in the $28 billion-$29 billion range. The public debt now amounts to more than $320 billion, or more than $25,000 per taxpayer.

Mr. Hockin: It is because of the debt that you left.

Mr. Garneau: This debt has increased by 80 per cent since the Tories took office. I hear the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Hockin). The Government stated in its electoral platform that its main objective was to cut the deficit without increasing taxes. The deficit has increased by 80 per cent since October, 1984, with more than $25,000 per taxpayer. The Government's agenda was to cut the deficit. The deficit is still growing at a pace of $77,000 per day.

Mr. McKnight: It is interest on your debt, Raymond.

Mr. Garneau: When the Liberal Government left office, the debt was $175 billion. It is now $320 billion, an increase of 80 per cent for which you are responsible. You should tell that to the Canadian public.

This huge debt that has been piled up by the Tory Government, which promised to cut the deficit, costs $13 billion in interest charges every year. The Government has increased

taxes by $26 billion, after telling Canadians that it has done a terrific job by cutting the deficit by $1 billion this year.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, we also know that tax reform will be done in stages. The first step took effect on January 1, 1988 and contains a few tax reductions but unfortunately its impact was not felt on pay cheques until the beginning of July. Six months later! Why? The answer to this question is obvious: this Government acts only in response to political pressure. July 1 was chosen because it was near the elections, so that voters could feel a slight tax decrease after being hit with $26 billion in increases; the Government gives a few billion back and does it on July 1 to make it as close as it can to a possible election date. And in order to keep some room to manoeuvre, to be able to play on all fronts, the Government said to itself that with the July 1 date, if it could not hold the elections in 1988 but only in the spring of 1989, the refund for the first six months of 1988 would be paid then. It will give the voters another small gift and hope to buy their votes with their own money. Mr. Speaker, this is a loan of over one billion dollars that the Government has given itself. Many Canadians and companies would like to be able to give themselves the same privilege of interest-free loans.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a few minutes in this speech to denounce the other election trick of the Government, namely announcing now the good news, or what it claims to be good news, but leaving the bad news for after the election. I wish to talk about this two-stage reform and the one that is not on the legislative agenda now, sales tax reform. The Government is waiting until after the elections to bring it in. It is clear that the Government is only trying to repeat the trick it pulled in 1984. This Government then promised not to increase taxes. And we know how much this Government has increased taxes since 1984! Today they are trying to give us the good news before the elections, but after, watch out! That is when this famous sales tax will hit us. They did not want to introduce it in one step, as all observers and all Canadians who came to the Finance and Economic Affairs Committee asked, so that they could see the pros and cons and know what to expect for the future . . .

But this Government lacked courage! We must recall that more than three years ago, the most important component of tax reform according to this Minister of Finance was sales tax reform.

So much so, Mr. Speaker, that at that point the Minister of Finance did not even refer to personal income tax reform—he only stressed sales tax reform. He even suggested the existing sales tax, to use his own words, was "a silent killer of jobs".

He also indicated, as the Minister of State (Finance) (Mr. Hockin) yesterday repeated in his speech, the sales tax was hurting exports, and helping imports, in addition to being excessively complex to administer.

• (1150)

And so, may I ask, if since 1985 that tax has had so many flaws, how come the only part of the tax system that has not now been reformed is the sales tax?

Mr. Speaker, the C.D. Howe Institute even indicated in its 1988 report titled "Focus on follow through", the major economic advantages to be derived from reforming our tax system would come from reforming the sales tax rather than direct taxes. But when the time came to proceed with that reform, this Minister and this Government backed off.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Liberal Party feel that the current sales tax system must be improved. The Liberal Party is committed to reforming that tax upon coming to power. We further feel that basic foods such as milk, bread, butter and meat, should be non taxable items.

Moreover, we believe that a generous refundable tax credit must be established, to be indexed and paid in installments to middle and low income families.

Mr. Speaker, let me now say a few words concerning the complexity of that tax reform included in Bill C-139. I must first emphasize that the legislation includes more than 500 pages, 500 pages without even an index. Try and find your way through that!

In those more than 500 pages of text, there are a number of explanatory notes. We might as well laugh rather than weep over that! Especially when one of the major objectives announced by the Minister was to simplify the tax law.

To sum up my views on the matter, that reform no doubt is one of the most complex we have ever seen in this House. The tax system is being made much more complex in a number of areas rather than simpler. Even the experts can hardly find their way through that maze.

It should be remembered that in October 1986, the Minister of Finance stated in the document titled *Guidelines for tax reform in Canada* that one of the objectives was, and I quote: "making the tax system simpler so that it is more readily understood by more Canadians".

Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing all observers agree on, it is that the simplification goal never was achieved.

[*English*]

The best example that has been given to us concerning the complexity of tax reform has been provided by the Joint Committee on Taxation of the Canadian Bar Association and the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants. Let me quote what it said in its May 1988 submission about the so-called simplification:

> Our review and analysis of the April draft legislation, (now Bill C-139), only reinforced the conviction of the Joint Committee, that if simplification was a priority objective of the tax reform process, the Government has failed.

The most important consequence of such a complexity is, in the words of the Joint Committee, "the prospect of widespread non-compliance".

The report of the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs on tax reform came to the same conclusion. It capped its chapter on tax simplification by saying: "Tax reform has not successfully addressed the problem of simplifying the tax system". Why did the Minister promise something when he had no intention of delivering?

[*Translation*]

According to a recent study conducted for the Canadian Tax Fondation, only 30 per cent of taxpayers are brave enough to complete their income tax returns themselves. Nearly 40 per cent have it done by specialized firms, and 30 per cent by friends or relatives. If such was the case under the previous tax law, my prediction is a still larger proportion of Canadians will have to use tax experts in order to complete their income tax returns that otherwise could be greatly simplified.

[*English*]

I recognize that tax simplification is not an easy thing to achieve. It is a long-term goal. However, to achieve any progress at all, I believe, again with the Joint Committee, that the Government must make a firm commitment to simplification as a priority and be willing to accept trade-offs with other policy objectives.

If you remember, Mr. Speaker, in June 1986, the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs released a report about tax simplification. I must point out that this was a unanimous report also signed by the majority of the Conservative members of the committee. Those recommendations called for measures to simplify both the income tax form, which is the key aspect of tax simplification for most taxpayers, and the Tax Act itself. The Government should have acted but it did not. Why? Liberals have always stressed the importance of having a progressive tax system. It is a question of equity and fairness. No other issue more naturally divides Conservatives from Liberals. I fear that income distribution has worsened over the last four years. This is partly a result of economic trends, but also because of a tax system which has become much less progressive.

I believe one of the most important ways to redistribute wealth in this country is the tax system. What the Tories have done is to redistribute the revenue, but upside down, giving more money to the rich and taking more from the middle-class and lower-income earners. Along with millions of Canadians, I am shocked to see that every taxpayer pays more taxes in 1988, even after tax reform, than in 1984, except those earning more than $117,000 a year. I am shocked that some 60,000 profitable corporations will continue not to pay any tax despite tax reform, and I am also shocked at some 5,220 taxpayers with incomes above $50,000 a year paid no tax in 1986. Forty of those have incomes of over $250,000 a year.

You have to remember, Mr. Speaker, that 1986 was the first year of the implementation of the so-called minimum tax by the Tory Government. That is not fairness. It is not progressivity. Even though those numbers are striking, the most perniciously regressive aspect of tax reform is to be found in the new tax structure with three levels. It is not easy to explain why this new structure lacks progressivity, but the difficulty of the task does not make the system acceptable.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the number of tax rates have been reduced from ten to three. We now have three rates, 17 per cent, 26 per cent and 29 per cent. These are the federal rates only. Provincial rates must be added to these rates. Have you ever asked yourself, Mr. Speaker, why the 26 per cent rate, which kicks in at $27,500, is so near to the 29 per cent rate paid by high-income earners? Why is it that the 26 per cent rate, which is the middle rate, does not lie right in the middle between 17 per cent and 29 per cent? The answer to this question is very simple. The Government has decided to raise the middle rate to 26 per cent because it did not proceed with the reform of the sales tax immediately. This is why the Government claims that under phase 2 of the tax reform, when the sales tax will be reformed, enough revenue will be generated to reduce the middle rate. This is an implicit recognition by the Government of the unfairness of its new tax structure.

Those who are hurt are middle-income earners. Those with incomes between $30,000, $40,000 and $45,000 a year are the big losers with tax reform, and the Government knows it. What we used to call the silent majority are people earning between $30,000 and $45,000. The Government hits that group because it knows that those people will not come here to Parliament Hill and demonstrate their disapproval. However, I am confident they will do so during the time of the next election.

• (1200)

[*Translation*]

But the situation is even worse than what I have just described. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, in their tax reform report the Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce pointed out that, on all additional income, a good many middle income families will pay a higher tax rate than will high income households. Mr. Speaker, at the 26 per cent official federal rate a middle income family has to allow for an additional hidden 5 per cent levy due to the fact that every time a family gets a salary increase—say going from $30,000 to $31,000—it stands to lose 5 per cent of its refundable child tax credit. Let us look at it this way: a $30,000-a-year family whose income increases to $31,000 will have to pay a 31 per cent federal tax on the extra $1,000, which is more than the 29 per cent rate a taxpayer whose earnings go up from $100,000 to $101,000 would have to part with. The extra $1,000 in the hands of a family will be taxed at the rate of 31 per cent.

A future Liberal Government is committed to make the tax structure more progressive. Progressiveness does not necessarily imply higher tax rates. By lessening emphasis on counterproductive tax incentives and raising . . .

Mr. Cassidy: Oh, oh!

[*English*]

Mr. Garneau: When the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) has his turn he may address a question, but I would request that he please let me make my speech.

[*Translation*]

By lessening emphasis on counterproductive tax incentives and raising the minimum tax rate as we suggested earlier, while at the same time proceeding immediately with the sales tax reform, we would manage to make our tax system more progressive and still maintain lower tax rates.

In addition to axing some family assistance programs through the partial de-indexation of family allowances and refundable child tax credits, the Government missed a golden opportunity to revamp the whole family tax system. Canada's birth rate happens to be among the lowest in the world and the family structure has changed considerably over the past 20 years, but the Government has yet to make its tax legislation reflect this new reality.

As you know, in terms of the Income Tax Act a common-law couple is not treated as a family unit and each partner is considered to be a single taxpayer. This simple distinction between a common-law and a legal union entails very heavy financial consequences for couples, so much so that in some cases a common-law arrangement is a much better proposition than marriage when it comes to income tax considerations. Many groups gave strong evidence to that effect, but the fact remains that family needs are exactly the same whether the couple are legally married or live as common-law man and wife. First and foremost, I should think, overhauling the family tax system would be the fair approach. Some people might be concerned that such changes would favour a lifestyle over another, but not so, Mr. Speaker. I think that the state must avoid making a value judgment on the kind of union it prefers, it has to respect personal choices and give fair treatment to all couples no matter what their lifestyle may be. That was the low-key message conveyed by the Standing Committee on Human Rights. So what has the Minister of Finance been doing to make tax legislation more consistent with our society's changing mores? Not a thing, Mr. Speaker!

[*English*]

I would like to address one last issue before concluding my remarks. It is the issue of capital taxation. As many business people said when they saw the Government's proposal: "This is not capital taxation, it is capital punishment". The capital reform proposal will cause capital gains to be taxed more heavily than dividend payments. The signal sent to the business community is that the Government preferred to encourage prudent investment rather than risk-taking investment.

You indicated to me, Mr. Speaker, that I have only a few minutes left.

[*Translation*]

May I ask the House to show leniency and to give me two more minutes to complete my speech?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to give the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau) a few more minutes to complete his statement?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Cassidy: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) on a point of order.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I think his time shoud be unlimited since he is the first speaker from the Opposition to take the floor.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau), just like the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy), is allowed 40 minutes. I think there is unanimous consent to let him complete his speech.

Mr. Garneau: Mr. Speaker, I will not abuse the privilege granted to me by this House. I will only take a few more minutes to conclude my statement.

[*English*]

The Finance Committee has recognized this problem of capital taxation, and has proposed many measures to improve the situation. For instance, the committee proposed to limit the inclusion rate for capital gains to 66 per cent instead of 75 per cent, as proposed by the Government in this Bill. I fully support this recommendation, but it is only a partial solution to the whole question of capital taxation. I sincerely believe that the whole question of capital taxation must be completely revised.

How can the Minister of Finance explain the coherence of having abolished the $1,000 of investment income deduction, which is widely used by middle-income Canadians as well as senior citizens, while at the same time keeping $100,000 of capital gains exemption? How can the Minister of Finance explain that the capital gains and the investment income are not protected from inflation? What is the logic of a capital gains tax exemption and an inclusion rate of 75 per cent on the excess?

To improve the taxation of capital gains, some people have proposed to index the gains, as has been done recently in the United Kingdom. Some others propose to have more targeted measures to help the capitalization of corporations; some also claim that the $100,000 capital gains tax exemption should be simply abolished.

As the Senate committee report said, the question of capital taxation and of taxation of investment income has to be thoroughly reviewed. The Government must generate a new set of proposals more favourable to investments in the country's long-term competitive needs. The Liberal Party recognized this need.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I did not have time in the 40 minutes allotted to me to deal with all aspects of tax reform. For example, I leave it to my colleagues from Outremont (Mrs. Pépin) and Trinity (Miss Nicholson) to go further into the taxation of families, especially children. I leave it to my colleagues from Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) and Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) to discuss the issues relating to seniors.

I did not have time either to talk about the flow-through shares that the Government first eliminated and then replaced with a program that does not seem to give the desired results. I will simply remind you that the Liberal Party is in favour of maintaining this system of flow-through shares.

I did not have time to go to the bottom of the questions affecting research and development, and taxation of farmers. Neither did I have time to develop many other aspects concerning small business, taxation of... for example, the whole question of car expenses and offices at home. These are all questions that I hope my colleagues will deal with.

I did not have time either to talk about the taxation of insurance companies, which will have a considerable impact on Canadians' savings in those institutions. I did not have time to discuss the taxation rate of small manufacturing companies. The Minister had promised to lower the tax rate for small business from 10 to 8 per cent. Despite that, he increased it to 12 per cent. Neither do I have time to talk about the film industry.

[*English*]

This tax reform is only a smoke-screen. It remains incomplete; it does not simplify the tax system; it in no way improves the progressiveness or equity of the tax system; it places an unfair burden on middle-income Canadians; it is unjust for families; it discourages capitalization; it reduces the competitiveness of businesses; it makes life difficult for the self-employed.

The net result of Bill C-139 is that, in 1988, even after tax reform, all taxpayers will pay more taxes than in 1984 with the exception of those privileged few whose income is $117,000 and over. The average reduction in taxes for this group, which represents a mere 1 per cent of Canadians families, is close to $3,500. Second, a family with two children earning $32,000 a year will see their taxes increase by an average of $1,200 in comparison to 1984. Finally, if we compare the total revenues of the federal Government between 1988-89 and 1984-85, we realize that corporation tax increased by 28 per cent, while personal taxes and sales and excise taxes, paid for by all Canadians, increased by 62 per cent.

[*Translation*]

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the motion now under consideration be amended by striking out all the words following "that" and replacing them with the following:

"That this House is opposed in principle and therefore refuses to proceed with Bill C-139, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, 1977 and certain related Acts, because this Bill seeks to impose a tax system

1) that is not progressive;

2) that imposes an unfair burden on families;

3) that unfairly taxes middle-income individuals;

4) that is more complex than the one now in place;

5) that discourages capital formation and that reduces the competitivity of Canadian businesses".

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair finds that the motion of the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau) is in order.

[*Translation*]

Resuming debate on the amendment, the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) has the floor.

• (1210)

[*English*]

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak specifically about Bill C-139 which deals with the Government's tax reform. The Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Hockin) talked about a sense of urgency with respect to this Bill. It is interesting to me that this sense of urgency was such that the Government brought its tax proposals forward last June after lengthy delays, and then in December it decided what it was going to do. It was not until June 30 of this year that it finally tabled its tax reform proposals.

What came forward was not tax reform in the sense of a fairness that people were looking for across the country. What we got was Tory tax reform. This means that the interests of wealthy Canadians and of corporations was put ahead of the interests of average Canadians.

That is indicated by such facts as the following. The biggest tax cut in the tax reform is the cut in corporate tax rates from 36 per cent to 28 per cent. The biggest beneficiaries in terms of the income earners who win from this are wealthy Canadians earning over $100,000 per year. Average Canadians get about $6 per week in tax cuts. They have had far more than that in tax increases over the course of the last four years since the Conservatives came to power just under four years ago. But wealthy Canadians get an average of some $80 per week. What that means is that it is lunch at Winston's every week for a wealthy Canadian family which gets tax cuts under this particular tax reform, but for the average Canadian it is two big Macs and one milkshake to share every week.

The Bill which has come forward is some 500 pages long. It is an abuse of Parliament for the Government now to have this Bill before Parliament and the people of Canada for as short a period of time as the Government intends to have it.

The Finance Committee has worked at this Bill with a great deal of energy and effectiveness. Despite the fact that we disagreed about basic issues such as progressivity, nonetheless we made a large number of very useful and constructive proposals. I regret the fact that, perhaps guided by the Finance Department, or perhaps guided by its own ideological motivation, the Government has systematically chosen to ignore the vast bulk of those recommendations, let alone the recommendations coming from the New Democratic Party.

I want to serve notice to the Minister of State for Finance, to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson), to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and to all members of the Conservative Party that tax reform will be a major issue in the forthcoming general election campaign. The options that Canadians will have to choose will be between Tory tax reform that benefits the rich and the corporations on the one hand and fair tax reform as proposed by my leader and the New Democrats on the other hand and what we have been fighting for over the last many years.

What the Government has done is to put forward changes in the tax system to please its friends in the business community and among wealthy communities. I would say to the Minister of State for Finance that a symbol of the Conservative priorities is the fact that the urgency of tax reform that they saw was a tax-free capital gains provision of half a million dollars for wealthy Canadians most of whom earn more than $100,000 per year. As a symbol of the Tory priorities, when the Prime Minister had to replace his Principal Secretary, did he choose a union leader? Did he choose someone who had worked with the poor? Did he choose a woman who knows the problems that women have in having second class citizenship in our society? No, no, and no.

Who did he choose? The Prime Minister chose a close associate of Conrad Black of Argus Corporation. He brought the corporate elite to the Prime Minister's Office by putting Peter White to work as his Principal Secretary. That indicates the priorities of this particular Government.

The average Canadian has had tax increases on an average income of about $1,300 per year since 1984. That is the reality of Conservative tax policy. Under tax reform, if they are lucky they will get a tax cut of about $300 per year. That means that for every $4 that they have had taken from them in tax increases they will get $1 back. The finance critic from the Liberal Party tried to suggest that the Liberal Party was opposed to the approach to taxation taken by the Progressive Conservatives. He seems to have a short memory. Perhaps because he just came to the House only in 1984.

Who was it that began all the tax concessions to wealthy corporations? It was the Liberal Party. Who was it that began the cuts in top tax rates which are being continued by the Progressive Conservatives? It was the Liberal Party. Who was it that began the increases in sales tax?

[*Translation*]

The sales tax increases which had been first initiated by the Liberal Party were later on perpetuated by the Tory Party. Which is the party which widened the sales tax base to make sure that an increasing number of consumer goods used by the middle income Canadian family would be taxed? It is the Liberal Party which started all that, Mr. Speaker. Which is the Party which was the first to impose taxes on Canadian families below the poverty line? It is again the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker. Who started the de-indexing process? It is the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, with the 6 p. 100 and 5 p. 100 program which it introduced in the early 1980's. Who has maintained the archaic sales tax system which still exists now? It is again the Liberal Party which did nothing to change the system.

Who used its empty rhetoric to defend the fairness of the tax system? It is the Liberal Party, followed now by the Tory Party. That is why I wonder if the Liberal Party would increase the taxes on major corporations? The Liberals are like the Tories. They would equally preserve the privileges of the private industry in our country, just as they did when they were in Government. That is why I urge Canadians to judge the two major parties on their deeds rather than on their words, to judge the Liberal Party on what it achieved while in Government. When they sit on this side of the House, the Liberals talk like New Democrats, but when they are in Government, they act like Conservatives.

[*English*]

They talk like New Democrats when they are in opposition, but they act like Conservatives when they are in government. That is why when we say that tax reform will be a major issue in the forthcoming election campaign and New Democrats will be talking about fairness in taxation for average Canadians. We will put our proposals up against those of the Conservatives. We will put our proposals up against those of the Liberals as well. We will contrast the kind of fairness that we are talking about with what the Conservatives are doing in office and with what the Liberals did when they had power just a few short years ago.

It is interesting to recall that from 1981 to 1984 when the Liberals were in power Canada's banks with profits of more than $5 billion paid approximately 2 per cent of those profits in tax—about $72 million. Canada's trust and life insurance companies paid around 5 per cent of their profits in federal income tax.

It is interesting to note that during that period of time a teller in a branch of the Royal Bank paid more in tax than the Royal Bank itself paid. Did we hear the finance critic from the Liberal Party, who was then himself a bank president, criticize that particular position? He was silent. Did we hear Liberal back-benchers criticize that particular situation? They were silent. Did we hear Conservatives in opposition criticize that

situation? They were silent as well. Yet that is a situation which creates unfairness, cynicism and, finally, non-compliance from average Canadians who say: "Look, if the big corporations are getting all of the breaks, why the devil shouldn't I fiddle my taxes just a little bit as well?"

That is fundamentally demoralizing and undermining to the tax system which depends on voluntary compliance. If Canadians were really looking for fairness and frankness from the tax reform, then they are disappointed and will be disappointed with what they get from the Conservatives. In terms of fairness, when all is said and done what the Conservative tax reform really means is that three out of four wealthy families earning over $100,000 per year will get an average $4,165 per year in tax cuts.

Where does that figure come from? It does not come from the researchers in the NDP, it does not come from a bunch of gnomes in the back room of our Party who devised that. It is in the Government's own documents. The Government itself admits that after its tax reforms, some 60,000 profitable Canadian corporations will continue to get off every year without paying any tax. The average Canadian family will be left paying about $1,000 a year more in income and other taxes than in 1984, presuming that they had the same income as they had in 1984.

• (1220)

In addition to that, the Conservatives have been hardly frank with the Canadian people. They have kept the bad news hidden in terms of what they intend to do about the new sales tax. The Democrats admit and accept that we need a change in the present sales tax system. It is up to the Government to act on this issue. The Finance Committee has just in fact come back with a report indicating that the current changes, the interim changes proposed by the Government on sales tax, are unworkable, unacceptable and ineffective, but we do not know what the Government intends to do.

It was only after months of pressure that we finally had the Minister of Finance accepting that he was not going to continue with his long-cherished ambition to slap an 8 or 10 per cent sales tax on food, on the groceries that every Canadian buys every week. Now, we just do not know what else will be taxed and what is out. The Minister of State for Finance is here. He can interrupt me now and tell me what is going to be taxed and what is not, what is in and what is out. How much will any tax cuts that took effect in July of this year for average families be wiped out once we have the regressive sales tax as proposed by a Conservative Government that puts the interests of the wealthy and of corporations first? How will that affect the tax savings?

Mr. Hockin: What do you think of the present sales tax?

Mr. Cassidy: I have just said—if the Hon. Minister had been listening—that the present sales tax is not a good sales tax. It ought to be changed. The Finance Committee has said that as well. We do not know and Canadians do not know the Government's proposals. The Government is carefully waiting until after an election for the other shoe to drop.

Mr. Hockin: How about the Labour Party in New Zealand?

Mr. Cassidy: The Conservatives may have got some of the ingredients right, but they are still following the same recipe that favours the wealthy and lets the largest corporations off easy. The end result is that the average Canadian family is left paying the bill.

Let me point out that three out of four wealthy families get over $4,000 a year in tax cut. The average family earning $35,000 a year gets a cut of only $350 a year. The family earning under $15,000 a year gets a cut of only $100 a year.

In addition to that, the tax reform as proposed by the Conservatives is fundamentally unfair when it comes to families across Canada. As far as families are concerned, the Conservatives think that all it takes to raise a family is $65 a year in tax credit, over and above what is given to the tax system for the average taxpayer who is single. It is $65 a year per child. It is a bit more for the third and subsequent child, if your income is under $24,000 a year. But a tax credit of $65 a year is about $1.28 per week, I believe. Now, $1.28 per week, I would like to inform the Minister of State for Finance, will not even buy one of the cheapest hamburgers at McDonald's or at Burger King in order to help that kid make it through the week. Certainly, it will not pay for the food, milk, extra housekeeping, clothing, personal supplies, educational supplies, sporting goods that a child needs, if the child is going to live normally with his or her peers, for all of the other expenses that are entailed in having children and raising kids.

I think people have said that raising a child these days is an investment which we carefully make. It may be $75,000 or $90,000 over the childhood of that child, until the child is independent and on his own at the age of 20 or 21.

What does a Conservative Party propose to give in terms of that cost? Well, $65 over 20 years works out to about $1,300 or perhaps 1 per cent of the extra cost to families who are raising kids.

Finally, the Conservatives point out that 850,000 taxpayers will be taken off the tax rolls, but they ignore the dimension. A million taxpayers have been added to the tax rolls since 1984. If the wealthy had paid their fair share under the tax system as proposed by the Progressive Conservatives, middle and low-income families could have got a fairer tax break. If the wealthy had paid their fair share, we could have taken families which were below the poverty line off the tax rolls in terms of paying income tax, instead of a family who is $1,000 below the poverty line paying tax. A family who is $2,000 below the poverty line will be paying federal income tax. A family who is $3,000 below will be paying tax. In fact, the tax for families will begin at around $18,500. The poverty line in urban Canada, for an urban Canadian family right now is some $23,000 per annum. So you reach down to $4,500 below the

poverty line and yet people at that level are still going to be paying tax.

It is interesting to note what the priorities of this Government are. A taxpayer with an income of $30,000 a year, if he or she is single, will get a $695 tax cut. The Minister nods. He acknowledges the figures which are drawn from his figure. A single taxpayer earner with two kids, with a spouse who is not working, will get a tax reduction of $590. If it is a more typical Canadian family, two income earners and two kids under 18, it will get a tax cut of $285. A single person over 65 will get a cut of $430.

It is significant that in the typical Canadian family with two incomes it takes two wage earners to support the kids, pay the mortgage or the rent, and buy the food and other essentials that you need. That particular family at $30,000 a year, instead of getting the largest tax cut—which would seem to make sense—gets the smallest tax cut, while the single person gets the largest cut. There is something fundamentally wrong about that.

We, the New Democrats, believe that the Canadian tax system is long overdue for fundamental reform. We stand out and speak up for fairness, efficiency and simplicity in the tax system, but the tax system that we have in Bill C-139 is neither fair, efficient nor simple. The committee has come in with some useful suggestions, but it failed to take up the challenge of redrafting the proposal in terms of the fundamental principles which should underpin real tax reform.

Let me cite one specific thing. The first recommendation of the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs, I regret to say, was to endorse the rate structure which is contained in the proposals put forward under tax reform by the Minister and by the Government. I think it was a very serious mistake because, when you cut the top rate of taxation from some 34 per cent of the federal level down to 29 per cent, it is impossible to create a progressive tax system. When you create a situation where a secretary working for Bell Canada pays a marginal rate of tax, only five points less than the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Bell Canada, Mr. Jean de Grandpré, who has an income of close to one million dollars a year, there is something fundamentally wrong with that. Average Canadians will tell you that, and yet, somehow the Government is so distant from average Canadians that it simply does not understand that at all.

How can you defend a situation where out of every dollar that Mr. de Grandpré gets in additional income he pays only a nickel more in tax than the secretary who perhaps is trying to raise a couple of kids and live on her own, perhaps on one income, and certainly is having a tough time getting by on that particular income?

While the tax system's intention is, among other things, to raise funds for government expenditures, it is also a serious moral and philosophical intervention into the society and the economy. We live in a society where income is unequally distributed through the mechanism of the market in the form of wages, salaries, dividends, interest and that kind of thing. Income is not distributed equally and the market will not distribute it equally. Whether or not the market acts efficiently in economic growth, it is a poor instrument for realizing social equity. Therefore, as New Democrats, we believe that the central focus of the tax system is to achieve a redistribution of income from the wealthy to average and lower-income Canadians. What the Conservatives believe is something completely contrary. They have been captured by the neo-Conservative view that we need to get the tax system down to a system of taxation as flat as possible. If they could have reduced the categories from 10 rates to 1 rather than 10 rates to 3, I believe they would have done so if they felt they could have sold that, but in the end they could not do that.

• (1230)

The Conservatives are setting the stage for a shift from income taxation over to consumption taxes, despite the fact that consumption taxes affect average Canadians much more than they affect wealthy Canadians, because wealthy Canadians can afford to defer expenditure and consumption because they have lots of money to go around. The Conservatives are creating a system which is less and less progressive. That is demonstrated by the fact that the biggest tax cuts go to wealthy Canadians and the smallest tax cuts go to average Canadians.

The reform package here fails to achieve any substantial redistribution of income among Canadians. The one progressive part of the system, which is the personal income tax, is not far from being neutral in its impact. The reform package is consciously structured so as to be neutral in terms of income distribution. Otherwise progressive features, such as converting tax exemptions which favour upper income earners to tax credits which favour lower income earners are more than offset to changes to the structure of tax rates.

If you really believe in fairness, Mr. Speaker, then you would judge that all forms of income should be treated equally. The Liberals, however, do not believe in fairness. When they were in power they did not treat income equally, and the Conservatives are no better. Income from property, such as capital gains and dividends, is treated differently by the Conservatives than income from wages and salaries.

I hear the Hon. Member for Don Valley East (Mr. Bosley) basically supporting the privilege in which many of his constituents live since he comes from one of the most affluent constituencies in the country. While I have great respect for the Hon. Member, who is a former Speaker and a distinguished Member of this House of Commons, I want to suggest to him that his constituents are far less in need, and if they are committed to a fair society here, they should be prepared to accept willingly a redistribution of income through the tax system rather than fighting at the top always to be in first place.

I go on to point out that we think the corporate share of the over-all tax burden which represents a withholding tax on property income should be increased. We think that the sales tax share, which represents a regressive tax on consumers, should be reduced. Unfortunately, this question of balance was not examined at any length by the Finance Committee nor, of course, was it examined to any extent by the Government.

We think as well that there is a real problem in tax fairness between big business and small businesses in Canada. That continues in the tax reform which is here. The tax rate on businesses and on larger corporations is alleged to rise by a modest amount. The corporate share of Canadian tax collections, which was about 20 per cent in 1984 when the Conservatives came to power, is down to 15 per cent today. In four or five years time it will still be no more than abut 17 per cent of total tax collections, about $1 in every $6, whereas the average taxpayers will be paying well over half of those tax collections, Mr. Speaker. In addition to that, tax benefits intended to create jobs are overwhelmingly concentrated and directed toward large corporations, while small businesses pay more tax and yet create the vast majority of new jobs in this country.

I would say that if we are talking about efficiency, and that is an important goal as well, then the Government has failed to come to grips with the whole question of tax expenditures, which amount to some $30 billion a year, which amount to a sum equal or greater than the annual sum of the deficit in Canada, and which the Government has simply not touched through the tax reform. If you were to take these tax expenditures and reviewed and assessed them on an annual basis, as the New Democrats believe should be done, then you would start to create a system that would be more efficient, you would be measuring every expenditure by a Government whether it was a direct expenditure or an expenditure through the tax system.

[*Translation*]

Unfortunately, the Tory Government has done nothing in that direction. We believe it is possible to target tax expenditures to ensure that key objectives such as job creation and regional development are achieved with considerably less spending on the Government's part. Once in a while, some tax expenditures are justified such as the flow-through shares. Nevertheless, we believe that in a great many cases, direct expenditures from the Government are much more efficient than tax expenditures to reach national economic goals.

[*English*]

We believe that the goal of accountability has not been seriously addressed by the Government or by the committee. That is what I was saying just now. We recommend that each tax expenditure program should be assigned to a relevant Department for review and consideration every year with regard to alternative policy instruments.

We believe that there should be a tax expenditure analysis presented annually, along with the spending Estimates, the Budget and the Public Accounts. We believe the tax expenditures should be integrated with the spending envelope system and be subjected to the approval of Parliament. Unfortunately, we are not making much progress on that. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because wealthy Canadians and corporate Canada know they have a better chance of making headway through the back door via tax expenditures than through the front door via direct expenditure by Government.

Finally, on this front, we have the question of simplicity. The Bill which is 500 pages long hardly adds to simplicity. In fact, the tax practitioners are absolutely beside themselves in trying to deal with this tax measure. I regret that the measure is likely to go through the committee and back through this House with little or no effective scrutiny of the details of the legislation.

In 1986, before tax reform, half of all Canadians had someone else prepare their tax returns. One-third of Canadians had tax experts prepare their tax returns because they were too complex for them. Ordinary Canadians are increasingly baffled by the complexity of the tax system. That will certainly not change through this provision. In fact, that is also true as far as corporations are concerned.

There has been a lot of talk about the automobile expense provisions which the committee urged be fundamentally changed and which advice the Government ignored. I read through a seven page memo prepared by one of the leading accounting firms that purported to explain the new provisions on automobile expenses. I have to confess that I did not understand it, even as someone who has some expertise in this area and who has spent the last year looking at tax reform as a member of the Finance Committee. If I cannot understand it, how can someone who is running a small business understand it? How can a salesperson or someone working for a firm understand it? Why do we have to create a system where every time you turn around you have to resort to a tax lawyer who charges $200 an hour for his or her advice?

We had hoped to see a fairer balance between individuals in the tax system. Unfortunately, that is not to be. We had hoped to see a higher top rate on those people earning $50,000 or $60,000 a year who can afford to make that kind of contribution. We had looked for a system where wealthy Canadians would pay more rather than less.

We are fundamentally in disagreement with the approach taken by the Government, which is to say that it will plug loopholes on the one hand but then turn around and take money which is gained from loopholes and give it back to the same people. When a Department is forced to give up expenditure because of cut-backs in a particular area, it is not allowed to take the money and put it into some other area of Government. The money goes back into the Treasury and is then spent according to the general priorities of the Government. When it comes to tax reform, the Government has shovelled money around so that wealthy Canadians who lost certain loopholes are getting the money back through lower tax rates.

It may be a more neutral tax system, but it is not a tax system that is fair or more equitable.

It should also be noted that the new credits to be introduced in 1988 will not be fully indexed to inflation. The income tax burden on average families will increase in real terms and many more poor families will be forced back on the tax rolls. In other words, the 800,000 families who may be taken off the tax rolls today will find themselves back on them in the unlikely event that this Government is back in power for the next three or four years after the election.

• (1240)

The partial deindexation means that the $300 tax cut for the average family will be systematically eroded to the point where there will be no effective tax cut about three or four years down the line. That is primarily rooted in two things. The first is the failure of the tax reform White Paper to introduce a fair tax rate structure. The second is the failure of the Government to bring in full indexing on tax rates, particularly for people earning under $30,000 a year. Instead, the credits and everything else are partly deindexed as part of the Tory approach to tax reform.

There are other problems and disparities. One is the fact that the Government is still backing away from full taxation of capital gains. My Party disagrees with that. We disagree with the priority given to the $500,000 tax exemption. The fact that it has been capped at $100,000 is modest progress, but the tax exemption should not have been put there in the first place. It should not be changed or maintained, it should be taken out. We think that the principle that a buck is a buck is a buck, first enunciated by the Carter Commission on taxes back in the 1960s, should be endorsed now if we are to keep our country economically strong and provide for economic regional development. Surely people should know that a dollar they earn is taxed on the same basis as for everyone else and there are not sharpsters and wise boys and girls and people who have the inside track who are able to cut their taxes by means of such devices as the privileged rate given to dividends and capital gains.

That is why my Party recommends that, with the exception of farmers and small businesses—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Darling: Aren't you wonderful?

Mr. Cassidy: —and we are prepared to make those concessions, that capital gains be fully taxable and that the lifetime exemption be eliminated. I hear some disagreement. Perhaps some members of the Conservative Party do not believe that farmers or small businesses should be exempted. If that is the case, let them say so during the debate.

We note that while many of the tax exemptions or deductions in the system have been replaced by credits, at the same time other personal tax measures which largely favoured the wealthy, such as the deduction for RRSP contributions, the special treatment of dividend income, and the full deduction of interest costs for income, have been treated as deductions rather than credits. If you want a system that deals fairly with people at different income levels, we propose that those be dealt with in the form of a credit rather than a deduction. Why should wealthy Canadians get deductions and average Canadians get credits? Why not make it all a system of credits?

I have already spoken about the unfairness of the system with respect to families. I have spoken about the fact that the tax reductions for average families are themselves derisory. A few bucks a week, and that money is going to be very quickly taken away. They are far less than the tax increases which have taken effect under the Conservatives since 1984.

The figures are a bit difficult to calculate, but the National Council on Welfare calculates that by 1991 the total child benefits for a two-child family at the poverty line will have been reduced by $314, and the average two-child family will actually lose $925. Those figures may have changed a little bit with the changes to the proposals since 1987, but not a heck of a lot. I ask, what kind of country is this when the tax system deals so unfairly with people who are performing, apart from everything else, the one absolutely fundamental responsibility of every generation in any society, which is to ensure that children are born and a new generation comes along to carry the torch and keep the human race going? How do we treat that in Canada? Judging by the Tory tax reform, we treat it with contempt.

We urge that the $65 tax credit per child be significantly increased and indexed to inflation. The change just for the third child and subsequent children is not good enough. We believe the new credit could and should be melded with an increased and reindexed family allowance.

The NDP also has a long-standing policy to increase the refundable child tax credit by 80 per cent as an essential step toward lifting low-income families with children above the poverty line. If we have a commitment to children, if we have a commitment to families, then let us do it now, and not wait until after the election.

In the same vein, I heard my friend, the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau), suggesting that absolute necessities of life such as bread, milk, butter and a few similar products should not be subject to sales tax. I am not sure if he was trying to draw a distinction between all groceries and certain limited essentials. However, I want to serve notice on the Government again that it would perform a major disservice to Canadians, and would make a fundamental political error, if it ever again tried, as the Minister of Finance did a year ago in June, to impose a sales tax on the groceries Canadians buy every week. That is a fundamentally unacceptable position. We do not accept it. We fought it from the moment it was proposed. The Minister, after six months, finally backed off. However, on behalf of average Canadians, we say that this is

an unacceptable provision and we will not accept it. Do not let us see the Government going back on that promise.

I want to go on now to deal with the corporate side. It is significant that the increase in taxes on corporations under the Conservatives is far less proportionately than that which took place under tax reform in the U.S. In fact, I think there is a lot of deception taking place on this issue. The marginal rates on high income individuals in the U.S. are much higher than the Progressive Conservatives try to pretend. Corporate taxes went up far more there than in this country. It is interesting that the Conservatives, having promised in 1984 that a minimum tax would be brought in on individuals have failed to do so on corporations. Yet it has been estimated that a minimum tax on corporations of 20 per cent, which is the rate applied in Ronald Reagan's America, would bring in an extra $2 billion a year here in Canada. That would in turn allow tax cuts for average Canadians.

It is also notable that that would sharply cut down if not eliminate the large number of profitable Canadian corporations, some 60,000 or so, who will continue to be able to avoid tax on their profits after tax reform.

New Democrats suggest there should be a minimum tax on corporations here in Canada. If it can be brought in in corporate America despite Reaganomics, for goodness' sake, we can do it here in this slightly more progressive country. I suggest we should be doing that now. We should not be waiting. We should bring in the minimum tax. That is another way of assuring average Canadians that when they pay their fair share, everyone else is doing so as well.

I have had a great deal of correspondence from individual Canadians asking about the elimination of the $1,000 investment income tax deduction. The theory for removing it is quite strong in the sense that you make up for it by means of changes in the basic tax rates and credits and that kind of thing, and by not distinguishing between people who earn by working and those who earn from interest or dividend income. That I understand. However, the more I think about this, the more I realize that the reason people are really offended at that omission is the fact that the Government is cutting the taxes of wealthy Canadians, much of whose income comes from interest and dividends, and at the same time is taking away one of the few tax concessions given to average Canadians. That raises real questions in our minds.

I understand my time is up, Mr. Speaker. I would seek the indulgence of the House and ask for unanimous consent to continue, with the understanding that I would finish by one o'clock.

• (1250)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the House grant unanimous consent to the Hon. Member?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Cassidy: I suggest that in terms of simplicity we have a very serious problem. When I began to pay income tax 20 odd years ago my tax form was a dozen pages long, now it is 80 or 90 pages. I am overwhelmed with record keeping and the various ancillary documents I have to submit. Many other Canadians are suffering the same kind of thing. That is why New Democrats believe that there should be a plain language tax form. Why can the tax form for most Canadians not be a dozen pages or so, something we can fill in in the course of a couple of hours rather than having to consult a tax preparer and pay $50 or $200? The tax preparers often do not understand the law either. Why does it have to be so complicated? Why can it not be simple again? Why can we not provide people with a system which is both simple and fair?

Why can Revenue Canada officials not be available to meet with taxpayers on a regular basis to assist in tax filing? A constituent of mine who works here in the House of Commons told me the other day that for the last two weeks he has been trying to get the taxpayer inquiry number at the Revenue Canada office here in Ottawa. He has phoned morning, afternoon, and evening, day after day after day and that telephone number has been consistently busy. That, of course, is no service at all to the public. If he were Mr. White, working for the Prime Minister, or a colleague of Mr. Black, it would be available in black and white. He would have easy access to the people who could give him the tax information he needed. However, that is not available for average Canadians.

I want to turn now to the changes made by the Government since this first came forward in 1987. We know that the Government refused to move in a meaningful way in terms of the tax credit for children. It moved only with respect to the third and subsequent children. I grant that that was the Finance Committee's recommendation. I think the committee was wrong on that particular point. We argued very strongly against that. The Government increased the refundable tax credit by the magnificent sum of $35 per child but refused to raise the net family income threshold as the Finance Committee had proposed.

On automobile expenses the Government proposals are of a mind-boggling complexity. It refused to listen to the Finance Committee. I want to tell the Minister of State for Finance and his boss that every small business in the country is up in arms over that particular provision. They will be spending thousands of dollars every year just to try to administer this particular law in its proposed complexity. The 27-cent and 21-cent feature which was added in the final run might alleviate things a bit. We will study that in the committee.

However, it does not have to be this complicated in order to prevent business people from driving a BMW or a Jaguar to work on the firm. That is what we want to eliminate. That is what offends average Canadians who are nursing an eight-year old car and do not understand how someone else can drive a very expensive automobile on the firm.

With respect to the taxation on farming, the Government has listened to a certain extent, and I say thank you for that. The Government's proposal for a modified accrual system of accounting on farms was going to offend and outrage every farmer across the country. It was not workable, it was not fair, and it was not reasonable. I am glad to see that the Government has finally backed away from that particular proposal and is now looking at this in more detail.

In other areas, however, the listening was a little less intense. I note, for example, that the Government refused to impose the alternative minimum margin tax which was unanimously proposed by the Finance Committee and would have had the effect of bringing in some $400 million a year from under-taxed sectors, that is, the banks and other financial institutions. In other words, the Government caved in to the lobby from the banks and other financial institutions. It came in with a temporary capital tax on the charter banks of one or one and a quarter per cent, which the Minister of State for Finance himself knows is a perpetuation of an archaic tax. If the Minister wants to move on the sales tax because it is archaic, why is the Government perpetuating an archaic tax?

Mr. Hockin: You want revenues from the banks. That's revenue.

Mr. Cassidy: The revenue that will come in is an estimated $120 million in the first year and $125 million in the second year. The committee proposed unanimously, with the support of the Conservative Members, a $400 million increase in revenues. That would have enabled us to create a fairer tax system, but the Government did not want to offend the banks by doing that.

It is interesting that the Government has moved a little bit on some technical provisions with respect to the "put in use" rule relative to the capital cost allowance but, having plugged a few loopholes, it now starts to open them again, most notably with the guarantee of a tax ruling on the Revenue Department with respect to the expenditures on the Hibernia project which it seems to me now sets a precedent for every other corporate interest to look for similar treatment. We will be back very quickly to where we were under the Liberals.

The Government did not accept the Finance Committee's recommendations of an advanced corporation tax or to close the preferred share dividend loopholes available to large corporations. There, too, I think the Finance Committee was well in advance of the Government. Again, the people who benefit the most from things like the preferred share dividend loophole or the moving of dividends from one company to another are Conrad Black and Peter White in the Prime Minister's Office. Only four or five days ago he was in Toronto fiddling around with preferred tax share dividends and that kind of thing in order that ordinary taxpayers would have to pay more so that he and his corporate associates could make more and more bucks.

Mr. Hockin: Nonsense, we removed all that.

Mr. Cassidy: The Minister of State for Finance says "nonsense", yet it is true and he knows it. He used to teach business at Western Ontario and he should know that that kind of thing is going on.

The committee recommended that legitimate out-of-town travel expenses for sales purposes, et cetera, should not be subjected to the 80 per cent rule on entertainment and meal expenses. The Government did not grant that, and I think it was wrong. Instead, the Government has left the situation that legitimate business travel will only be deductible to 80 per cent, but if Labatt's from London wants to invest $200,000 in a VIP box at the Skydome it will be able to deduct 80 per cent of that cost as a business entertainment expense.

Again, there is some disparity in that. The small business here in Ottawa in the hightech industry which is trying to crack the European market will find that the cost of maintaining its representative in Europe for a week or two while on a sales trip is not fully deductible, but the expense for a box at the Skydome is 80 per cent deductible. There is something wrong with that.

The final point I wish to raise on that particular issue is that the Government has refused to move with respect to the recommendations coming from the tax fraternity on the issue of anti-avoidance. I would like to read an excerpt from the submission made by the Joint Committee of the Bar Association and the Association of Chartered Accountants. They said:

> The Joint Committee is fundamentally opposed to the introduction of a general anti-avoidance rule of the kind included in the draft legislation of April 13, 1988. The Committee is unanimous in its view that the existing statutory rules (with relatively minor modifications) and jurisprudence are adequate to combat unacceptable tax avoidance.
>
> The general anti-avoidance rule in the form proposed by the Minister of Finance is unnecessary, undesirable and represents a retrograde step in the evolution of Canada's income tax system. The introduction of such a rule will create an aura of uncertainty over ordinary business and commercial transactions for many years to come.

They strongly recommended two changes. The one which was accepted was to rule out Section 245(10). The one which was refused was to put the onus of proof onto the Minister of National Revenue.

I cited that because the committee itself felt that way too. It believed that if the Government had administratively been prepared to enforce the existing rules about anti-avoidance it would have been much more effective than bringing in new jurisprudence which will take seven or eight years to be clarified. In the meantime the Government is giving many firms a licence to cheat, firms which will not be caught under this new anti-avoidance rule.

The basic point which New Democrats have been making and will be making on the hustings is that New Democrats want a fairer tax system which benefits average Canadians. Tories want a Tory tax reform which benefits the wealthy and corporations. I believe that Canadians across the country want New Democratic tax reform and not Tory deform.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

ENERGY

DEVELOPMENT OF HIBERNIA OILFIELD

Mr. Gerald Comeau (South West Nova): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Governments of Canada, Newfoundland and Labrador, and a consortium of oil companies announced the details of the largest development project ever undertaken in Atlantic Canada.

The project means thousands of quality jobs to Newfoundlanders and Atlantic Canadians. As the first major offshore development project in Canada, Hibernia will also generate significant new business opportunities for hundreds of companies in Newfoundland, Atlantic Canada, and other parts of Canada.

The project will take Canadian companies to the leading edge of offshore oil and gas development technology. Canadian companies can then plan an even larger role in future offshore projects both in Canada and around the world.

This project is great news for Newfoundland and Labrador, great news for Atlantic Canada, and great news for all of Canada.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

FARM WOMEN—OFF-FARM JOBS

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, Canadian farmers are faced with a drought this year that threatens their livelihood. The drought is also accelerating major changes in rural families. Women have always worked hard on the family farm, helping with the harvests, raising their children and maintaining the home. But now they are faced with another burden, seeking paid employment off the farm to pay the bills.

The number of farm women with outside jobs has increased dramatically over the last 30 years. In 1951, 13 per cent of farm women worked off the farm; in 1988, that number is 68 per cent.

Farm women face many obstacles in trying to combine their many responsibilities. There are inadequate child care facilities for their children in the rural areas where they live. The jobs available to most of these women are minimum wage employment. Farm women are still responsible for most of the housework and child care, and that in addition to helping with many tasks related to the farm. All of this makes for very long and demanding days.

I call upon the Government to offer concrete support to Canadian farm women, especially now because of the drought. More rural day care centres need to be established. Farm women's organizations need to be strengthened through increased funding. As well, women's contribution to the farm must be recognized through pension reform. Finally, farm women will benefit along with all Canadian women from effective employment equity legislation.

* * *

VIA RAIL

EFFECT OF ANTI-SMOKING LEGISLATION

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, when passing laws in this House sometimes our enthusiasm for a cause blinds us to the adverse effect and expense imposed on others. For example, we recently passed Bill C-204, the Non-Smokers Health Act, which if proclaimed as is will impose severe constraints on VIA's operations. It will prevent VIA from offering smoking accommodation on more than 40 of its trains. In fact, Clause 5 will ban smokers entirely on all of its one-coach trains.

Also, VIA is discriminated against as it has no time limitations as provided for other modes, even though some trips last 75 hours. Additional equipment required to meet the requirements of the Bill will cost $8.5 million, and even worse, the rights of 300,000 smoking VIA passengers are negated and they will have to find other modes. Are smokers not Canadian citizens too?

* * *

ABORTION

SUPREME COURT'S REFUSAL TO POSTPONE HEARING

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, this morning the Supreme Court of Canada summarily dismissed an application by the Government to postpone indefinitely the case of Borowski. In that particular case now pending before the Supreme Court, the court is being called to decide on the rights of the fetus.

The Government had the audacity to interfere in an unprecedented fashion in the process of the court. In effect, the Government asked the independent Supreme Court of this

country to dovetail its agenda into its own agenda, for political reasons.

Chief Justice Dickson of the Supreme Court of Canada was not persuaded. One could not help but be embarrassed for the lawyer from the Justice Department who was instructed by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) to argue a very weak case.

It was an abuse of the process. When will the Government have the courage to bring in legislation in order to protect the innocent unborn?

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) in a letter dated February 24, 1984, when he was Leader of the Opposition, said:

> On the overall issue of abortion, I realize that there are personal, moral and religious commitments on all sides of the abortion question, and I am not prepared to support abortion on demand.

I call on the Prime Minister to live up to his convictions and bring in legislation to protect human life right from the moment of conception.

* * *

ATLANTIC CANADA OPPORTUNITIES AGENCY

CALL FOR SENATE TO PASS LEGISLATION

Mr. Pat Binns (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal dominated Senate is blocking progress in Atlantic Canada. It is holding up the Opportunities Agency legislation which is the best news for us since John Diefenbaker was Prime Minister.

We want to spend $1 billion in the next five years to let business develop their ideas, to create thousands of jobs and create long term prosperity.

• (1405)

Are the Senators, supported by Liberal Members of Parliament across the way, afraid we will get credit for new jobs and prosperity for Atlantic Canadians? Are they afraid of giving control to Atlantic Canada rather than keeping it here in Ottawa? Are they afraid we will succeed where they failed? Are they playing partisan politics on the backs of our small businessmen? This is an injustice to every Atlantic Canadian, to every Prince Edward Islander. We want jobs. We want prosperity.

I call upon the Liberal Members of Parliament to stand up, to get out of their seats, to walk over to the Senate right now and tell Mr. MacEachen and his colleagues that they are tired of being his patsies. Tell him he is wrong. Tell him you will support the Tories to develop Atlantic Canada.

S. O. 21

AGRICULTURE

CALL FOR INTRODUCTION OF LONG-TERM DISASTER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, three years ago the Prairies experienced drought and grasshopper infestations. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) agreed then that *ad hoc* federal disaster assistance to Canadian farmers was inadequate. The Minister promised to do something about it. Three years have passed and we still have no sign of a long-term disaster assistance program.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, much of Canada is in the midst of the worst drought in over 50 years. The Government is providing some assistance to Canadian cattlemen. However, there is still no sign of help for Canadian grain farmers.

The uncertainty of government drought assistance is causing deep anxiety for tens of thousands of farm families. My colleagues and I join farm leaders across Canada who want to know what happened to the commitment of the Minister of Agriculture to create a permanent disaster assistance program. New Democrats call upon the Minister of Agriculture and the agricultural community to develop immediately a long-term assistance program, a program to cover crops, livestock and fixed assets, a long-term program that would greatly reduce the anxiety farm families face each time they are subjected to natural disasters.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SPORT

TOUR DE L'ABITIBI

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, the *Tour international de l'Abitibi* is the most important multi-stage junior cycling event in America. From July 26 to 31, 1988, a number of national teams including those of Switzerland, France, The Netherlands, Czechoslovakia, Guadeloupe and Canada will be on the starting line. A total of 25 teams will be taking part in the 20th edition of the *Tour de l'Abitibi*. The 20 years of dedicated work by people such as Léandre Normand, Marc Lemay, Robert Baril, Roland Lord, André Babin, Claude Pagé and thousands of volunteers have paid off. Val d'Or has been chosen to host this 20th edition of the Tour.

Mr. Speaker, Canadian Steve Bauer showed his ability in the *Tour de l'Abitibi* in 1976 and look at him now: he is a top contender in the *Tour de France*.

S. O. 21

PUBLIC SERVICE

EXERCISE OF POLITICAL RIGHTS BY PUBLIC SERVANTS

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Federal Court of Appeal ruled on the political rights of federal public servants. The ruling invalidates section 32 of the Civil Service Employment Act, thereby granting the 214 000 public servants who come under this act the same political rights as all other citizens.

In so doing, the Court fulfilled the election promise which the Conservative Government was not able to keep. All interested parties expressed their satisfaction. Alliance President Daryl Bean called it a victory for all employees, one which allowed them to emerge from obscurity, and said that these new freedoms did not endanger the integrity of the Public service.

However, in its ruling the Court has created two categories of public servants. On the one side there are 214 000 public servants with full rights, and on the other there are 357 000 federal employees with no political rights.

I hope that the Government will have the courage to fulfill its 1984 promise and go all the way by granting full political rights to those Federal Government workers.

* * *

[*English*]

ATLANTIC CANADA OPPORTUNITIES AGENCY

CALL FOR SENATE TO PASS LEGISLATION

Mr. Lawrence I. O'Neil (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso): Mr. Speaker, yesterday we heard Liberal Members in this House charge that the ACOA Bill will mean the end of the ID Division of Devco. Nothing could be more misleading. The ACOA Bill gives the ID Division the status of an independent Crown corporation. The ACOA Bill will give it a separate board of directors. If Liberal Members want an autonomous ID Division they should support Bill C-103. It is time to support Atlantic Canada, not the Godfather.

Cape Breton has never seen the growth of new industries and the commitment of federal money of the kind delivered since the election of this Government. Included are $110 million for Sysco modernization, tens of millions of dollars for Devco, more than $150 million for small business development, and more than $50 million under the tax credit program. Our record is clear. If the previous Liberal Government was as committed as we are, we would not be discussing unemployment in Cape Breton today.

• (1410)

Yesterday we learned about Hibernia. We will develop oil in the interests of Atlantic Canadians. The Liberals were determined to leave it under the sea.

RAILWAYS

SITUATION OF NEWFOUNDLAND RAILWAY EMPLOYEES

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, when rumours first circulated about the closure of the Newfoundland Railway, the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) and Premier Brian Peckford of Newfoundland said that their first priority would be the workers who would lose their jobs. We learned on Sunday that the Minister for International Trade gave repeated assurances to the workers and the unions, saying to them behind closed doors: "Keep your mouths shut, and we'll look after you".

They were deceived. When the deal to close the railway was announced on June 20 there was nothing there from the Government of Canada for the 500 workers who would lose their jobs. They would get nothing that they were not already entitled to by their hard won collective agreements or existing employment contracts.

"Keep your mouths shut, and we'll look after you". Those are the words of the Minister for International Trade—patronizing workers, intimidation of possible opposition, and then a stab in the back. That is the arrogance of this Minister and this Government. That is how much they can be trusted.

When will the Government learn that people expect openness and honesty from government? The workers at the Newfoundland Railway got exactly the opposite.

* * *

SPORTS

TOUR DE FRANCE—ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CANADIAN CYCLIST

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Mr. Speaker, for the last two weeks Canadians have been following the heroic achievements of Steve Bauer, an Erie riding constituent who lives in Fenwick. He is in fourth place in the *Tour de France*, the world's most prestigious bicycle race.

To win this over 3,000 kilometre race which demands that riders pedal over mountain peaks from 4,000 to 7,000 feet in height, and speed across the borders of Belgium, Spain, Switzerland, and Italy, is considered to be cycling's highest honour. Steve has won the coveted yellow jersey five times. The yellow jersey is presented to the over-all leader at the end of each day-stage of the race. He wore *le maillot jaune* for four consecutive days, earning him the recognition and respect not just of Canadians but of Europeans as well.

I am sure I speak for all Members of the House and all Canadians in congratulating Steve Bauer and conveying to him our best wishes for a quick finish to Paris.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

LAY-OFFS—GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE URGED

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, the crisis on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway system continues. We still have in excess of 1,400 men and women, most of whom reside in the city of Thunder Bay and elsewhere along the system, who have been laid off. We have grain that is trickling to a slow stop coming from the west to a point at which we may only be handling 4 million tons for the next crop year.

I have raised this matter in the House. I have raised it directly with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Bouchard) and with the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mrs. MacDougall) asking for some kind of program that will ensure that those people who are required to move Canada's gain through the eastern system are treated in the same way as those who are producing the grain, the farmers.

I call again on the Government to develop a program that will ensure that grain can move through the eastern system. Temporary elimination of Seaway tolls, lockage fees, and government imposed charges will help. The long term requires additional work.

We need to do what we can to protect those workers who are so vital to the system. I ask the Government to give consideration to changes to the unemployment insurance legislation so that those workers can be protected as well.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—WATER RESOURCES

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, the opposition fearmongers were wrong again. Last week, for days on end they tried to link the proposal to divert water from Lake Michigan to the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. Now the United States Army Corps of Engineers has decided not to go ahead with that diversion.

If water is part of the deal, why would the United States have done that? Could it be that water is not part of the deal? "'Tis so", cries the paranoid Opposition. One thing is certain, the Opposition intends to drag every red herring it can out of Canadian water.

S. O. 21

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NICARAGUA—APPOINTMENT OF DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIVE ADVOCATED

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, today is the ninth anniversary of the Nicaraguan people's victory over Samoza. A tiny country often invaded and ruled by the United States sacrificed many thousands of lives to rid the country of the last ruler left in place by the United States. Since then, the U.S. Government has tried to recover control of Nicaragua. It hired ex-National Guard officers with bloody records of brutality, and initiated a war of terrorism, concentrating on the killing of children, women, and unarmed campesinos.

• (1415)

Recently an uncertain ceasefire has been negotiated with the help of other Governments in Central America, South America, Europe and Canada. However, the U.S. has recently tried again to disrupt the peace through its ambassador, who openly encouraged a public demonstration which ended when the demonstrators attacked the police with stones and sticks and provoked the police response.

I call on the Government of Canada to follow the recommendation of the special committee and appoint a direct representative to Managua so that we no longer depend on the United States for our information about Nicaragua.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

U.S.S.R.—SITUATION OF ARMENIANS IN AZERBAIJAN

Mr. Bill Attewell (Don Valley East): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet decided that the region of Nagornno-Karabagh will remain part of Azerbaijan. This decision is a shock and huge disappointment to Armenians around the world. They had been hoping and praying that Karabagh would become part of Soviet Armenia. As I said in this House on March 1, 1988, the decision to separate this territory in 1923 was an injustice.

With Armenians accounting for at least 75 per cent of the population of Karabagh, they have everything in common with Soviet Armenia and nothing in common with the other citizens of Azerbaijan. In fact, they have suffered human rights violations and many have been killed.

This was one of the most important tests of General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev's policy of *glasnost*. He has failed in his first major test. Canadians of Armenian heritage will not forget nor will they give up. The struggle for human dignity and justice will continue.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF VICE-SPEAKER OF KOREAN NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. Speaker: I wish to draw to the attention of Members the presence in the gallery of three distinguished delegations. The first is led by Hon. Sung Hwan Noh, Vice-Speaker of the Korean National Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF SRI LANKAN DELEGATION

Mr. Speaker: The second, is the presence of a delegation from Sri Lanka, led by the Chairman, Mr. Wijeva Gunawardena.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF FRENCH SENATE SOCIAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE DELEGATION

Mr. Speaker: I wish to draw attention also to the presence in the gallery of Mr. Claude Huriet, Senator and head of the delegation of the Social Affairs Committee of the Senate of France.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

ENERGY

DEVELOPMENT OF HIBERNIA OILFIELD—STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. I am told that today in Newfoundland investors big and small are making firm investment decisions based on what they perceive to be a firm agreement or deal announced yesterday in Newfoundland by the Prime Minister and the Premier of Newfoundland.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: Land is indeed being bought and sold and scarce financial resources are being drawn to offshore related activities in the expectation of a guaranteed return. My question to the Deputy Prime Minister, and perhaps to the Hon. Member for St. John's West, is the following. I ask the Minister whether he is prepared to confirm today in the House that, notwithstanding the stated intentions contained in the Statement of Principles, what in fact was announced yesterday in St. John's was merely a Statement of Principles and not a firm and legally binding agreement to proceed with Hibernia development.

• (1420)

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, what was announced yesterday in St. John's was just as described, an agreed statement of principles between the Government of Newfoundland, the Government of Canada, and the five oil companies that make up the consortium that is developing Hibernia. It was a result of two years of negotiations from June, 1986, and finally concluded on July 9, 1988. As is the usual practice, the detailed legal agreements will be completed before the end of March.

Major expenditures on the project will start in 1989. There will be an investment of $8.5 billion, the greatest investment in any single project ever in the Atlantic region, and ever in Newfoundland. There will be 35,000 direct and indirect jobs created in Newfoundland, and of course across Canada many thousands of others.

The people who stopped the development from 1980 to 1984 and tried to crush the Province and the Government of Newfoundland are the very people now across the House trying to sabotage the deal with this type of silly question.

TERMS OF AGREEMENT

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, the only thing the Opposition is attempting to sabotage is falsehoods. What we are trying to save and define is the truth. I thank the Member for St. John's West who stood on his feet, unlike the exercise that took place in St. John's, Newfoundland yesterday. There was quite a difference, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday it was a firm deal. Today the Minister has confirmed it is merely a Statement of Principles.

The first principle contained on page 1, paragraph 2 of the document, is the following:

> The execution of this Statement of Principles by the signatories hereto is not intended to and does not create legally enforceable rights or obligations between the signatories hereto or between any of the signatories hereto and any third parties . . .

The Member for St. John's West, who is a Newfoundland Member of Parliament, shares with me and every Newfoundlander a desire for development, but also a desire not to see people's hopes crushed or their investments burned. Is he prepared to say clearly today, out of all the confusion, all of the hoop-la, and all the smoke and mirrors, that that article, that escape clause that precedes every other statement in yesterday's announcement, makes it possible for any one of the partners from now to March 31, 1989, to cancel out of this deal at any time without penalty? Is he prepared to confirm that?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I will confirm this, Mr. Speaker, that five major oil companies have entered into a compact with the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland, the principles of which are set out in the agreement made public yesterday that will result in a $5.2 billion dollar capital expenditure off the coast of our province. It will put a firm

economic base under the economy of the Province of Newfoundland for the first time in 450 years. Every Newfoundlander, except those who are jealous or those who are politically motivated, is claiming that this is a great day.

Rather than the actions of former Prime Minister Trudeau who said to Premier Peckford: "I'll see you in court. The jurisdiction and the resource belongs to us", our Prime Minister has gone hand in hand under the Atlantic Accord and we are putting $2.7 billion into the project so it goes ahead and saves Newfoundland and gives Newfoundland an economic chance for the future.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, an empty barrel makes the most noise.

Mr. Crosbie: You should know.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member will note that the Chair felt it was appropriate to close off the Minister's reply. I would hope that the Hon. Member, recognizing that, would phrase his question in such a way that neither the Minister nor the Chair is provoked.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you, Sir, that I meant no disrespect to you and, more important, no disrespect to the Minister. He has a wonderful mind. It ignites when he wakes up in the morning, works flawlessly, and stops as soon as he stands on his feet in the House of Commons.

POSITION OF PETRO-CANADA

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, the Minister does not want to deal with the document. He does not want to admit that the first clause, the legal clause or the escape clause, means that any partner could cancel out at any time for any reason without penalty, but we will take his silence as an acknowledgement of that fact.

• (1425)

Let me ask him this question, Mr. Speaker. Even given the best intentions of having a real deal by March 31, 1989, within eight months, how is it that the Government would be so sure of its statement yesterday and so sure that within eight months there will be a real deal—sometime after elections are held, of course—and how is it that we see the president of one of the major partners in the consortium who was at the press conference yesterday—and I speak specifically of Petro-Canada and its President, Bill Hopper—

An Hon. Member: Where is the question?

Mr. Tobin: You are getting the question—saying with respect to Petro-Canada's financial obligation—

Mr. Grisé: Short answers, short questions.

Mr. Tobin: —and Petro-Canada's financial participation in the deal, "We don't have the money"? How is it, 24 hours after a deal is announced, the President of Petro-Canada is saying with respect to that deal, "We don't have the money" as is reported in today's *Financial Post*? What kind of Statement of Principles was announced yesterday? When will that Statement of Principles be kept as a firm, legal, binding document?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, that Hibernia project is going. It is agreed. The companies have agreed. The Government of Canada has made it all possible with the initiative that we have taken and with the agreements that we have made. They will all be legally bound at the end of March. In the meantime, we are morally bound. We are completely bound. We are bound by our word. We are bound by the handshakes exchanged. And, Mr. Speaker, the proof of the pudding will be in the eating.

Those people who tried to crush the Government of Newfoundland, who stopped development for four years, who sat in their seats here and did nothing, the Benedict Arnolds, have failed, and their last minute attempts to sabotage this project will fail as well. As I said yesterday about Premier Peckford, a hero is one who knows how to hang on one minute longer than the vile forces arrayed against him.

AMOUNT OF PROVINCIAL ROYALTIES

Hon. William Rompkey (Grand Falls—White Bay—Labrador): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the same Minister. He talked a lot about being bound. The fact is the one that is bound most is the Province of Newfoundland. Of the three partners, the weakest partner has to give the most. The companies get money, they get a guarantee. The Government of Canada gets its taxes, its duties, and the Prime Minister himself said Canada will be paid back every cent that it spent. The Government of Newfoundland gives up taxes, reduces corporate taxes, it has to pay $100 million and it gets a royalty of 1 per cent.

Why is it the weakest partner gets a royalty of 1 per cent where Alberta gets a royalty of 12 per cent and Saskatchewan gets a royalty of 20 per cent? Why did the Member for St. John's West allow Newfoundland to mortgage its own future?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, in my 23 years in politics I was never prouder than yesterday, and I am just as proud today.

Last week the hon. gentlemen opposite said that Newfoundland wasn't going to get any royalties at all, it had given up royalties. Today the hon. gentlemen are suggesting it is 1 per cent. The way it works is this. Before the project is in full production Newfoundland starts off with a royalty of 1 per cent. As it gets to full production the royalties mount. If the price of oil goes up, royalties continue to mount.

Mr. Tobin: To what?

Mr. Crosbie: Then, Mr. Speaker, if the project does really well Newfoundland gets a supplementary royalty of 12.5 per cent. In addition, the main support frame is constructed in

Newfoundland, the gravity base structure is constructed in Newfoundland, 50 per cent of design engineering is done in Newfoundland, and 35,000 jobs will be had in Newfoundland. While the hon. gentleman was in the last Cabinet he did everything he could to crush Newfoundland. He should be ashamed to stand up in this House and ask a question about this project.

Mr. Rompkey: Mr. Speaker, if ifs and ands were pots and pans, there would be no work for tinkers. That is what the Minister is, he is a tinker. He is tinkering with the future of Newfoundland.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. William Rompkey (Grand Falls—White Bay—Labrador): Mr. Speaker, what is the maximum? It is 5 per cent if the price of oil goes up. There are so many ifs.

I know what temporary jobs are like. I have gone through Churchill Falls and temporary jobs evaporate pretty quickly. What about the long-term revenue? There is no long-term revenue. I ask the Minister again why has he allowed Newfoundland to mortgage its own future, because that is what he has done?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of thinking that resulted in the betrayal of Newfoundland from 1980 to 1984. When Mr. Peckford wanted to settle with Mr. Trudeau, what did Mr. Trudeau say to him? He said, "I will see you in court". That was the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite. They weren't thinking about the future of Newfoundland then. They were doing the bidding of their master.

But we have a Prime Minister who wants to see every part of Canada develop, who was met yesterday with gratitude, who will go down in history as a friend of Newfoundland, as someone who built co-operative federalism, who has built our economy, who has carried out his promises, who entered into the Atlantic Accord and carried out the Atlantic Accord. The Hon. Member should be ashamed for questioning this deal in this House.

• (1430)

COST ESTIMATES—TERMS OF AGREEMENT

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the same Minister about a part of this deal which I assume he has read, after the public relations disaster of the trade deal. I would like him to enlighten us on the escape clause which says that if the detailed cost estimates for the project rise to $5.6 billion from the current $5.2 billion, either side to the agreement can pull out.

In light of the fact that the cost estimates rose from $4.2 billion in March of this year to $5.2 billion at the end of May, what assurance can he give us that from now until March, 1989, we will not see a cost increase of $300 million and the whole deal is gone?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, isn't that a typical NDP attitude? Their philosophy is expressed by the statement that many a man waits for his ship to come in who never sent one out in the first place. That is the NDP philosophy.

We are sending our ships out. Mobil is sending its ship out. Gulf is sending its ship out. Columbia Gas is sending its ship out. Chevron is sending its ship out. They are committed to putting over $1 billion into this. They are not going to lose all that and let it all go because costs may have gone up. They figured inflation into this.

If the NDP were in power this project would never be started, and there is the living proof. Why, I was reading documents before you were snivelling!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Harris: The comments of the Hon. Minister give truth to the idiom that age does not necessarily bring wisdom.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

PRICE OF FUTURE ENERGY EXPORTS

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker—

Some Hon. Members: We want George!

Mr. Masse: Baker is smart enough not to be here.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member for St. John's East.

Mr. Harris: Mr. Speaker, yesterday's announcement brings into focus the energy provisions of the trade deal, which parts the Minister may not have read. I would like him to confirm that Article 904 of the trade deal will force Newfoundland and Labrador energy, whether it be oil or hydroelectricity, to be exported to the U.S. at the same price it can be sold in Newfoundland, thereby prohibiting for all time energy pricing as a method of attracting industrial development to Newfoundland and Labrador, which the Minister knows is an economic development strategy that successive Newfoundland Governments have long promoted.

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I was not surprised when I did not see the hon. gentleman down celebrating in Newfoundland yesterday. He was up here trying to condemn and damn this deal when he should be supporting it with every inch of his frame. It is St. John's east and west of the Avalon Peninsula that are going to be especially favoured by this development, along with Come-By-Chance where the main support frame and gravity base

structure are going to be built. I would sooner be older and less wise than a puking babe, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nystrom: That wasn't even funny. Flora is embarrassed.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Minister.

Mr. Crosbie: I withdraw the words "puking babe" and change them to mewling babe, Mr. Speaker.

With reference to the question, the free trade agreement does not dictate what price the oil from Hibernia can be sold at, or the price of electricity. It can be sold at whatever price a willing buyer will pay for the oil or electricity. There is no impediment at all. In fact the free trade agreement helps this development because of course there is now an assured market in the U.S. for this oil if it is not all sold in Atlantic Canada.

Some 110,000 barrels a day will come from Hibernia, and that is 60 per cent of the capacity of Atlantic Canada. As a result of Hibernia will come Terra Nova, and Ben Nevis, and all of the other fields out there will be developed. For the next 100 years Newfoundlanders will experience prosperity such as they have never experienced before.

Fortune has turned for Newfoundland because of our Prime Minister and our Government, and Premier Peckford and his Government, not because of the saboteurs and people who never take a risk on the other side of this House!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

EFFECT ON NEWFOUNDLAND

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, the province of Québec has used the availability of low cost energy to attract industry for many years. Much of it is derived from the Churchill Falls hydro power. This resulted in significant economic activity, in the pulp and paper industry, and aluminum, and magnesium smelting, to name just a few.

Why is Newfoundland limited to the development and export of energy, watching it flow out of the province forever, this time from 200 miles away? Why is Newfoundland being denied this economic development strategy which has worked so well for Québec? Does the Minister not realize that Article 904 of the trade deal will forever deny industrial development in Newfoundland and Labrador based on our abundant energy resources? Will he not admit that there really is prohibition of a two-price system for oil which would allow Newfoundland to use it to develop its own industry?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland can purchase the oil. Atlantic Canada can purchase the oil. Canadians can purchase the oil. Americans can purchase the oil. Germans can purchase the oil. Japanese can purchase the oil. They can all purchase the oil at the highest price the market will pay. That is what they can buy the oil for.

With respect to jobs, the Atlantic Accord is grandfathered. The free trade agreement does not apply to it in any event with respect to the provisions for employment and performance and benefits. Even if it did, appropriate packages could still be there.

There is going to be work done in Québec. There are going to be thousands of jobs created in Québec shipyards as they construct modules there. There are going to be hundreds of jobs in engineering in Alberta and Ontario and right across this mighty nation. Some $5 billion is going to be spent, much of it on goods and services.

Some Hon. Members: More!

Mr. Crosbie: This is a national project of which Canadians can be proud!

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys.

Mr. Crosbie: There is not one part of Canada from one end of the country to another that is not going to benefit from our Prime Minister's leadership in carrying out his promises to the voters!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys.

REFINING OF OIL

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker—

Some Hon. Members: We want George! We want George!

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys.

Mr. MacLellan: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Hon. Member for St. John's West. The Statement of Principles gives no indication that any of the oil is going to be refined in eastern Canada, at Come-By-Chance or any other refinery. Nor do we have any indication that any of it is going to be sold in eastern Canada, let alone Newfoundland itself. In fact a federal official says it will probably be sold on the Atlantic seaboard of the U.S.

Why is it that the Minister cannot at least give us some assurance, in spite of the free trade agreement which he says will not allow us to dictate where the oil is going to wind up, that at least Newfoundland will be able to purchase some of the oil produced on its own territory?

• (1440)

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Oh, Mr. Speaker, the inconsistency of it! The first two questioners from the Liberal side say it is all a bluff, it is not going ahead, it is just a statement of principle, there is no legally binding agreement. Then the next questioner gets up to complain that the oil not yet produced is not going to go to Canadian refineries, it is going to go somewhere else in the world. That's inconsistency.

The oil will go to Canadian refineries if we want it to go to Canadian refineries. If someone else will pay more for it, it can go to their refinery.

The Member is right that there is going to be oil. His comrades are wrong, wrong, wrong, just as they were wrong from 1980-84, sitting by, doing nothing while Newfoundland was stabbed in the back.

Mr. MacLellan: Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised the Minister does not know anything about oil because it is obvious his speciality is wind power.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

JURISDICTION OVER RESOURCES

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, the Government has said it wants Newfoundland to be able to control its own resources. Yet the agreement—or the Statement of Principles, I should say, excuse me—says that the project shall be exempted from any production prorationing or other restrictive programs.

That means that Newfoundland was forced to give up jurisdiction over its own resources so that any contract that may come as a result of a potential or possible agreement will have complete control.

Why did the federal Government force Newfoundland to give up jurisdiction over its own resources while telling it it would have them?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, no one was forced to do anything. This was a voluntary agreement. It was Mr. Trudeau's Government, helped by the hon. gentleman opposite, that tried to force Newfoundland, and where did that get them? It got them where they are now, on the other side of the House.

No one is forcing Newfoundland. Newfoundland is going to get, for example, 1,100 direct permanent jobs and 2,426 indirect jobs. In the peak year, 1992-1993, it will create 8,900 jobs in Newfoundland.

Newfoundland now has an unemployment rate of 17 per cent. That is why the Prime Minister has been so supportive in this project which he has carried out in accordance with the Atlantic Accord. Our Prime Minister was described by Shakespeare in *Measure for Measure*. "He was ever precise in promise-keeping."

Mr. Tobin: "Oh, what a tangled web we weave,
When first we practise to deceive!"

Mr. Crosbie: You've had it, you've had it.

Mr. Tobin: We'll see about that. I'll meet you in Corner Brook. I am waiting for you, Crosbie.

Mr. Crosbie: Bring out the stretchers.

Mr. Speaker: I am reminded of what Burns said:

Oh wad some Power the giftie gie us
To see oursels as ithers see us!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—
CONTINENTAL CONTENT RULE

Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Member for St. John's West, the Minister responsible for International Trade and the champion of Atlantic Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Reid: John Dingell, the representative of that automobile manufacturing State of Michigan and Chairman of the United States House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce states that his bottom line with respect to the free trade agreement is that there must be a 60 per cent North American content rule. Many automobile makers in this country support that proposition.

If automobile producers on both sides of the border support a 60 per cent continental content rule, why do we have to wait till next year or "sometime maybe"? Why can we not make that amendment to this agreement now?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, this is the first intelligent question we have heard in this Question Period.

Mr. Boudria: That's more than we can say for the answers.

Mr. Crosbie: The free trade agreement rule of origin requires that at least 50 per cent of the direct costs of manufacturing be incurred in Canada or the U.S. That is a more demanding rule than is presently in effect. At the present there is included in that calculation overhead, advertising, and administrative expenses. Under the new rule none of those categories are included.

Therefore, the rule of origin now requiring 50 per cent is equal to at least 60 to 70 per cent of the cost under the present rules. Therefore, we have made quite a stride forward already under the free trade agreement.

Finally, when this was discussed with the Americans they would only agree to do this if certain provisions for the enforcement of the rule were weakened, which would have made it very difficult to enforce the content rule. Therefore, there was no satisfactory agreement arrived at with them. We have the 50 per cent, but our 50 per cent is equal to 60 or 70 per cent today. I trust the honourable "sleekit beasties" opposite understand that.

* * *

ATOMIC ENERGY OF CANADA LIMITED

DOCUMENTARY ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. I have here a copy of a document prepared for AECL by the Ridley Research group of Toronto. They targeted some 20 environmental groups for surveillance, shadowed these groups, and did research on them.

Did the Minister approve this investigation? If he did, why did he approve it? If he did not approve this, what action is he taking to discipline AECL?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I was informed of yesterday's statement this morning and I asked AECL officials to explain the situation. I was told, first, that this was public information quoted from articles in Canadian newspapers and magazines; second, that AECL had no plans whatsoever to create any group to organize the phoney promotion of environment positions. The House and the Hon. Member particularly can be assured I will give this matter due consideration. It is important and I will meet personally with AECL management to make sure that Crown corporation's behaviour towards Canadians is above reproach.

[*English*]

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, in this document there was some reference made to personal conversations between some of the people who were investigated, which was probably not culled from newspaper articles. At two o'clock this afternoon Mr. Ian Munford told one of our staff that they had filing cabinets full of documents on these groups.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Since those environment groups asked for a public inquiry on that issue, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister is now prepared to order that inquiry and make public all the information concerning that matter?

Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the House I take this question most seriously, and I must first meet with AECL management before committing myself publicly to the position the Hon. Member is suggesting.

* * *

[*English*]

FISHERIES

HIGHLAND FISHERIES PLANT IN GLACE BAY, N.S.—LAY-OFFS—MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. Yesterday the Minister told the House that Clearwater Fine Foods received additional enterprise allocations for vessels between 65 and 100 feet. He stated further in *Hansard*:

> —Clearwater is not willing to continue to employ these workers, notwithstanding the fact that there are fish available to Clearwater's plant if Clearwater chose to go out and catch them.

Would the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans explain to the House and the 310 workers affected at Highland Fisheries in Glace Bay what he meant by that statement? Will he also explain why he refuses to grant an enterprise allocation to that particular plant for boats 65 feet or less in Glace Bay?

The workers wish to know the facts. The community wishes to know the facts surrounding this most difficult situation.

Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, I certainly share the concern being expressed by the workers of the Highland Fisheries plant.

• (1450)

We have received representation from Clearwater Fine Foods seeking additional allocations to maintain supply to this plant. The Hon. Member knows that the enterprise allocations are dispersed each autumn and according to criteria of fairness to ensure that all plants receive adequate supply within the limits of available quotas. That process has been followed in this case.

The company in question has several thousand tonnes of quotas available. In 4VN, for example, there are 4,000 tonnes of inshore groundfish; 4VSW, 7,800.

The offshore enterprise allocations of June 18 left 2,100 tonnes of groundfish for Clearwater and 750 tonnes of groundfish for the 65 to 100-foot category.

In a nutshell, there are ample quotas available to this company. The fact is that the four vessels originally based at

the Highland Fisheries plant have been moved to southwestern Nova Scotia by the company and are catching fish in that area and delivering them to the Port La Tour plant as a matter of corporate policy.

REQUEST THAT MINISTER INTERVENE

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for outlining those facts for Members of the House, the workers, and indeed the community at large. However, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans knows only too well that his Government has assisted Clearwater Fine Foods on a number of proposals to the Government of Canada. It has provided a great deal of funding for the modernization and building of a new fish plant at Highlands in Glace Bay, thereby helping the corporate sector.

Will the Minister not now intervene on behalf of those 310 workers at the fish plant in Glace Bay and order the senior management of Clearwater to come to his office with a proposal which is both sound and realistic, and order them to put that plant into full operation? In view of the fact that the Government of Canada has spent money at that plant and has given money to this multinational corporation, will he not now do that for the workers affected?

Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, of course the Hon. Member is referring to the unfortunate fire that devastated the Glace Bay plant some three years ago, which led to assistance by this Government to reconstruct that plant prior to its acquisition by Clearwater Fine Foods last year.

I would expect that the management of Clearwater Fine Foods, who have received many allocations in other species, particularly in the area of special allocations in shrimp and offshore clams, et cetera, would live up to their obligation to keep that plant open and keep these employees working. I will convey such a representation to the company.

* * *

HOUSING

MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES—USE OF CROWN LANDS IN TORONTO

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. He will know that the major banks in Canada have increased their mortgage rates on five-year mortgages to 11.75 per cent, which will make it even more difficult for people in areas like Toronto to get into the housing market. What steps is the Government taking to control mortgage rates? Second, what steps has the Government taken to free up either unused or under-utilized Crown lands in the city of Toronto for the construction of affordable housing?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for his question. In order to control mortgage rates the Government is making sure that inflation does not get carried away. The inflation rate outside of energy and food has been 4.8 per cent in the last five months. This high rate is a problem. We want to avoid the 22 per cent interest rates we had in 1982. We want to avoid the situation that Canadians faced in 1981 and 1982. We want a moderate monetary policy and that is what we are pursuing.

CN LANDS

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, the Minister will know that an annual income of some $98,475 is required to get a house selling on the market now for about $230,000. He knows that last week the City of Toronto made a proposal to build affordable housing in the downtown market area, and that some of those properties are owned by the federal Government through CN.

Is the Government talking to CN to make sure that those properties are handed over to the City of Toronto at a reasonable price or at no cost at all, in order to build that kind of affordable housing that is being proposed by the City of Toronto?

Mrs. Shirley Martin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, there is probably nowhere in Canada where growth and prosperity are more noticeable than in the city of Toronto. Certainly this has had an effect on the housing market there.

The Minister is well aware of the concerns of the Hon. Member and has already met with the Minister of Housing for the Province of Ontario. They have looked at available options and are evaluating the situation.

* * *

AIRPORTS

PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—LIMOUSINE SERVICE PERMITS

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. It concerns the disastrous and chaotic situation with limousine service at Pearson International Airport in Toronto.

A few days ago the Minister's officials issued 35 new permits to five existing companies without tender and without advertising. The Minister knows that the total street value of these permits is over $4 million.

Why did he issue these 35 new permits without tender, without advertising? Can he explain why individuals were not allowed to tender or bid for these permits? Will he explain to the people of Toronto what the pay-off was?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, that is the same type of question that Hon. Member asks in the House, in which he hints at something without having any proof. Everyone knows that in Toronto presently it is very difficult at Lester B. Pearson Airport. Indeed, on an urgent basis we issued 35 new permits to the existing companies. At the same time, however, I can assure the House that we have already advertised in *The Toronto Sun*, *The Toronto Star* and *The Globe and Mail* 35 new permits that will be tendered next fall.

REQUEST THAT MINISTER REVOKE NEW PERMITS

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, the Minister has made the situation worse at Pearson International. I do not think he realizes that he has given these five companies a windfall of over $4 million.

Will the Minister revoke these 35 permits and issue all permits on a tendering basis? Will he allow for a fair system so that all individuals and companies will be able to bid fairly for these lucrative permits at Pearson International Airport in order to ensure that the travelling public is better served?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, again the Hon. Member is trying to hint at something when he knows that there are some conditions to those 35 new permits. I hope he knows that, otherwise he should not ask the question. Those conditions will guarantee, for example, that a permit cannot be transferred for any kind of reimbursement.

I repeat, in the fall 35 new permits will be issued by tender. It is quite possible that with Terminal 3 we will do the same operation next spring or fall. First we have to give the best service to people in Toronto. That is exactly what we are doing.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NICARAGUA—REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT APPOINT DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Today marks the ninth anniversary of the Sandanista revolution in Nicaragua. For some nine years Canada has not had any diplomatic representation in Nicaragua.

Given the unfortunate deterioration of events in Nicaragua recently between the United States and the Sandanista Government, and given the recommendation of the special committee on the peace process in Central America to establish at least a *chargé d'affaires* if not a full ambassador in Managua, is the Government prepared to act on that recommendation and move toward placing someone in Managua on behalf of Canada?

• (1500)

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Member for his question, and himself and other members of the committee for their work. At this stage I can only report that we are considering the recommendations of the committee of the House that travelled to Central America and I cannot give him today the assurance he seeks today.

REQUEST FOR EARLY DECISION

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this kind of action would be forthcoming very soon. The Government appears to have moved expeditiously to restore relations with Iran. I would hope that in the very near future the Minister would be able to announce that a new relationship has been entered into with Nicaragua.

Given the situation in Nicaragua and the fact that the peace process is in such a fragile state of affairs at this point, making Canadian participation on the ground even more important, could the Minister say when the Government intends to make up its mind? There is an element of urgency to Canadian involvement here.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the report came down a matter of weeks ago. It was welcome. I am considering its recommendations and we will act on some of them as quickly as we can.

I think the Hon. Member would agree that, important as it might be to have an enlarged permanent diplomatic presence there, it is also very important for us to try to do everything we can to ensure there is some new life injected into the peace proposal in that region.

* * *

FISHERIES

GEORGIA STRAIT CHINOOK FISHERY

Mr. Ted Schellenberg (Nanaimo—Alberni): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans is aware that the Georgia Strait Chinook fishery is important to the British Columbia economy. He is also aware of the declining number of Chinook available to fishermen. With the reluctant co-operation of the sports fishing community, he has acted to save those Chinook by implementing a tagging program, spot closures, and size restrictions. Now the Minister has received a recommendation that his Department initiate a policy of non-retention. In other words, fishermen can have all the fish they can't catch. Surely the Minister has no intention of bringing in catch and release regulations on Georgia Strait Chinook?

Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I cannot give the Hon. Member that assurance at this time. As the Hon. Member knows, the

Chinook stocks in the lower Georgia Strait rivers have declined drastically over the past 20 to 25 years to a level of some 4,000 fish returning to these rivers last year as compared to over 30,000 in the mid-1950s. Our scientists tell us that these stocks are threatened with extinction if we do not take strong management initiatives, and we have asked all sectors to absorb a 20 per cent cut in their harvest this year of these important and magnificent Chinook stocks, compared with last year.

We have, therefore, introduced a minimum size limit of 24 inches, so that we already have a non-retention fishery for Chinook smaller than 24 inches. I will be looking carefully at the catch rates and the strength of this stock as we approach the autumn months before making any decision as to whether or not a non-retention fishery might become necessary later in the year.

Mr. Speaker: The final question will be from the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—WATER RESOURCES

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister for International Trade. This morning the Rawson Academy of Aquatic Science, a non-partisan, independent association of scientists and professionals, made a very thorough, comprehensive and scientific case that fresh water is in fact included in the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. It said that the agreement gives the United States substantial rights to our water not given under GATT, and that the dire consequences will only be known in years to come.

Considering the warming of our planet due to the greenhouse effect and the growing shortage of water, and considering the fact that the Government says it is opposed to the export of water, why does the Minister not make this thing absolutely clear by amending the agreement so that there is a provision that fresh water will not be covered by the agreement? Why will he not agree to that?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, there appear to be different opinions on this matter because I can refer the hon. gentleman to a study done by Mr. Frank Stone of the Institute for Research on Public Policy, a well known, respected and independent group. Mr. Stone is the author of "*Canada, the GATT and the International Trade System*". He has had a long career in the Department of External Affairs. He represented Canada at the GATT and represented us in negotiations on the Canada-U.S. Agreement on Great Lakes Water Quality. I will quote what he said:

> The free trade agreement . . . has nothing at all to do with the diversion or inter-basin transfer of water.

Furthermore, he said:

> Water diversions have never been discussed in the GATT and any suggestion that GATT covers water diversions or inter-basin transfers would be hooted down in Geneva by the GATT member countries.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me repeat, large scale water projects are not part of the FTA. There is nothing that forces Canada to sell water or build pipelines or canals to divert water and, as was said earlier in this House, this is the hon. gentleman's red herring.

Mr. Allmand: Make it clear, John. Don't leave it to chance.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BROADCASTING ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications) moved that Bill C-136, an Act respecting broadcasting and to amend certain Acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunication, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be speaking in this debate this afternoon. I say that because what we are doing is moving steadily forward on a process which was begun some three years ago with the establishment of a task force to review the broadcasting system of this country, the Caplan-Sauvageau task force. There were then many weeks and months of detailed study by the parliamentary Standing Committee on Communications and Culture, with the intervention of many individuals and organizations all across the country to bring to fruition a new Broadcasting Act for Canada.

When this broadcasting Bill received first reading just a few weeks ago, I stated at that time that it contained vital measures which would affect for many years what Canadians viewed on their television screens and listened to on their radios.

Broadcasting, without question, is the most pervasive cultural medium in the country. That is why I am convinced that Bill C-136, the new Broadcasting Act, is far more than just a set of business criteria governing an industry. It goes to the very heart of our culture and of our country.

[*Translation*]

I am pleased to have an opportunity to tell my colleagues in the House how important this Bill is. I will be telling them why I think it ought to be passed quickly.

[*English*]

Clause 3 of the Bill is, of course, the key article and is fundamental to understanding the thrust of Bill C-136. It is a statement of principles. It states clearly that radio frequencies are public property and that broadcasting is a public service "essential to the maintenance and enhancement of national identity and cultural sovereignty", irrespective of the method of transmission. The broadcasting system, as stated in Clause 3, should serve to "safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada". These statements, and the redefinitions of broadcasting terms, represent a recasting of the regulatory landscape to reflect the dynamics of modern Canadian society.

• (1510)

The influence of broadcasting is known to all Members. The power of radio and television to inform, to sell, to mold opinions, to create personalities, to provide people from coast to coast with a shared experience is enormous. It is unparalleled.

While this Bill seeks to carry the broadcasting industry into the 21st century, it also recognizes the central role that it plays in the lives of most Canadians. For example, in just one week a typical Canadian listens to between 18 hours and 24 hours of radio and 24 hours of television. It is therefore fundamentally important to our political and our cultural sovereignty that our broadcasting system be an accurate reflection of who we as Canadians are, how we behave and how we view the world.

In addition to these social considerations, there are other external pressures threatening the broadcasting system, pressures endangering the ability of our broadcasters to remain competitive and to explore new ways of contributing to the choices of programming that are available and must be available to all Canadians.

As you know, Sir, the existing Broadcasting Act was passed in 1968—20 years ago. It is based on one technology, the technology of over-the-air broadcasting transmitters. New technologies, ones which do not use this spectrum, are increasingly making obsolete current definitions of what constitutes broadcasting as written into the 1968 Act. New technologies have emerged which are not included or defined in that piece of legislation and are therefore making that Act increasingly obsolete.

Existing technologies, ones which have come into being in more recent years such as cable and satellite dishes, do not fit easily into the 1968 Act. We have had to turn to the courts again and again to determine whether they fall within the jurisdiction of existing broadcasting legislation.

[*Translation*]

The courts confirmed that the 1968 legislation applied in certain cases but not in others. Every time the scope of these definitions gets narrower the Government loses some of its ability to set the socio-cultural aims of broadcasting on behalf of all Canadians.

[*English*]

We face the challenge of drafting legislation that can deal with the technology of today, as well as the technology of tomorrow. Our solution is not to add to existing definitions; it is to allow broadcasting technology to evolve by freeing it of legislation that defines the medium of technology.

The approach of Bill C-136 is to be technology-neutral. Broadcasting is defined by content, not by the way it is received by the audience. The signal is not the key. What the signal carries is the important factor.

This technology-neutral approach means that distribution systems can use the technology of their choice. It also ensures that Bill C-136 will keep its legal foundation in the face of future technological development, something which is very critical if the institutions that govern the broadcasting system are not to have their power eroded.

There are increasing societal pressures which demand attention as well. Since 1968 our society has evolved and has changed in many areas. For instance, there is now the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the changing role of women, Meech Lake, the recognition of distinct French and English-speaking societies, the growing awareness of our multicultural diversity, the recognition of aboriginal claims and rights—all these developments are changing how we approach broadcasting and what is expected of the medium. The pressure for legislation which recognizes this evolving reality is growing upon us every day.

[*Translation*]

The particular context of English and French broadcasting commands our attention as well.

The presence of two official languages is more than a simple constitutional reality, it is a fact throughout our broadcasting networks. Bill C-136 explicitly acknowledges the existence of our two official languages as well as the fact that the economic and cultural reality is not the same for English and French broadcasters, that their requirements may differ.

The Bill stipulates that the programming provided by the CBC should reflect the different needs and circumstances of each official language community, including the particular needs of English and French linguistic minorities.

The CRTC must apply these regulations with flexibility and take into account the different characteristics of English and French broadcasting. For instance the Bill has a clause concerning the establishment of a wide array of English and French broadcasting services throughout the country. With this clause the CRTC will be in a position to require that more French services be made available to francophones outside Quebec, in addition to those provided by Radio-Canada. This clause also shows that the Government is committed to expand services intended for official language minorities.

[*English*]

With the rapid progress in broadcast technology Canadians are demanding an ever greater variety of choice. Our broadcasting system provides a truly remarkable range of radio and television signals. There are literally hundreds of radio signals in the country. Cable television carries dozens of channels. The mix includes private and public stations, both in English and in French, as well as Canadian and foreign programming.

However, in their demands for more and better choice, Canadians are sending a message that is loud and clear. It is: "We want access to increased Canadian choice especially in prime time." That is the message. That was the message that I took to the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture in February of 1987 when it began studying the Caplan-Sauvageau report.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that the Government had just received the report of the task force on broadcasting policy, a report which has been referred to many times in this Chamber and elsewhere. This report was referred to the standing committee for examination and for recommendations. The committee studied it in detail over a period of months—indeed, for one year and a half. I said at the time that I first addressed the committee on this subject that I was convinced that the Canadian broadcasting system is the nervous system of our country. It links us together. I told the standing committee at that time that, more than ever, "broadcasting must be seen as a fundamental part of cultural policy."

• (1520)

It was clear then, and it remains clear today, that any initiative must set out the over-all broadcast framework policy, the broad policy under which we must operate, outlining the objectives of the broadcasting system as a whole, as well as the mandate, structure, and powers of both the CRTC and of the CBC.

As I told the standing committee at that time, our ultimate concern must be with the content of programming that is and must be available to Canadians. We must address both the quantity of Canadian programming and its quality if we are to promote viewing acceptance by the public. If we are to have the audiences that we think are vital to Canadian programming we must be sure of the quality of that programming as well as its quantity.

A nation's fictional repertoire is the life-blood of its culture. We must never underestimate the impact of dramatic television programming for, within it, I would say we find the surest expression of our cultural values, of the way we live, as well as our collective memory.

We do indeed share the life experiences of people in other countries. But, as Canadians, we experience them in our own way. We must ensure that we have the opportunity to share this experience with each other, and to appreciate the heritage we enjoy as Canadians—and we must do it, Mr. Speaker, in prime time.

Bill C-136 promotes this imperative. It will strengthen Canadian programming; it will enrich our culture and our national identity; it will permit us to embrace new technologies; it will provide the choices that Canadians expect and want; and it will strengthen Canadian broadcasting.

I would like to make it very clear that this Bill does not seek to limit choice and does not restrict choices. But to ensure that competitive Canadian programming is a central component of an even greater choice of viewing and listening options, the Canadian choices must be there. This means additional Canadian drama and variety must be seen and must be shown in prime-time English television, and also improvements in the production quality of French-language television.

I want to make it very clear that this legislation does not erect barriers against programming that is not Canadian. Canadians now, for the most part, are able to access programming directly from a variety of sources in the United States. What we are talking about here is the encouragement of the production of more Canadian programming by a broadly based approach involving all the players in the broadcasting system. I want to talk about those various players for a brief time, because so often in the past we have considered the players being solely the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. We must go beyond that.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is vital in this enterprise. Bill C-136 makes clear the central role of the CBC and, in particular, its responsibility for the provision of Canadian programming. The CBC will serve Canadians by providing a distinctly Canadian viewpoint in its programming, including news, variety, drama, and sports.

The Government believes very strongly that Canadians deserve genuinely Canadian popular choice programming which may be different in emphasis from the offerings that private commercial stations give us. We are giving the CBC the financial means of creating programming aimed at the interests of the Canadian audience. We are increasing the CBC's budget by $35 million a year above and beyond its annual increase for inflation. That $35 million is money that is directed to programming. Of that $35 million, $20 million is targeted to help the CBC meet its goal of 95 per cent Canadian content on prime-time English television. The other $15 million is intended to help Radio-Canada increase the production budgets for French language programs. The CBC will remain what it has always been: the principal vehicle for cultural expression in Canada.

We are also strengthening the accountability of the CBC, as recommended by the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture. At the same time, we are guaranteeing the CBC's independence in programming and operations. I want to underline, Mr. Speaker, that the corporation's freedom of expression and its journalistic, artistic, and programming independence is safeguarded for the first time in Bill C-136; it is written into the legislation.

The mandate of the CBC, as contained in this Bill, will mean that the CBC will lead in providing authentically Canadian choices, particularly in popular drama in both official languages. But the programming responsibility is not the CBC's alone. I mentioned the role of all of the players in the broadcasting system, and so I want to make it clear that the responsibility for Canadian programming does not rest solely with the CBC. For the first time private broadcasters have a specified legislated responsibility to contribute as well. The Bill contains a number of new instruments for the regulatory authority so that it will be better equipped to supervise the broadcasting system without excessively intrusive procedures. The new powers that are accorded to the CRTC will make this possible.

It is important to understand that broadcasters do not have the option of not doing, or doing less Canadian programming. That option does not exist for them. They cannot say that they will not do more, or they will do less. That is not an option. We are putting before them the means by which they too as private broadcasters can increase their Canadian content.

This Bill is a new approach. It gives the CRTC the tools to work more closely with private broadcasters so as to increase Canadian programming in vital but under-achieved target areas such as drama. The legislation includes the basis for a performance incentive which encourages individual broadcasters to increase the amount of specifically targeted areas of programming, notably drama, in a way which best responds to their economic capabilities. That is above and beyond the Canadian content that is now expected of them.

We will ask the CRTC to hold hearings on applying the performance incentives and to recommend the best use of the incentives. This innovative new tool will give English language broadcasters in particular an added incentive to invest in quality Canadian programming. It is worth noting that private broadcasters themselves say that quality Canadian programming makes good sense. It distinguishes them from the competition. Canadians have said time and again that they will watch quality Canadian programming. Canadians have shown it. I would say to you that French-speaking Canadians have done so and shown so for decades.

• (1530)

Bill C-136 also provides an Alternative Programming Service to meet needs not fulfilled by existing mass entertainment broadcasters. This service has been discussed in many ways: by the task force, by the parliamentary committee and by advisers to my Department from the industry. This service will provide the kind of programming that does not appear, or only rarely appears, on existing television outlets. A key role of the Alternative Programming Service will be the portrayal of Canada's multicultural nature to Canadians as a whole.

Canada, as you know, does not have a uniform single culture but a diversity of cultures. The Alternative Programming Service mandate will provide all Canadians with a more realistic view of the multicultural realities in all parts of the country, and that is so critically important as the diversity of our country becomes greater and as the strengths and the benefits that that diversity provides become better known. This new service's innovative programming will complement large audience programming, and it will cater to tastes and to interests not provided for by mass producers. The process of establishing the Alternative Programming Service should be completed within two years.

Programs from across the country, regional programs, programs through the multicultural dimension, programs of the performing arts, all these will be part of the new service's specific mandate which is anchored in Bill C-136.

This Bill also recognizes the unique contribution which distribution services are making. While cable is the most common method of distribution, others are emerging. I refer specifically to subscription television, satellite master antenna television, multi-channel, multi-point distribution systems, and satellite direct-to-home, to name but a few of the new distribution systems that now exist.

[*Translation*]

Bill C-136 acknowledges that cable TV has expanded considerably since the Broadcasting Act became law in 1968, reaching into more than 70 per cent of Canadian households and altering the basic concept of broadcasting.

Time has come to define anew the role of cable TV operators. Are they just like ordinary companies, or should they be expected to play a wider role and shoulder heavier responsibilities in the field of broadcasting?

As it happens, cable TV companies are already actively involved in programming, particularly with respect to French broadcasting.

The Bill acknowledges the fact and provides that program producing distributors open access to non-affiliated services.

[*English*]

The CRTC is being given the power to mediate disputes between broadcasters and cable distributors. The distributors involved in programming will still be subject to CRTC approval and control, and they will be required to meet the objectives of the broadcasting policy. That is written into Bill C-136. All distributors, whether involved in programming or not, will be required to continue to give Canadian programming a priority.

I would like to comment briefly as well on the way in which this legislation deals with the questions of fairness and access. The past two decades have been marked by a growing awareness of human rights. Canada has repatriated the Constitution and has entrenched within it a Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The accessibility of broadcast media to all Canadians, the way in which broadcasting reflects Canadians to themselves,

and the fairness with which it handles different points of view, these are all addressed in this Bill.

This legislation also recognizes the needs of Canadians living outside of urban areas, recognizes the needs of aboriginal peoples, and the special needs of Canadians with physical disabilities.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss MacDonald: The Government has already announced a number of initiatives to bring distribution systems to small communities, communities that are more remote, and as well has undertaken to provide a satellite distribution system for the reading service of the blind.

I return to the need to stop the erosion of the institutions to regulate and direct the broadcasting system, because that is what has been happening in recent years.

Bill C-136 therefore does not base its definition of broadcasting in technology, but takes a technology-neutral approach.

The major participants in broadcasting can therefore expand and change with the most effective, the most profitable, technologies that they can utilize. Bill C-136 opens the door. It does not limit technologies in the way in which they can be employed, in delivering broadcasting services across the country.

Because it is not solely rooted in technology, the federal Government's ability to exercise its jurisdiction will again be firmly established and will not be challenged as technologies continue to change.

In summary, let me recapitulate why Bill C-136 is vital for this country. It establishes primacy for Canadian programming. It reflects the linguistic duality and the differences in English and in French broadcasting. It ensures that Canadian culture, Canadian tastes and society are reflected in programming and in operations. It provides all Canadians with access to a wide range of radio and television signals. It is technology-neutral and able to accommodate technological changes. It provides for an efficient and responsive CBC and CRTC.

[*Translation*]

With this Bill the Governement wants to promote our national culture and identity.

[*English*]

I want to say that I am very proud of this Bill. It has come about as the result of the work of a large number of people. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), the Cabinet, the members of the standing committee who worked for so many months, the Caplan-Sauvageau task force and all its members, the many Canadians who have appeared to express their views, individually and collectively, as organizations, have all had a major input into this piece of legislation.

I may say that no piece of legislation will ever satisfy everyone, in all of its details, but I am pleased with the initial response—whether it is from people in the media or organizations or groups across the country—to the way in which we are moving on this Bill. I am sure that it has been a collective effort and one in which I think the House can take a lot of pride. The Bill itself, I believe, will ensure the existence of a vibrant and dynamic Canadian broadcasting industry well into the 21st century. It will as well foster a cultural identity that is distinctively and uniquely Canadian. I am sure that that is what we all are seeking to attain.

• (1540)

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Could I get unanimous consent to ask the Minister a question?

Miss MacDonald: That is fine with me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: As unanimous consent has not been granted, we will resume debate. The Hon. Member for Mount Royal (Mrs. Finestone).

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): I have the sense that the Minister was prepared to answer, Mr. Speaker.

Miss MacDonald: Yes.

Mrs. Finestone: I am quite pleased to rise to speak to this Bill. I acknowledge to the Minister that this has been a *tour de force*. There have been inputs from large sectors of Canadian society to the Bill itself. These people have not as yet had the opportunity to examine the actual Bill which, as I am sure the Minister will agree, was only tabled a couple of weeks ago.

The Minister should receive a medal for the star performance which I accord her for getting this Bill through Cabinet and for getting permission to have it on the docket at this fast rate. In that regard I think we are all quite pleased to see this Bill coming to the point of its natural rotation of every 20 years so we can have a new look at what is happening in this incredibly swiftly evolving and changing telecommunications world in which we live.

That being said, it meets the commitment of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) who during his campaign in August, 1984, undertook to see to a new communications legislation which the Minister is now bringing forward in the summer of 1988. I find the timing rather interesting and I would like to comment on that for a moment.

Mr. Boyer: It is prime-time.

Mrs. Finestone: It is prime-time? I wonder whether it is prime-time, Mr. Speaker. This is the summer which is a time

when people are out relaxing, not paying much attention to the public agenda. It is interesting to note that the public agenda of those matters, which I believe fundamentally touch the character, the nature and the kind of people we are as Canadians, has been addressed during the summer months. We came back here two summers ago for a criminal issue. Last summer we came back because we were being inundated with refugees and we had to address a new immigration Bill.

Mr. Grisé: Thanks to the Senate we are still here.

Mrs. Finestone: We addressed as well at that time the Meech Lake Bill. This summer we are dealing with free trade and now broadcasting.

Mr. Boyer: All this and more.

Mrs. Finestone: If you look at the implication of what Canada is, who composes Canada, which the immigration and refugee Bills do, and if you talk about Meech Lake and the organization of this country, if you look at free trade and its potential impact on the future organization of this land, and then look at the broadcasting Bill, which as I think the Minister mentioned and which I would like to underscore, is one of the most powerful mediums of communication, education, information that impacts on society, you will note that here we are addressing this issue in the middle of the holiday season when there is very little interest about how we share and communicate with one another. I find this a little sad because we are talking about local, national and international future impacts.

This powerful medium, TV, radio and cinema form that part of our lives, and when you think about it, watching television is the number one leisure activity for Canadians. Canadians spend more than 24 hours each week on average in front of a television set. Each year Canadian children watch almost 1,000 hours of television compared to the 800 hours they spend in school. It is little wonder that they have an interesting perspective on what is Canada and how they will perceive things as they grow into adulthood and hopefully become interested in active political life. How will their thinking evolve with the impact of our public media on their lives and thought processes? Ninety-five percent of Canadians are radio listeners, spending 18 days a week on that activity. Two-thirds of Canadians say watching television is their favourite pastime, and more than 50 per cent of Canadians say that broadcasting is still their principal source of news and information.

I suggest that this Bill, which the Minister, with a degree of pride that is well earned, brings forward today, is one that will have a fundamentally important impact on the sovereignty of this country. That is why it is of great concern to me.

The standing committee tried very hard to remain non-partisan and non-politicized, although we had one unfortunate fall out over All-News. That aside, I think in general we have been of one mind with respect to how we should perceive this very important industry. We have all said that there is nothing wrong with having access to the wider world, notwithstanding the fact that there is an inordinate amount of American programming on our television screens. It is also very critical that Canadians have access to programs and movies, entertainment, information and enlightenment which represent our own cultural values. That is what we are missing. There are so many more hours of American news available which I think could have a very serious impact on us.

In order to remain as non-partisan as possible in this undertaking, I would like to put on record what some of the groups who have been looking at this Bill have to say. I am sure the Minister of Communications (Miss MacDonald) will listen and address these issues and concerns in the legislative committee, but which will be addressed to our standing committee sometime, I hope in the very distant future, but anyway—

Miss MacDonald: Don't say that.

Mrs. Finestone: What has been said in *Le Devoir*?

[*Translation*]

. . . in the Saturday July 16, 1988 edition of *Le Devoir*. The author of this article, Mrs. Esther Désilets, is Director General of the Canadian Institute of Adult Education. What happens to the CBC's mandate? That's the question she asks. And she adds:

> The long-awaited Broadcasting Bill is the culmination of an extensive process of reflection and consultation which the Canadian Institute of Adult Education has followed closely.
>
> There is reason to be happy, of course, that the Bill recognizes major achievements such as the leading role of the CBC and the public nature of the broadcasting system as a whole. However, the CIAE considers that the Bill has major faults which must be corrected if the present situation is to improve.

[*English*]

These are the observations where they find some errors or holes in the legislation which they feel need to be addressed.

[*Translation*]

The first is:

> Political Control over the CRTC
>
> The Bill proposes major changes concerning the CRTC. While reaffirming the need to put a single independant public agency in charge of regulating and monitoring the system, it does not increase its powers. It increases rather the powers of the Government and the Minister.
>
> The Bill would enable the Government to issue directions concerning all the CRTC's activities except the granting and renewing of broadcasting licenses. As far as broadcasting licenses are concerned, however, the Government would be able to send back and reverse CRTC decisions. Furthermore, the Government could exempt broadcasters from certain provisions of the Bill.
>
> Under the Free Trade Agreement, the Governor in Council will also have the power to issue directions to the CRTC as to the implementation and interpretation of the clause dealing with copyrights and integral re-broadcasting of American signals.

Finally, upon request from the Government, the CRTC could require that stations broadcast programs which the same Government feels are urgent in nature and of great significance for the Canadian people. We can foresee already the possible risk of frequencies being used for political partisanship.

The legislation does not provide for any real public consultation mechanisms concerning these directions. The policies and regulations developed by the CRTC have always been scrutinized during public hearings. Well, government orders provide only for very limited consultation mechanisms.

While supporting the principale that our elected representatives and the Government are responsible for developing major broadcasting guidelines, we cannot agree with the proposed political control measures on the broadcasting system. This control is much more political than democratic in nature.

Private broadcasters.

It should be recognized, however, that some recommendations in the Bill will reinforce the power of the CRTC over private corporations. Private corporations will have to respect more CRTC's regulations and decisions, as a result of to the explicit power given to the commission to issue licensees with binding orders. The Commission will also be empowered to levy a performance fee for broadcasting certain types of Canadian programs. It is to be hoped that these new measures will prove efficient.

Finally we note that the real monitoring power of the CRTC will not be reinforced by an extension from five to seven years of the licence renewal period. In this area, we would prefer, as suggested by the CPCC, that the CRTC should issue more frequently license renewals of less than five-year duration.

A Canadian Broadcasting Corporation with a different vocation? The vital importance of the CBC is clearly reaffirmed in this Bill. Moreover, this recognition is reinforced by supplementary budgets. That is the most interesting aspect of the new policy.

We wonder however about the proposals which might alter the CBC's vocation. When we compare the clauses in this Bill with those in the 1968 legislation, we realize that such a possibility exists.

According to the current legislation, the CBC should be "a balanced service of information, enlightenment and entertainment for people of different ages, interests and tastes covering the whole range of programming in fair proportion".

According to Clause, 3(1)(*m*) of this Bill, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, as the national broadcaster, should provide radio and television services incorporating a wide range of information and entertainment programming that is predominantly and distinctly Canadian.

What will happen to the CBC's mandate concerning the broadcasting of programs for people of different ages, sexes, cultures and tastes? It is stated further that in the evening, during prime time, CBC will offer Canadian programs which are likely to appeal to the widest audience and that such an effort is necessary to justify the subsidies granted by Parliament and obtain the advertising money it needs.

● (1550)

[*English*]

There is the mass audience appeal as opposed to the "large" appeal that CBC had before.

[*Translation*]

There is ample reference to TV dramas, as if that was the essential part of TV programming. What about news, public affairs, cultural programs? Is the CBC recognized a specific role in those areas?

A reading of the proposals suggests that the only aspect that would set CBC's programming apart from private sector programming would be the quantity of Canadian productions as compared to American productions.

It goes on to say:

In the area of news and programs to satisfy more diversified tastes and smaller audiences, they proposed alternative programming. Although in the legislation there is reference to alternative services in French and in English, in fact one English language service only is in play, the French speaking public having to be content with TV 5 and existing services.

What is the next question?

French language television.

The recognition of the specific nature of French-language TV is a welcome fact. But what is behind that principle? On closer look, the proposals would rather seem to increase the imbalance between services offered in French and in English. Although new English services are proposed, when it comes to French services the only proposal is for improvements to existing ones.

The policy declaration is based on the fact that French-speaking audiences already are getting from Radio-Canada and Radio-Québec a programming that meets its tastes and special interests, and that soon TV 5 will be added to those services, while such needs are not covered on the English side, whence the proposal for an English-language alternative service.

It may not be warranted to multiply French language programming services because of the limited size of the French-speaking market. However, there should be an attempt at assessing the impact on the development of French-speaking culture of the lack of new programming services in such strategic areas as news and culture.

Currently, the specific needs for specialized broadcasts of a major part of the French-speaking population are no more covered than those of the English-speaking public. Radio-Québec, in the evening, increasingly tends to target the larger audience. TV 5's future programming will not either meet the requirements for alternative programmings services proposed in the legislation.

Measures to improve the quality of French-speaking programming will not have such a significant impact as is being implied. Of course, a $15 million budget increase over the next two years is an improvement. But, in view of the current imbalance—in the order of 50 per cent—between French and English-language production budgets, this measure seems to provide for a catching up rather than for real development.

In order to increase Canadian programming, the statement suggests incentive bonuses. These bonuses will have practically no impact on the French programs produced by the private sector . . .

. . . and I can even add on the English programs as well.

The performance incentives will be determined by the number of drama and variety shows produced by private broadcasters. But, since the French private broadcasters already transmit more than five hours of drama shows a week, which is more than the suggested minimum, they will not benefit from this incentive.

Only the additional credits granted to Telefilm Canada for French productions will in fact benefit the French language television community. It's clearly insufficient. Democracy not at stake

And then, she adds:

> This Bill is leaving unresolved some major problems related to the whole issue surrounding the control and the democratic access to the broadcasting system. As far as broadcast time for regional communities, various social groups and women organisations is concerned, the Bill suggests no real measures. It also avoids talking about the concentration of media ownership, offering no solution to the problem relating to the joint onwership of distribution and programming undertakings. Also, no specific recommendations apply to community broadcasting.
>
> This Bill respecting broadcasting, as presented, is unacceptable. Some serious deficiencies will have to be corrected if we are to improve the broadcasting system and allow it to develop in conformity with the relevant social and cultural objectives. The Government has to provide for the creation of a parliamentary committee to study this Bill.

[*English*]

I think that is one of the best summaries of the concerns. I recall raising many of those concerns at the press conference following the deposition of the Bill by the Minister.

• (1600)

Mr. Boyer: What does the Liberal Party think about the Bill?

Mrs. Finestone: I said at the very outset what the Liberal Party thinks about the Bill. I suggest that my hon. colleague not worry; he will hear in parliamentary committee what we think about this Bill. I have already made my point of view known.

The Canadian Conference of the Arts has some concern about cabinet power of direction. Paul Siren, President of the CCA, expressed some unease with regard to the Cabinet's seemingly unlimited power of direction over the CRTC while maintaining the Government's power to set aside or refer decisions back to the commission. He said that either of these measures would have been sufficient safeguards but that both would give the Government undue control over the arm's length regulator.

We in the committee did not necessarily agree with that point of view, but I would advise the Minister that there are important and substantive groups which see problems other than those the committee indicated.

With respect to alternative programming, the Canadian Conference of the Arts was also disappointed with the estimated two-year delay in the setting up of an alternative programming service. Other concerns include the provisions to allow cable operators to become programmers and broadcasters. The lack of consideration for regional production and programming needs is underscored as well as the state of the CBC all-news channel. These are serious concerns which they intend to bring to our attention in the parliamentary committee.

With regard to the CBC, ACTRA said:

> The extra money that will be phased in hardly makes up for the millions the CBC has lost in cut-backs. And while the CBC is expected to fulfil a wide mandate, the money to go forward just isn't there. In short, this part of the announcement doesn't exactly make my socks roll up and down. The CBC's parliamentary appropriation for 1988-89 is $119.6 million less than the appropriation for 1984-85 in constant dollar terms.

With respect to alternative programming, ACTRA said:

> It deserves scrutiny, because unfortunately it may contain some pitfalls. The notion that Canada needs another outlet for Canadian production, particularly of the kind that has no current access to the broadcasting system, is a good one. But, if the mandate of the service is too narrow, and the funding insufficient, it risks becoming a ghettoized service ignored by the viewers. If implemented to genuinely serve Canadians equally, it may prove a success.

With respect to cable companies, ACTRA said:

> Cable should not be in production because there are too many possibilities for unfair corporate concentration. We've maintained that separating programmers from cable distributors provides for a much healthier climate. It's a shame the Government doesn't see it that way.

With respect to the Minister's discussion about the Canadian Charter and equality opportunities for both women and minorities, allow me to bring to the Minister's attention that Media Watch has been following this new Broadcasting Act and is concerned about serious omissions.

The Standing Committee on Communications and Culture supported a number of the Media Watch representations. It was convinced that special employment equity measures were necessary. The standing committee recommended that the Broadcasting Act include provisions designed to increase significantly the number of women and minority groups at all levels within broadcasting until equitable representation is achieved.

In this new Act, the purpose for which operations and therefore employment may be scrutinized is obscured. The Government claims that it is recognizing human rights in provision 3(1)(c)(iii), but it chose not to define in clear terms that operations and programming come under scrutiny for the purpose of determining whether principles of equality are reflected. The CRTC authority to make real change in terms of employment equity is undermined in this new legislation and women are once again faced with legal and administrative battles which they can ill afford. I would suggest that the same holds true for minority groups. I regret that the CRTC was not given a direct and specific mandate to apply employment equity as part of its responsibility.

We have heard from other groups, and I wish to cite a very interesting observation which was brought to our attention this morning as we were involved with the free trade agreement. It comes from the Stratford Festival Company and is signed by nearly 350 employees at all levels including actors, producers, seamstresses, tailors, cutters, et cetera. They are concerned about the free trade agreement and the specific cultural provision in Article 2005 which exemplifies the kind of sell-out of our national sovereignty which they believe to be taking place. They are particularly concerned about the notwithstanding provision of the agreement. The example they use relates

to broadcasting. I hope the Minister will have an adequate answer for this example. They say:

> If a future government were to introduce a broadcasting Bill that specified greater Canadian content—

I know that is what the Minister wants and that is why she has put incentives into the Bill. They continue:

> —U.S. commercial interests could claim loss of revenue (less "Dallas" "Cosby Show" etc. on Canadian TV channels). The U.S. government could assess that loss as $X millions and take "measures of equivalent commercial effect" in, let's say, the Atlantic fisheries. Our Atlantic fishermen would naturally be outraged by the cultural initiative. Canadian would be set against Canadian and of course the new broadcasting Bill would be dropped. U.S. corporate interests would prevail.

They elaborate on this perspective with respect to how measures of equivalent commercial effect can open the door to American corporate intervention and interest. I suggest that these are serious concerns which ought to be addressed.

In terms of aboriginal languages the committee recommended that the new Act recognize the right of Canada's aboriginal peoples to receive service in representative native language where numbers warrant and as public funds become available. We went through a whole presentation on this issue, but in the final analysis the legislation does not assure service in representative native languages. I will save the Minister from all the details of this matter, but I will certainly bring it forward in committee. The Government has failed to act upon the committee's recommendation that the CBC offer services in the aboriginal languages. The National Aboriginal Communications Society has expressed its dismay about the failure of the Government to act on the committee's recommendation.

This legislation does not set limits on foreign broadcasting services in Canada. Recommendation No. 58 was that the Act should be drafted to define the essential role of distribution undertakings, those being cable, as that of distributing Canadian radio and television services in English and in French, both public and private, with first priority given to public sector Canadian services, followed by private Canadian services with the exception of the "three plus one" services already carried.

• (1610)

The Bill should make provision for the carriage of foreign radio and television services only when the programming they provide is complementary to that available from licensed Canadian broadcasters and network operators. The Bill should also provide for priority to be given to the carriage of services in French in distribution undertakings that serve primarily Francophone subscribers.

I see nothing in the Bill that will enforce the provisions found in Recommendation No. 58. In fact, there is great disappointment about tiering and the amount of carriage of non-Canadian services that will be allowed on extended basic cable according to the Government's Bill. The Minister will recall that our standing committee recommended limits on those foreign broadcasting services in Canada. The Government claimed that this would unduly restrict the access of Canadians to a range of international broadcasting services and that its purpose was simply to encourage more high quality Canadian shows.

I suggest *The Toronto Star* sums up that response in a very significant and succinct way when it said: "Do statements like that mean Ottawa has declawed its broadcast policies in the same way it weakened its film distribution Bill to overcome American objections?" Did Jack Valenti write the script for this performance as well?

Let us consider vertical integration of distribution undertakings. The committee stated the following in Recommendation No. 51:

> The Act should provide that no distribution undertaking may have an ownership interest in, or be in common ownership with, a pay television, specialty or any other network programming service distributed on such undertaking on the basis of a contractual relationship between the licensed network and the distribution undertaking, or where the consent of the network or the distribution undertaking is required for carriage.

There was very serious and long debate about this area and how it should be addressed. The Government decided on inaction on vertical integration. It chose not to preclude distribution undertakings from participating in programming and from participating as broadcasters. The Minister has rejected our recommendation, our recommendation in the committee's sixth report, in its policy report, and the recommendation in the Caplan-Sauvageau report that they not be allowed to be programmers and vice versa. There is an inherent conflict of interest. I hope the Minister will be open minded in addressing this issue in the committee.

I have had much comment on the legislation that weakens the CBC's regional programming role and lacks definition of the community sector. We have made it quite clear that the broadcasting industry should address the private, the public and the community sector. I know the Minister responds by saying it is covered under local broadcasting, but it is not defined who is responsible or how the community sector will be financed and by whom.

Our Recommendations Nos. 22 and 23 suggest that the Canadian broadcasting system should play an active role in stimulating a Canadian consciousness and should serve the special needs of each geographic region in both official language groups by contributing actively to the exchange of information and expression among the regions and between French and English speaking Canadians. The system should acquaint all Canadians with the traditions, values, practices, and aspirations of each region of Canada. I have said that there should be a footprint in both French and English right across this land as part of the fundamental characteristics of this land.

Recommendation No. 23 was that the Canadian broadcasting system should encourage the development of Canadian expression, providing a wide range of programming that

reflects Canadian attitudes, opinions, ideas, values, and artistic creativity; displaying Canadian talent in entertainment programming; and offering information and analysis concerning Canada and other countries from a Canadian point of view.

I suggest to the Minister that by changing the mandate and description of the responsibility of the CBC that particular responsibility has essentially been emasculated. The legislation states: "It is hereby declared as the broadcasting policy for Canada that the programming provided by the Canadian broadcasting system should be varied and comprehensive, providing a balance of information, enlightenment and entertainment". The Government has removed "enlightenment" from the CBC's mandate, which is a serious responsibility. The Bill states that the system should reflect the regions rather than that each region should have a role.

As a result of the Government's cuts, CBC's service to the regions has been reduced by 28 per cent. Even the increase of $35 million a year to the CBC will do little to those Tory cuts.

Bill C-136 has weakened the CBC's regional programming role even more. The 1968 Act required the CBC to serve the special needs of geographic regions. Now the Conservatives only want the CBC to reflect Canada and its regions to national and regional audiences. That is a significant difference in responsibility and operation.

Other groups who have spoken to me are very concerned about the policy that fails to ensure a distinction between a made-in-Canada program and Canadian programs made in Canada. There is a very significant difference. The program *Night Heat* is an example. It is part of a move toward a North American broadcasting system about which we must be very careful as we analyze the impact of this Bill.

The requirement that individual broadcasters provide programming that is predominantly Canadian in character is proposed to be changed. As a result, the CRTC would be free to reduce its requirement that broadcasters maintain 50 per cent Canadian content and still be consistent with the new Bill's intent. The CBC description is reduced to distinctive. These descriptions are of fundamental importance. We see the Bill as paving the way for the Canadian broadcasting system to become more Americanized than we had anticipated.

The CBC's mandate has been altered by removing the requirement that its programming contain a balance of information, entertainment and enlightenment. We are left only with information and entertainment. While programs like *Ideas*, *Quirks & Quarks* and *Arts National* on radio and *Man Alive* and *The Nature of Things* on television may not attract the large commercial mass audience needed for high ratings and the maximum advertising dollars, it is the kind of programming that has made CBC so unique and highly respected as a broadcaster. The alternative television service is ill-defined.

There are many positive aspects of this Bill. It addresses some areas that needed attention. It was an excellent move to make this Bill technology neutral.

However, there are also issues which makes one wonder about the juxtaposition of the free trade legislation with the broadcasting legislation. I suggest that those considerations will be addressed with great precision under the lens of a microscope.

[*Translation*]

. . . to study it through a microscope in order to make sure that the goal the Minister is aiming for is reached, as well as the goal our Committee is aiming for, and the goal of each and every group we have heard, and which the Caplan-Sauvageau Committee has heard, which is to increase the Canadian content of television programs throughout the day so that our children will be able in the future to learn who they are and why they are who they are.

• (1620)

[*English*]

With that observation, I look forward to an open-minded approach at the committee hearings that will take into consideration the observations I read today. These are not my observations but the observations of people who looked at this Bill, people who were part and parcel of the input into this Bill and who are generally happy with the Bill, with the exceptions I have brought to the Minister's attention over the course of the last 37 minutes.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, as communications and culture critic for the New Democratic Party, I am very pleased to respond to Bill C-136, to the Minister's speech, and to the speech of my colleague, the Member from the Liberal Party. I think the essential problem with Canadian broadcasting is that the public sector is underfunded and the private sector is not doing its job. I can summarize my speech by that line. I think the rest is detail, although important.

Let me say it again. The public sector under this Government is underfunded. That includes the CBC. The private sector, that is all private radio and television stations especially the television stations, is not doing its job. It is not producing quality Canadian programs. The question is: Will this Bill change the situation? I am afraid that the answer is no, it will not change the situation, all rhetoric aside.

As the Minister has said correctly, this Bill is the first major change to the Broadcasting Act since 1968. The necessity for this change is beyond question and the Minister has also said that. First, for technological reasons there needs to be a change. The evolution of distribution and production technology since 1968 has been truly extraordinary. Just as important, however, a new Act and new policy have been made essential by what might be called the crisis in Canadian broadcasting. That crisis has been the subject of numerous commissioned

reports. If one stacks them up, they would go from the floor to the ceiling. Two of the reports I hold in my hand, the Caplan-Sauvageau report and the report of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture, are two examples. They outlined the contemporary crisis in Canadian broadcasting, and it is not just because of new technology. The Minister mentioned the satellites and cable that we did not have in 1968. It is a crisis in watching, if you like. I would like to give some figures from the Caplan-Sauvageau report.

[*Translation*]

... page 745. Of the 52,000 hours of English-language television programming provided annually to average Canadians, only 70 hours are Canadian drama, including comedies, films, mini-series, etc. Of the 27,000 hours of French-language television programming available to the average francophone viewer, only 630 are Canadian drama. It means that 98 per cent of all English-language drama programs are of foreign origin. For French-language television, the proportion is 90 per cent, Mr. Speaker; only 28 per cent of all programs offered on English-language television are Canadian. Domestically produced programs do not even account for one third of the time Canadians spend watching English-language television.

Francophone teen-agers spend half their television viewing time watching foreign programs. For anglophone teen-agers, the figure is 80 per cent.

[*English*]

Eighty per cent of our Anglophone young people spend their hours in front of television watching foreign programs in English and the majority of the time passed by Francophone young people is also spent watching foreign programming. The crisis of Canadian television is not isolated, and I want to quote from the study by the Caplan-Sauvageau task force:

> The reasons for these problems are clear: the public sector, which must be the chief purveyor of quality Canadian programming is inadequately scaled and funded; the private sector which should complement the public sector at least to the extent of contributing to the fulfilment of the social objective of the Broadcasting Act is not contributing enough.

I say also that this crisis, which is documented by the statistics and by the Caplan-Sauvageau report, is not isolated. Canadian television is not isolated in the difficulties we face in developing distinctively Canadian cultural industries. I think the Minister knows this. She is a Canadian nationalist, I believe. She must know that Canadian films represent only 3 per cent of screen time in Canada. Canadian films only take up 3 per cent of our screen time.

Three per cent of film profits stay in Canada. Ninety-seven per cent of profits go outside of Canada. Three per cent of the new video cassette sales are Canadian made. Ninety-seven per cent are foreign made. Our own publishers own only 30 per cent of the Canadian market. Seventy per cent is foreign owned. Seventy-seven per cent of the magazines sold in this country are foreign magazines. Eight-five per cent of the records and tapes sold in this country are foreign. Rick Salutin pointed out: "No other supposedly independent country mirrors this situation". To be a really independent country, it seems to me that we must have as far as it is possible, and in the sense that we live in a global village, an independent Canadian culture. Frank W. Peers, writing in *A Canadian Forum Supplement* in March 1988, said:

> —one of the tests of nationhood is that more communications take place within a country than between that country and another. Are Canadians governments prepared to recognize the importance of internal communications if the political structure is to be sustained?

I agree that he makes a good point. Doug Fisher, writing in the *Toronto Sun*—another level of journalism; going from the left to the right here—on June 27, said:

> How do you see that the viewers and listeners have their profusion of choice, even as technology widens it, while ensuring enough of the listening and viewing is Canadian to keep our identities and distinctions?

I think that is a good point and I will come back to it. Of course, a wider number of positive things is happening in Canada's cultural industry—and I do not want to sound too negative—in particular with respect to its broadcasting system, with such films as *My American Cousin*, *Un Zoo La Nuit* and television programs such as *The Kids of Degrassi Junior High*. I said before that that is not a description of an evening cabinet meeting.

One sees what Canadian talent can produce. We have lots of talent in Canada. In animation and documentary work, Radio Canada, the CBC, and the National Film Board have had remarkable achievements. One need only draw attention to the work of Frédéric Back, whose film *L'homme qui plantait des arbre* won an Oscar this year, to see the kind of programs Canadians can produce when given the opportunity. However, it is a little tragic that in the days following Mr. Back's triumph at the Oscars it was revealed that Radio Canada had been forced to dismantle its animation department because of the Government's fierce assault on the budget of French language broadcasting in this country.

Miss MacDonald: What nonsense. He is going to a new international film board.

Mr. Waddell: I should mention the extraordinary success of CBC Radio both in English and French. In spite of being forced to run on a shoe-string it is gaining audiences yearly from the top 40 competitors.

• (1630)

This morning I listened to the Peter Gzowski program. He did a great interview of the Hon. Member for New Westminster—Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett).

Miss MacDonald: Do you stay in bed that long?

Mr. Waddell: The Minister asks if I stay in bed that long. This morning I did just to listen to CBC radio and Peter Gzowski.

What is clear at this time is that Canada and its cultural industries need visionary and aggressive policies of expansion.

It is a particular shame that due to the Mulroney-Reagan trade deal our ability to engage in such policies will be severely curtailed.

I want to come back to the trade deal because one has to see Bill C-136 in the context of the world around it. Part of the big world around it is the trade deal.

Before leaving this aspect of Canadian culture I want to say that I think we English Canadians do not know how vulnerable we are. I think we cannot wait 20 years for another Broadcasting Act. That is why this Act is so important. In my lifetime we used to have debates, when I was a student, about whether there was a Canadian culture. We meant by that an English Canadian culture. We always felt that there was a French Canadian culture.

There is an English Canadian culture. We have accepted that. We understand it. We know what it is. I do not think that young people today have that debate. There is an English Canadian culture and a French Canadian culture and, above that, a Canadian culture with its multicultural aspects and its native heritage. We know that. The question is: Will we be able to keep that in light of the onslaught of the American empire and its incredible cultural penetration of the Canadian market?

I was told by someone in the Government who is a Francophone, and I will not mention his name, someone who had been in Cabinet: "You Anglophones do not realize that you may lose your whole culture if you do not start now trying to protect it as we in Quebec in the 1960s took measures to protect our culture".

Having outlined the present crisis we face in Canadian broadcasting, I would like to assess what the Government has done over its entire mandate to help or to hinder Canadian broadcasting. I suggest that one cannot look at this new broadcasting policy and at Bill C-136 without putting it into the context of the Government's performance over its mandate.

We have seen the Government over the past four years institute a systematic attack led by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) on the public broadcasting system in Canada. One need only cite the example of the all-news network decision. In that case the CRTC, the federal regulator, awarded the licence to put together an all-news network to the CBC. The CBC had a bid that was vastly superior to its competitor. It was also cheaper to Canadian subscribers.

The Government and the Minister of Communications (Miss MacDonald) intervened to sabotage the CBC's bid. What is the result of the Government's policy? The result of the Government's policy—

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member has made an accusation that he cannot in fact back up in the House. The licence awarded by the CRTC to the CBC for an all-news station comes into effect on September 1, 1988. The Department of Justice has stated that the appeal period is the 60 days following that. Therefore only then can appeals to the Cabinet be considered.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That sounds a bit like debate.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that right now we do not have an all-news network. The all-news network in Canada is the CNN, Ted Turner's network. We have an American all-news network as a result of the Government's policy in delaying this matter. The real story of the Government's assault on the CBC is found in the vicious budget cuts we have seen over the past four years. I would add that this process started with a previous Liberal Government and has continued. I wish to give Hon. Members the figures.

In 1984-85, the CBC's budget was $905 million. In 1985-86, it was $826 million. In 1986-87, it was $806 million. In 1987-88, it was $789 million. In 1988-89, it will be $775 million.

With respect to this Bill the Minister talked proudly about the new money for the CBC given to it to help it reach its commendable aim of having 95 per cent Canadian content. In fact, the Minister is giving $20 million to the English service and $15 million to the French service. That is great, but that hardly even begins to correct the damage to public broadcasting the Government has done over the past four years. We cannot, as the Minister apparently believes, continue to expect the CBC to produce magic when it is not given the means to fulfil either its present mandate or the mandate that is outlined in the legislation we are discussing today.

What has been the result of the Government's broadcast policy? We have seen the cut-backs in the CBC budget. There has been *de facto* privatization of the CBC which is consistently being forced to find new money on its own, mostly through commercials, to make up for its shortfalls. Over the past four years the evolution of CBC generated revenue has been as follows. I will give Hon. Members the figures. In 1984-85, the commercial revenue for the CBC was $232 million. In 1985-86, it was $232 million. In 1986-87, it was $251 million. In 1987-88, it was $251 million. In 1988-89, it will be $266 million.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the effects of this Government policy have been especially hard on the CBC's French services.

[*English*]

We have seen a pattern. It is: cut the CBC budget and increase commercial revenues for the CBC, force it into becoming more like a private station. The way one makes money, as private broadcasters know, is to bring in all the American cop shows and put them on prime time. That is how cash is generated. That has been the change that this Government is forcing on the CBC.

The Minister said in her speech, and I give her credit for it, that the CBC is the nervous system of our country. When we look not at the Minister's rhetoric but rather examine the

substance of it, we find that it really does not follow this Bill, the letter or the spirit of either the standing committee's report or the Caplan-Sauvageau report. It was not a New Democrat but rather a Conservative, the chairman of the standing committee on broadcasting, who said that 250 million new dollars annually were needed.

The Minister, in relative terms, is offering crumbs to the CBC. Where, at the very least, is the money that was lost by the CBC as a result of the sledge-hammer cuts of the Minister and her predecessor? When it comes to rhetoric the Minister is fine. When it comes to getting the beef, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) has not produced it. It is a sham. That is not just my view, Mr. Speaker. I will give Hon. Members some quotes from people who have looked at this matter. The President of ACTRA, Dale Goldhawk, said on June 24, 1988:

> And while the CBC is expected to fulfil a wide mandate, the money to go forward just isn't there. In short, this part of the announcement doesn't exactly make my socks roll up and down.

The Ottawa Citizen stated:

> But MacDonald's pledge to spend $250 million over four years to enhance the Canadian broadcasting system wouldn't even restore funding to the level it was at when the Tories took power four years ago.
>
> And the promised spending is only a fraction of the $130 million to $250 million a year that the all-party communications committee said two weeks ago was necessary to improve the broadcasting system.
>
> MacDonald has obviously won some concessions from a cabinet with a blinding anti-CBC bias. But it didn't buy the basic conclusion of the Caplan-Sauvageau task force . . . the CBC is the heart of Canadian broadcasting and it is seriously underfunded.

Jamie Portman stated on June 23 in an article in *The Spectator* of Hamilton:

> The government has ignored a recent call from an all-party Commons committee that it show its commitment to better Canadian programming by increasing its support of broadcasting with up to $250 million in fresh funding annually . . . in real dollar terms, the CBC's budget has shrunk by more than $150 million since the Conservatives came to power.

Mr. Portman is a senior Southam reporter in arts and culture.

● (1640)

Those are my major criticisms with respect to the CBC in this Bill. I have some other matters that I would like to raise about the CBC that should be considered in the legislative committee. We were pleased to find in the Bill, and the Minister acknowledged it, that: "The CBC is the principal vehicle for cultural expression in Canada". We were also pleased that some of the recommendations of the standing committee with respect to the distinctiveness of the French language service and the separation of the president and chairman's office have been addressed.

However, I have the following question for the Minister. As I read the Bill, Clause 91 seems to fire the President of CBC, and no doubt that will be clarified in committee. Clause 91 states:

> Every person holding office as a director of the Corporation, other than the President, immediately preceding the coming into force of section 35 shall continue in office—

Goodbye, Mr. Juneau, after that. Perhaps in committee we can examine the difference between the president and how the president is now to be elected by the Board of Directors.

I have some concern, as does my colleague from the Liberal Party, about the word "enlightenment" which has been dropped with reference to the definition section in the Bill. The CBC is expected to become simply a mass audience network with the abandonment of more specialized programming. At the same time, in the Bill the Minister is ignoring the crisis of regional programming in the CBC. On the first point, I would say to the Minister that we need to have a CBC that is capable of having an appeal to a mass audience, while at the same time is able to address more minoritarian interests. To take off the CBC live drama, music, and documentaries, and perhaps programs such as *Man Alive*, the Minister seems to be making commercial factors the litmus test of what should and should not be on the network.

The real abandonment comes in terms of regional programming. I say to the Minister that we take this very seriously. The standing committee has detailed the problems of regional programming in its report. The CBC has been forced to cut 28 per cent of the resources for regional programming in order to maintain networking programming in recent years. I come from Vancouver and I see what that means to the local CBC, to the actors, the producers, the writers, and the directors. They get laid off.

This Bill reduces the CBC's mandate to meet the distinct needs of the various geographical regions of the country. I do not understand why the Government wants to do this. What we have here is a centralizing of the CBC. If all CBC dramatic programming is to come from Toronto in English and Montreal in French, then this can hardly be called Canadian content totally. The Minister has forgotten that Vancouver, Calgary, Québec City, Halifax, and Chicoutimi have to be involved in this process in order to have a truly and uniquely Canadian CBC.

The role of enlightenment as well as regional multicultural programming falls under the rubric of the new alternative programming network. However, the Minister has not yet secured the funds for this network. We appreciate that she did not get it turned down, but she put it on hold. We still do not have it. Thus we will have to wait for a few more years of study and delay, and the Government has apparently ruled out a CBC role and left it to the CRTC to decide on the structure. This service does not exist and will not exist until some time in the next decade, yet there is a pressing need for the type of programs that I talked about.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grisé: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council, on a point of order.

Mr. Grisé: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to interrupt . . .

[*English*]

I want to inform the House of the proceedings for the rest of the day.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that motion M-163 stands under Private Members' Business in the name of the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields), but that the Member will not be present and that his motion will be postponed or put at the end of the list of Private Members' Business.

[*English*]

You will find unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that at five o'clock the House will move to Government Orders with Bill C-139. This Bill will be debated from five o'clock until nine o'clock, at which time you will call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gauthier: Motion No. 163 was to be moved by the Hon. Member for Athabasca. Normally it would have been debated at five o'clock. If I understand the rules a Member may give notice prior to that that he is not ready to proceed. I understand that the Table Officers received no such notice that the Member was ready to proceed today even though the motion was to be scheduled.

If I understood the Parliamentary Secretary, he wants us to agree to drop this to the bottom of the list. Indeed, what should happen is that the motion itself should be completely dropped from the list. If I understand the rules correctly, since the motion has been called and there is nobody to move it, it should be withdrawn completely from the list of motions and Bills to be proposed to the House by private Members.

If the Parliamentary Secretary is asking for concurrence in his proposal that the motion be dropped to the end of the list, then this is a precedent that is being created. I do not disagree with that, but I want to ensure that we do not do this every time. Members cannot put motions or Bills on the Order Paper, not come into the House, and prejudice other private Members who may have motions or Bills about which they feel strongly and would like to move. We would then be held hostage by somebody who at the last moment does not show up.

There is a stick here which should be applied once in a while to remind Members that they cannot have it both ways. Members have to be present when their motion or Bill is called, otherwise it will be dropped.

Out of respect for the Member, and the fact that the question was put in such a courteous and reasonable fashion, I agree that although we will co-operate today, no precedent has been set.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grisé: Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) for his comments and clarifications on the situation before us. I accept his comments.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Continuing debate with the Hon. Member for Vancouver—Kingsway.

Mr. Waddell: Perhaps the House may allow me a few minutes after five o'clock. I was going to finish by five, but if the House will give me a few minutes to wind up I will not abuse it.

I stated that the essential problem with Canadian broadcasting was that the public sector was underfunded. I outlined that in figures and in debate. The second problem was that the private sector was not doing its job. This is probably the weakest part of the Minister's Bill, if I might say so.

In the Bill the Minister proposes to pressure the private network to produce more Canadian programming. This will have, at most, a very modest effect. Private broadcasters are always talking about producing quality Canadian programming, but they show very little interest in providing it. I want to quote from an article in *The Vancouver Sun* of June 25, 1988. In the article Douglas Sagi quotes Mr. Barry Duggan, Vice-President of CKVU, who stated:

> I question whether Canadians want more Canadian programming. But I agree they certainly want better Canadian programming.

This is a standard line. Ray Peters, President of western BCTV, also questioned whether Canadians want more Canadian programs. He stated:

> I don't think there should be more Canadian programming. I think there should be better Canadian programming and that's why I like the idea of incentives.

That basically summarizes the position of the private sector. The question is: What about the whole idea of this policy thrust? I would like the Minister to pay special attention to this. Robert Fulford, a very distinguished Canadian and writer, has put his finger on it. Mr. Fulford made the point by stating:

> —the ancient bureaucratic axiom that an idea should never be allowed to die just because it doesn't work. In this case the idea is that private broadcasters, licensed by a federal regulator to use the public's airwaves, will spend a substantial part of their revenue on original production.

Mr. Fulford basically said that we were flogging a dead horse here. He further stated:

> —the parliamentary committee on communications and culture delivered one more rebuke to the broadcasters. "Private television," the committee's report said, "has been making an insufficient contribution to achieving the goals of the Broadcasting Act."
>
> Every royal commission and task force has said the same thing, and each of them—like the parliamentary committee—has then expressed the pious hope that private broadcasters would finally deliver what they promised when they were licensed. Year after year, the broadcasters have declined to do so—

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, what the rate of return is for private broadcasters in this country, as set out by the broadcasting committee and not denied by private broadcasters? It averages 50 per cent a year on investment. They are enjoying unprecedented riches, but almost none of this money is going to writers, actors, and film makers. In my view, this Bill is not going to change that.

• (1650)

Private networks have become transmission belts to bring American programs to Canadian viewers with Canadian commercials inserted. The regulators, the CRTC, have not been able to do anything about it over the years. In fact they have become like other regulators an essential part of the business that they are supposed to control.

What is the Government doing to change this matter? It seems that the Government has watered down the requirement in the current Act that private broadcasters be predominantly Canadian—and it has not worked anyway—and has brought in a form of performance incentives.

This is the question I want to put to the Minister, and I was not given unanimous consent to put it. How do these performance incentives work? If you look at it in the face of the Bill, we have fees collected by the Treasury Board if these private networks do not perform with more Canadian content, which they have never done in the past in prime time. This is going to be done in secret. This is a recipe for slush funds, for political interference and for trouble. This is one of the worst parts of the Bill. It is supposedly to attack the worst offender, that is, the private networks especially on television that are using the service just to run American cop shows in Canada, to make a lot of money, and not to put enough of it back into quality Canadian programming. There is the villain.

What are they doing about it? In this Bill the Government is bringing in a very shoddy scheme which is flawed with difficulties in terms of the performance initiatives. I think that we have to look at that issue very deeply in committee.

I want to raise another point and I think the Minister would be interested in it. I want to cover the Bill's reaction to one of the recommendations of the committee with respect to women in minority groups. I will read the recommendation, and I quote:

> The programming carried by the system should provide a balanced representation of Canadian society, reflecting its multicultural and bilingual realities, its aboriginal peoples and the composition of its population with respect to sex, age, race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, and mental or physical handicaps.

What does the Bill say in Part I, Section 3? It says the following:

> 3(1)(a)(iii) strive, through its operations and programming, to reflect the circumstances and aspirations of Canadian men and women, including the linguistic duality and multicultural nature of Canadian society and the special place of aboriginal peoples within that society,

That is not good enough. What the Government said in its reply to the committee about why it could not put in a tough section as the committee recommended was that the goals of commercial expression were to outweigh the goals of government policy toward minority groups and women.

We will still see on television the Italian who is portrayed as greasy, the Newfoundlander who is portrayed as stupid, women who are portrayed as not being important. That kind of continuation of these things will remain on Canadian TV without a tough section. Considering the Minister's record in this matter, she should look at it very carefully.

I see the Minister has arrived, perhaps she did not hear that I was attacking her for the fact that women were very critical of this aspect of the Bill and that that aspect needed strengthening so that the portrayal of women can be different on Canadian television.

With respect to aboriginal communities, I have heard in recent weeks that the Minister's somewhat limited commitment to satellite broadcasting in the North is somewhat less than originally thought. We will be pressing the Government on these proposals. I put it on guard with respect to any weakening of this proposal.

I would like to particularly underline the work of Rosemary Kuptana who is with Television Northern Canada in her proposal. I was co-counsel of the Berger inquiry into the Mackenzie Valley pipeline. In 1974 the CBC, through the vision of the late Andrew Cowan, through the hard work of Whit Fraser, a CBC reporter, and other native reporters, was able to broadcast the hearings in seven languages. That was 1974. We broadcast in English, French, in Dogrib, Slavey, Loucheux, and East and West Arctic Eskimo. That was done. It is amazing what can be done with aboriginal broadcasting in this country. It is amazing what can be done in terms of Canadians from different parts of the country talking to each other. It does not have to be cop shows from L.A. as the basis for Canadian programming.

I want to refer to the trade deal before I close, and why the two matters are so intertwined. Basically the trade deal says that it does not change the *status quo*. Fine. Then look at the *status quo*. Three per cent of our film distribution and 80 per cent of our publishing are foreign controlled. We can on down the line. I gave the figures at the beginning of my speech.

What happens if the Minister really wants to change that to enact a nationalistic Canadian policy so that we finally have control of our own airwaves and our own culture? What happens if we want a real progressive policy? Then the other part of the trade deal comes in, the Americans could take equivalent commercial measures, not just in culture but in other aspects like forestry, mining, and so on.

Assume for the moment that you are the Minister of Culture, Mr. Speaker, and that you enact a very progressive policy in which Canadianization is very important and of prime concern. The Americans start retaliating. What do they

do? They put tariffs on B.C. lumber or B.C. fish. Then the workers who are out of work come to you and say: "You had better remove that progressive cultural policy".

Do you see how it works, Mr. Speaker? That is the insidious part of the trade deal. The fact is that the Mulroney-Reagan trade deal will mean that there cannot be any Canadian nationalistic cultural policy. There can only be this tinkering that we see in the present Bill, which is fundamentally changing the rules of the game. That is why the people from the Stratford theatre who recently signed a petition of protest, the actors and actresses, know in their hearts that the Mulroney-Reagan trade deal stops the future Canadian Government from really enacting progressive policies with respect to Canadian culture.

I want to end there, because the Bill will go into committee. Marshall McLuhan once said that we lived in a rear-view mirror society. It was like looking in the rear-view mirror in your car, which takes you back to your past. Even though we live in the present we think in the past. Artists, he said, think in the present. They do not live in a rear-view society. We are looking back, it seems to me, in this Bill. We are not looking ahead. The new world means fibreoptics, codable signals on television, and addressable receivers. Nothing has been dealt with in the Bill with respect to that. This is a backward looking Bill, not a forward looking Bill. It is a Bill born in haste, because of the attitude of the Conservatives on pornography, their vicious cut-backs in the CBC, and their general attitude to Canadian cultural agencies and patronage appointments. The Government had to do something, and that is why we are debating this Bill today.

I want to say to the Minister that I am not making those criticisms against her personally. I hold her in the highest of regard. I am sad that she is shackled with such a right wing bunch of Philistines as are in this Government. We have built a unique broadcasting system in Canada. It is unique in that it is ours. It is both public and private. It goes back to many commissions and reports. In the future this new technology will help us. We will have to zero in on choices for Canadians. We do not want to force Canadians to watch Canadian programs. That will not work.

• (1700)

Miss MacDonald: That is exactly what you said earlier.

Mr. Waddell: What we in the NDP offer, which the Government is not offering—and the Liberals have no policy on anything so they are not offering it—is a chance for Canadians to watch quality Canadian programs and for Canadian artists, writers, performers, dancers, and musicians to have those jobs and produce that programming, not only for Canada but for the whole world. To do that there has to be adequate funding for the CBC, including perhaps what Robert Fowler said years ago in his royal commission. He said that we had to give the CBC a long-term plan and assured funding removed from political influence.

First, we have to fund the CBC adequately and make it the main vehicle of public broadcasting. Second, we have to require private broadcasters to do their fair share. I have my doubts whether the system proposed in this Bill will work.

Miss MacDonald: All you have to do is vote against it.

Mr. Waddell: We cannot wait another 20 years. It is ironic that this debate comes on a Tuesday afternoon in the middle of the summer with a few Members in the House. The Minister is here listening to the debate, I acknowledge that. It is almost like the Bill has gone through as just another Bill. Next to the trade deal it is maybe the most important legislation that we deal with. Let us think of where Canadians spend their time and get their knowledge, Mr. Speaker. They get it through modern communications and from watching TV. That is from where we now pick most of our news, our drama, and public affairs. That is what people do in the modern world. That is why this Bill goes to the whole heart of the future of Canada. That is why this Bill is flawed. It still has not solved the essential problem, and that is an underfunded public sector and a private sector that is not doing its job. That has to be changed or Canadian cultural sovereignty will not survive.

Miss MacDonald: Will the NDP vote against it?

Mr. Waddell: You heard me.

Miss MacDonald: Great.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understood that the debate was now finished and there would be further debate later on. There was not to be just three speakers on the Bill. This was just to start the Bill.

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Waddell: That is not the agreement that I gave. We have more speakers. The Hon. Member from Saskatchewan wishes to make comments on the Bill.

Mr. Grisé: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Vancouver—Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) is right. It was agreed by the three House Leaders that we would have the first three spokespersons on the Bill and then we would call it five o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the Hon. Member for Yorkton—Melville satisfied with that?

Mr. Nystrom: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock, we will now proceed to Private Members' Business.

National All-News Channel

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—MOTIONS

[*English*]

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

NATIONAL ALL-NEWS CHANNEL

On the Order: Private Members' Business:

December 11, 1987—Mr. Shields—That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should set aside the decision by the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) to award the national all-news channel to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In accordance with Standing Order 39, notice was published of the debate scheduled to take place today on the motion standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields). Since the Member is not present to move his motion at this time the motion would, by unanimous consent, be put to the bottom of the order of precedence. Is there unanimous consent to do that?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: As the Parliamentary Secretary indicated, debate will resume on Government Orders from now until nine o'clock tonight, and the House will rise at nine o'clock by unanimous consent.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate on Bill C-139.

• (1710)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

INCOME TAX ACT AND RELATED ACTS

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Wilson that Bill C-139, an Act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, 1977 and certain related Acts, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs, and on the amendment of Mr. Garneau (p. 17724).

Mr. Pierre H. Vincent (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak on second reading of Bill C-139, a Bill of vital importance to all Canadians and to the economy of this country. As you know, Bill C-139 concerns the tax reform which started in 1984 and was subsequently continued, a reform that will make our tax system more equitable. First, there was thorough planning.

There was consultation, and adjustments were made as required to provide the majority of Canadians with a tax system responsive to their needs, a system that, I would say, for the first time in the history of taxation in Canada, responds both to the economic needs of this country and to the needs of Canadian men and women. It is probably the first time, Mr. Speaker, since the famous war tax of 1917, which was a temporary tax, that Canadians will see an increase on their paycheck in July as result of this reform. Mr. Speaker, about 9.7 million Canadian families will pay less income tax in 1988 and subsequent years. This means that 85 per cent of Canadians will pay an average of $500 or less income tax per year. And that is a first!

This was achieved in a number of ways. First, as you know, over the years we phased out the tax shelters provided under the system, such as tax credits for scientific research which meant that billions of dollars were spent by a few taxpayers, a few companies, while the majority of taxpayers did not benefit. And even worse, the people who should have benefited from this scientific research tax credit, our scientists, never benefited at all. It is time we put an end to the abuse that existed under the previous Liberal Government and which cost Canadians billions of dollars without doing anything for our country, without giving Canada anything worthwhile as far as scientific research was concerned. Now that these funds have come back into the system, today we can consider the kind of tax reform that will benefit all Canadians. And as I was saying, 85 per cent of taxpaying Canadians will see their tax bill go down this year—they already saw that on their pay cheque for the beginning of July.

This was also done by broadening the tax base; as you know, many companies were not paying their fair share of taxes, for various reasons. So companies that were not paying tax will from now on pay their fair share, giving us money that will allow us to reduce Canadians' tax burden.

What is perhaps most important in this whole tax reform is the change we made to the personal exemption and all exemptions, converting them into tax credits. As you know, Mr. Speaker, exemptions are beneficial to high-income individuals and penalize low-income Canadians. This is easy to illustrate: If you earn $100,000 a year and have a personal exemption of $3,000, your tax rate is 50 per cent and you save $1,500. But if you earn $10,000 a year, your tax rate is 20 per cent and with the same $3,000 annual exemption, you save $500 or $600 of tax. By changing this and giving everyone the same $1,000 tax credit for personal exemptions, whether they make $10,000 or $100,000 a year, they all have the same tax advantage. And this is a major reform of our tax system. It makes it an equitable system, fairer for all Canadians. Looking at my colleague from Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau), I am sure that he cannot contradict this. He is familiar enough with the tax system to know that tax credits definitely make our system fairer and more equitable. This same principle will apply to all exemptions that Canadians had before, like the married exemption, etc.

Tax reform also has another purpose, namely to encourage private initiative, to give Canadians more money in their pocket, as we have been saying since 1984, so that they can decide what to do with it. I do not think that it is up to the Government to direct everything that goes on in the daily lives of all Canadians. The more money taxpayers have in their pockets, the more they will be able to spend as they like, or save or invest, spend on recreation, whatever; that will be good for our economy and our country. And it will automatically encourage economic growth and help create jobs. That is how you have to look at tax reform; this is the philosophy for Canada's future to keep in mind.

Our reform will also solve the problem of corporate taxation. Some companies were overtaxed and others paid nothing at all. As I said, those that paid nothing will pay from now on. But those that were overtaxed could not be internationally competitive; again, Mr. Speaker, in running a country, you must not think only of tomorrow, but 5, 10, 11 years ahead. We are 11 years away from 2000. This underscores the importance of the free trade agreement and of the tax reform which will make Canadian companies more competitive on international markets because their tax rates will indeed stand comparison with those of companies in other countries. It is just as important to Canadians who want to work, who have jobs and want to hang on to them, who are eager to make progress and seek to achieve a better quality of life. You know, Mr. Speaker, very often people equate quality of life with environmental considerations. It is true and it is a sound approach. I think in terms of social benefits, it is true and it is a sound approach as well. But quality of life also implies that Canadians have decent incomes which are not reduced by unduly high taxes. There are no incomes without jobs, and there will be jobs only if Canadian companies can make progress and expand on a logical, normal and lasting basis. That is where that tax reform comes in.

Viewed from a different angle, the reform means that 850,000 Canadians will no longer pay income taxes. Low income Canadians will no longer be taxpayers, including 250,000 older men and women who will never again have to file a tax return, if indeed they have no other income to declare.

With respect to older Canadians, the tax reform means that nine out of ten of them will pay less income tax. Mr. Speaker, you can appreciate that the one out of ten who will have to pay more has a much higher income, and it is only normal that he or she contributes to our society just like all other Canadian men an women.

We have maintained the $100,000 capital gains tax exemption, $100,000 which again will make it possible for Canadian taxpayers to invest and earn a fair investment income.

As a rule, as you know, investments create a great many jobs. So we left at $500,000 the capital gain exemption to benefit farmers as well as small and medium sized businesses.

In this country, most jobs are created by small and medium-sized businesses, and I think it is advisable, as well from an economic point of view in terms of the tax reform, to give special attention to those who keep the economy moving and create employment. That is the reason the $500,000 capital gain exemption exists for them.

And the same reform offers the advantage of being an incentive for the private industry. I met last weekend with people with small and medium-sized businesses who told me: we feel it is important for our employees to have a lighter tax burden because we can give them a good pay, and it is equally important that our business should also have a lighter tax burden to keep us competitive on the international market.

Mr. Speaker, the future of Canadian businesses is on the international market. I do not think that as Canadian businessmen, we should rest on our laurels but that we should think of the future. We must realize that we have in Canada some 25 million potential consumers, but we should think of the new opportunities open to us. In the Trois-Rivières riding, there are a number of very good business people who have already understood the message and who are already exporting in large quantities on the international market. I could mention a few who, through their exports, have created dozens upon dozens of new jobs in my riding. If these people had felt that they were going to limit themselves to Trois-Rivières, the region, the province or even the country, fewer jobs would have been created in Trois-Rivières. I feel I must congratulate and encourage our Canadian exporters to look towards this extraordinary new market which beside the United States—this will be achieved through the Free Trade Agreement—also includes the European Common Market. We must have an economic vision of what will happen in a few years from now and to take the necessary steps in Canada to improve the quality of life for all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I referred a moment ago to a vision of the future. Automatically, we think of children. The child's tax credit in 1988 has reached $559 and is consistent with what we had already announced in 1986 concerning the federal sales tax.

You will certainly remember that when we increased the federal sales tax by 1 per cent in 1986, we introduced at the same time the concept of a sales tax credit for low-income people and families.

That is what I called developing a tax system which takes into account the needs of Canadians, something foreign to the former Liberal Government which increased taxes without an eye for the future. We had ample evidence of this with the successive budgets of the previous federal government, the scientific research tax credit, the various industries where they abused the income tax legislation, overburdened Canadian taxpayers, without ever doing anything to improve the quality of life and the economic future of Canada.

This is a priority of the tax reform, something for which we can congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) and

say: You have done a great job! The tax reform is great for all individual Canadian taxpayers, for all Canadian corporations, for the economy of Canada and the quality of life of Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member opposite may quack as much as he pleases, nothing he can say will disprove that. Those are the facts of Canadian tax reform.

I see my colleague from Saint-Maurice (Mr. Grondin) nodding that I am right. Even though he is on the other side of this House, he's able to recognize—because he is an honest man—the good things accomplished by the Conservative Government, and I congratulate him for it.

It might be useful, Mr. Speaker, while talking about tax reform, to go back to what has been done since 1984. With the minimum tax put in place in 1986, for example, all Canadians must pay their fair share. That could have been done under the previous Liberal Government, but their good friends wouldn't stand for it. We have put in place a system that requires all Canadian taxpayers to pay their taxes on a yearly basis.

We have also stopped income splitting between family members, which provided tremendous tax shelters to restricted groups. That has also been set aside.

The Registered Home Ownership Savings Plan was primarily used as a tax shelter by families, but low income people couldn't afford to take advantage of it. That has also been settled.

Tax shelters created by the old regime for yachts, cottages and the like were used any which way. We also put a stop to that.

The scientific research tax credit, which I referred to earlier, cost Canadians billions of dollars, didn't do anything for our scientists or the Canadian economy, but fattened some companies' pocketbooks. That, Mr. Speaker, is an aberration. It is unbelievable that this party let such things go by when it was in power.

I recently read an article in which the former Minister of Finance said that he was aware of what was going on but that nothing could be changed and that the deed was done. So they let it go at that. They let billions of dollars escape which should have gone to companies X, Y, Z here in Canada.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, when we speak of fiscal reform, I think we must also consider the second stage of fiscal reform. Indeed, it is also important. It is part of the vision of Canada, of the expectation of a better quality of life which I mentioned earlier.

The second stage of fiscal reform will deal with the federal sales tax. It is a well known fact that the federal sales tax, in its present patchwork form, in its sorry state which defies description, Mr. Speaker, and with which the former Liberal administration had managed to "put up", is a nuisance to Canadian businesses and prevents them from competing successfully with foreign firms.

So the second stage is on its way and hopefully, as negotiations are proceeding well, with the agreement of the ten provinces we shall arrive at one single provincial and federal sales tax which will apply to most if not all goods and whereby Canada as well as the ten provinces will have a better tax system for the good of all Canadians, one which will be beneficial, which will improve the quality of life of Canadians and, rather than cause the loss of jobs in Canada, will create employment as does the first part of the tax reform, which I hope will be adopted as soon as possible by this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions or comments. The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Centre (Mr. Cassidy).

• (1720)

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity which we get very seldom, to put questions in the House to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, in this case on matters concerning tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the tax reform proposal was tabled in the House in June 1987, today, July 19, 1988, is the first time we debated the issue in the House, except for a few short statements in response to the statements made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) in June and December last year.

I have a question for the Parliamentary Secretary. He just said that all Canadians should pay their fair share of taxes, but in the Government's proposal, and I have the figures here, we see that among the winners, a family with an annual income of $100,000 will enjoy a tax reduction of $4,165 compared with $140 for the individual with an annual income of less $15,000.

Mr. Speaker, the Government seems to think that those who were not paying their fair share were mainly Canadians on low incomes. If we look at the breakdown, we see that the 26 per cent on low incomes will receive about $250 million in tax deductions, but the 2 per cent on higher incomes will get about $380 million in tax deductions. This means that 12 per cent of these reductions go to the wealthier groups in our society and only 8 per cent to people on low incomes, despite the fact that the latter group is much bigger.

Could the Parliamentary Secretary explain why the Government failed to introduce a tax reform proposal that would provide for a more progressive tax system? If we consider all taxpayers, in both cases the winners, that is those who are well off, receive far more in terms of tax reductions than those on low incomes. And could he explain the fact that if we consider the principle of fair tax treatment of families and single taxpayers, there seems to be a disparity that is indefensible in terms of social and fiscal justice? Mr. Speaker, a taxpayer with an annual income of $30,000 and who happens to be single receives a tax reduction of $695 per year, but if we have two taxpayers, both working with two children, their tax reduction is only $285.

It is difficult to give all the figures, but I wonder why a family with two wage earners who both have to work to be able to pay the rent or their mortgage, receive about $5 per week in tax reductions, while someone else with the same annual income will get $14 per week in tax reductions; and why do the wealthy get thousands of dollars in tax reductions, while those who are less well off might get a few hundred dollars? Why?

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the questions the socialists ask are always distorted and do not reflect reality. What I said at the beginning was that those who paid no tax will pay. And those who paid no tax, those who did not pay their fair share, were the ones who benefited from the tax shelters introduced by the previous Liberal Government. There are no more tax shelters. All Canadians must pay their fair share. There are no more tax shelters and the minimum tax was introduced for the very purpose of making everyone pay his or her fair share.

Moreover, 850,000 Canadians will no longer pay income tax. Eighty-five per cent of Canadians will pay less income tax. But still, Mr. Speaker, the socialist Member is unhappy. Eighty-five per cent of Canadians will pay less income tax and he is not happy! Eight hundred fifty thousand Canadians will no longer pay a cent of income tax. He is still not happy!

It was the same socialist Member, Mr. Speaker, who said that flow-through shares, which are a tax shelter, as you know, should be kept. This same Member is telling us to cut tax shelters and not to give to the rich and those with high incomes. Mr. Speaker, it is high-income individuals who buy flow-through shares; not people with low incomes, but those with high incomes buy them. So you see what the socialist Member is doing, Mr. Speaker. He is speaking out of both sides of his mouth. That is quite unfortunate. We have a fair, equitable tax reform that will benefit most Canadians and that will also . . . but the socialist Member does not mention that, nor that we have converted exemptions into tax credits, which definitely makes the tax system fairer than it was before. He does not talk about that. But maybe he should take a look at it, maybe he should take a proper look at his figures, and he would then see that this is fairness, this is a Government that shoulders its responsibilities and also considers the country's economy. You have to have a vision of the country when you carry out a reform, and a vision of the country for the future also, for the future of Canadians and their children. That is what the tax reform does.

• (1730)

Mr. St-Julien: Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the Hon. Member from Trois-Rivières (M. Vincent) and Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, I have a few comments to make on a particular tax credit, namely the R&D tax shelter. In the years 1983-1984, the then Minister, the Hon. Marc Lalonde, stated that his program would cost between $200,000,000 and $300,000,000. Some time after the Conservative Government's victory, the Right Honourable Prime Minister, Mr. Brian Mulroney, said that this research program had to be cancelled immediately, which was one of the first things the Minister of Finance did. Several months later, the Auditor General of Canada made public his audit of the program. Instead of $300,000,000, it had cost 3.9 billion dollars, Mr. Speaker, and out of those 3.9 billion dollars allocated to R&D, it was revealed that 1.9 billion dollars had been lost due to frauds and bankruptcies.

Here is a case in point. A mechanic from Victoria, British-Columbia, asked for 5 million dollars to set up a computer technology research program. He presented his project to senior officials and, by the way, Mr. Speaker, in 1983 and early 1984, these senior officials told the then Minister, Mr. Marc Lalonde, and the Canadian Government, the Trudeau Government, as well as Federal Liberal Members of Parliament—and the Hon. Member from Abitibi, Mr. René Gingras was one of them—to put an immediate stop to this waste of public funds. And that Victoria mechanic who got $5,000,000 is now in Japan writing a book on break-dancing.

And to think, Mr. Speaker, and I will close on that, that with those 1.9 billion dollars, we could have built right here in Canada, for the benefit of the Abitibi region or Trois-Rivières, whose Member works very hard for his riding and his constituents, we could have built, Mr. Speaker, in this great country of ours, 50 hospitals.

[*English*]

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to participate in the debate on this Bill on tax reform. Tax reform was introduced with great fanfare by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson). It was introduced as being his effort to simplify the tax system.

When I first saw the Bill I asked: Is it not great that we have a simple tax system? I decided to read some of this simple Bill, which has only 500 pages, since it introduces a new simplified tax system. I want to read some of it into the record to show how simple it is and how Canadians will be glad that the tax system has been simplified in this manner. It states at page 149:

> (4) All that portion of paragraph 88(1)(e.5) of the said Act following subparagraph (ii) thereof is repealed and the following substituted therefor:
>
> "shall, if the parent has been a private corporation continuously from the time of the winding-up to the end of the taxation year, be added to the aggregate determined under subsection 129(3) from which the parent's dividend refunds are to be subtracted, except that the amount to be added to the aggregate determined under subsection 129(3) shall be deemed to be nil where, had a dividend been paid by the subsidiary immediately before the winding-up, subsection 129(1.2) would have applied to deem the dividend not to be a taxable dividend".

Does that not clarify it? I am glad the system has been simplified in such a way as to make it understandable to my constituents and all Canadians. I am sure that when my constituents read this clause it will be eminently clear to all of them that we have a simplified and beautiful tax system.

If the House is not convinced that the tax system is easy to understand, let me turn to the next page to show that I have

not purposely selected any passage to embarrass the Government. That is the last thing on my mind. It states at page 150:

> (6) Subsection 88(1) of the said Act is further amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (e.8) thereof, by adding the word "and" at the end of paragraph (f) thereof and by adding thereto the following paragraph:
>
> "(g) where the subsidiary was an insurance corporation, (i) for the purposes of paragraphs (12)(1)(d),(e),(i) and (s) and 20(1)(l), (l.1), and (jj) and 20(7.(c), section 33, 138, 138.1, 140, 142 and 148 and Part XII.3, the parent shall, notwithstanding paragraph (e.2), be deemed to be the same corporation as, and a continuation of, the subsidiary, and
>
> (ii) for the purpose of determining the amount of the gross investment revenue required to be included under subsection 138(9) in the income of the subsidiary and the parent and the amount of gains and losses of the subsidiary and the parent from property used by them in the year or held by them in the year in the course of carrying on an insurance business in Canada—

Most of my constituents, as all Canadians, will be pleased that the Government has simplified the tax system in the way I have just described it.

We have had some deliberations on this Bill at the committee level. On May 17, 1988, I attended the Finance Committee hearing because I was interested in this new simplified tax system. I wanted to know in very tangible terms whether or not this new system would result in a more simplified tax form. Obviously, the jargon I just read is quite complex, even in its so-called simplified form. I asked an official of the Department of Finance, Mr. David Dodge, Senior Assistant Deputy Minister, who was appearing at the committee that day: "In very tangible form is it going to have fewer lines on it"—I was describing the tax form—"or is it going to be essentially the same thing?" I asked: "To most Canadians our tax system is measured not in many of the ways that perhaps you would, sir. It is: Am I able to fill out my income tax? That is a tangible measure of how simple or otherwise the tax system is".

The response of the Senior Assistant Deputy Minister, as it appears at page 164:10 of the Finance and Economic Affairs Committee was:

> It is going to be a little bit shorter, because there are a few things that are treated differently, or are not there under the new legislation. But as I said, my colleagues at Revenue Canada have tried to design it in such a way that there would be as little change as possible in terms of the flow of what people are used to in filling out their own forms.

In other words, the Senior Assistant Deputy Minister has told us that essentially it will be the same thing.

• (1740)

Are you not glad we are simplifying it, Mr. Speaker? Once it is simplified it will be the same as before, after all that effort. That kind of explanation, of course, does not satisfy me entirely of how simple a tax system could be.

[*Translation*]

In his excellent speech earlier today, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau) explained to the House that this tax reform occurs following four major tax increases from this Tory Government. We should remember that these increases were quite unfair for middle-income Canadians. And we know that under this tax reform, there will be very little progressiveness in the application of this so-called reform. The reform is certainly incomplete, because the sales tax will be delayed until next year. But why next year? The answer is quite simple and most Canadians are aware of it: because this Tory government wants to implement these tax increases only after the election. Yet, Mr. Speaker, there is something which this Tory Government has overlooked but which you know as well as I do, being non-partisan, and it is that the forthcoming election will mean the end of this Tory Government. That is fortunate for most Canadians, except of course for the rich friends of this Tory Government.

Mr. Speaker, the personal income tax under the proposed tax reform will be reduced from 10 to 3. So the federal tax rate will be 17 per cent on the first $27,500 of taxable income, 26 per cent on the amount between $27,500 and $55.000 in taxable income, and finally 29 per cent on the amount in excess of $55,000 in taxable income. If you look at the three levels, you see quite clearly 17, 26 and 29. Therefore, the middle class will face a tax rate of 26 per cent. Mr. Speaker, 26 per cent is not halfway between 17 per cent and 29 per cent. As you can see, people with average salaries will again pay more than their fair share, contrary to what the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister explained to us today. Again, this is a Tory legislation which is unfair to a great many Canadians.

The Parliamentary Secretary told us today something to the effect that the affluent in Canada should assume their fair share of the tax burden. That is true and most of us agree that the rich should pay their share and naturally low income people should not have to shoulder a disproportionate amount of the tax burden. Well, we are well aware that ever since this Tory Government came to power, 1 million Canadians are paying more income tax. The Government is now saying that 850 000 Canadians will pay less income tax. Well, Mr. Speaker, the net result is that 150 000 Canadians will continue to pay more. If 1 million pay more while 850 000 pay less, the net result is that 150 000 Canadians are already losers in this whole process, even before the implementation of Phase 2 of this Tory Government's tax reform. The end result is that Canadians are always losing under a Tory Government. It is a well known fact that Tory times are hard times. As the English say . . .

[*English*]

Tory times are hard times. Let me remind Canadians of some of the tax increases. Since the Tories have came to power, many Canadians are paying more income tax. As I indicated previously, a million taxpayers are paying more.

Let me refresh the memories of Members of the House and all Canadians who are listening to us with respect to those tax increases. First, let me talk about direct taxes. In October 1984 we had a sales tax increase from 9 per cent to 10 per cent, a $1 billion increase. On January 1, 1986, the sales tax increased from 10 per cent to 11 per cent, another $1 billion

tax increase. As the Tories say: "What is a billion?" On April 1, 1986, the sales tax increased from 11 per cent to 12 per cent, another $1 billion. Then they decided to extend the tax to children's candy—Tory policy—soft drinks, health goods, dental instruments, snack foods, and so on. That resulted in $460 million of tax increase. There was an increase in sales tax from 8 per cent to 12 per cent on paint, wallpaper, and children's toys, which produced $60 million.

Then there were tax increases on gasoline. There was a 2 cent per litre increase on September 3, 1985, a 1 cent per litre increase on January 1, 1987, a 1 cent per litre increase on February 19, 1987, and a 1 cent per litre increase on April 1, 1988. If we add all that together, and I say this so that the Hon. Member for Chambly (Mr. Grisé) can repeat it faithfully to all his constituents, we have $2.5 billion worth of tax increases. Strangely enough, that is an increase of some 5 cents per litre. That 5 cents per litre is more than the 18 cents per gallon which caused the Government, led by the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark), to be turfed out in 1979. That is the sad reality.

Unfortunately for all Canadians this particular Conservative administration has a large majority in the House of Commons. What I am saying today must be thought provoking. It is even waking up some of the Tory back-benchers. That is a good sign. They are earning their day's pay.

I could continue talking about massive tax increases. Let me speak about the 10 per cent sales tax on long-distance telephone calls and cable television services. That has generated $945 million. I represent a largely rural constituency, the great riding of Glengarry—Prescott—Russell. In my riding, and in many other rural constituencies in Canada, citizens do not have a choice as to whether or not they will phone long distance. Some people in rural areas have to phone long distance to speak to their doctor, the farm implement dealer, the veterinarian or the drug store. To phone anywhere one has to pay for a long-distance telephone call. That is the reality of living in a rural area.

Obviously the Minister of Finance, who comes from downtown Toronto, is not too familiar with rural areas. He imposed a sales tax not on basic service, not on luxury items, but on long-distance telephone calls, which means that this tax is unfair and discriminatory against the rural Canadians I am charged with representing in the House of Commons. That is the unfairness of this system and this so-called tax reform with these tax increases of the Conservative administration.

I see the Hon. Member for Gaspé (Mr. Marin) opposite. He represents, as I do, a rural riding. He knows how unfair are those taxes on long-distance telephone calls. He has probably had the opportunity to tell the Minister of Finance. If he has not had that opportunity, there is still some time before the Tories are turfed out of office; a few months at least but not much more. He should tell the Minister of Finance, while he is still the Minister of Finance, that this tax on long-distance telephone calls is indeed unfair to a large number of rural Canadians living in Glengarry—Prescott—Russell and elsewhere.

It is particularly unfair to senior citizens. I received a telephone call yesterday in my office from a senior citizen in my riding who, upon looking at his telephone bill, became really upset about the fact that because he lives in Hawkesbury he had to pay tax on a long-distance phone call to his children living in Ottawa. He has to pay surtax because he has cablevision coming into his house. This gentleman is 88 years old. Why is the Government permitted to impose these types of taxes on senior citizens such as the one I have just described? Obviously there is no rational explanation for that other than the fact that the Minister of Finance is insensitive to the needs of rural Canadians. He has imposed this most unfortunate regressive and discriminatory tax on rural Canadians, the tax on long-distance telephone calls.

• (1750)

There are pages of tax increases in the Bill. I could read them all into the record but if I did that I could hardly speak on anything else this afternoon, except of course if my colleagues extended the time permitted for me to speak, which I know that given the non-partisan tone of my speech they would probably want to do. In the unlikely event that they refuse, I am going to change topics here and move on to more on the area of tax reform.

In the constituency that I represent there is an organization which builds low-head generating stations. These generating stations create employment in my constituency. They are then built on site. They are manufactured in my riding and installed in northern Ontario. They usually provide meaningful employment to residents of remote communities in northern Ontario. This was creating good employment in my riding, which is certainly not in northern Ontario but which suffers from high unemployment. People investing in these types of projects were doing so by means of the flow-through share mechanism. Of course, they have now had a lot of difficulty, first, with the outright cancellation of this measure and, second, with the modifications that were proposed by the Minister of Finance. The long and short of it is that valuable research, development and installation was going on here, and now the whole thing has been placed in jeopardy by the actions of the Conservative administration.

We know that the New Democratic Party has had a great deal of difficulty with this issue. Sometimes it has been in favour of it and sometimes it has been against it. It has not been easy for members of that Party, and I sort of sympathize with them on this issue. I will return to the area of research and development in a minute.

I want briefly to touch on the area of automobile expenses in the tax reform Bill. A number of people in my constituency and several other constituencies in Canada use their cars to work. Their car is a travelling office. I feel that the imposition of the $20,000 maximum for the deductibility of automobiles

is unfair. I ask the Minister at least to index that amount and, hopefully, even to increase it so that it will not adversely affect people who work in their cars.

If one's office does not have wheels on it, then it is fully deductible. If an office does have wheels on it, as is the case with a travelling salesperson, then there are restrictions which are unfair which have been put on them by the Government.

In conclusion, I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservative Government has failed miserably in the area of research and development with or without tax reform. I talked about the flow-through shares. There are several other areas which I could address.

I want to say that in the United States the non-tax support for research and development is 33 per cent and the tax support is 7 per cent for a total of 40 per cent. In France there is 22 per cent non-tax support and 7 per cent tax support for a total of 29 per cent. In Canada, we have 12 per cent non-tax support and 8 per cent tax support for a total of 20 per cent. We can see how underfunded research and development is in Canada.

Given that serious underfunding, I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Saint-Maurice (Mr. Grondin):

> That the amendment be amended by deleting the "and" before (6) and the period at the end thereof and by adding the following:
>
> "and (7), imposes a higher burden on small manufacturing corporations and unnecessary red tape on the self-employed."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will take the Hon. Member's subamendment under advisement and report back to the House later. On questions and comments the Chair recognizes the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I know that the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) agrees with me in some of the criticisms I have made about the Government in terms of the lack of progressivity in the tax reform proposals which have been put forward. I am sure that he agrees with me that there is something wrong with the tax system that cuts taxes for most people earning over $100,000 by $4,000 per year but only cuts taxes for people earning $15,000 and less per year by an average of $140.

I know that he agrees with me that there is something wrong when the Government claims that many people will be paying less tax when in fact average Canadians were paying about $1,200 more in tax after tax reform than they were prior to 1984. In other words, the Progressive Conservatives have raised the taxes on the average family earning of perhaps $35,000 per year by a sum of $1,500, and then it has turned around and taken down their taxes by perhaps $250 or $300 per year for a net increase that we calculate of $1,253 per year.

I know my hon. friend will agree with me that there is something perverse about a situation in which only the top 2 per cent of taxpayers earning more than $100,000 per year wind up paying less tax in 1988 after tax reform than they paid in 1984.

My reason for asking a question of my hon. friend is the fact that it seems to me that some of the problems we are having with taxation under the Progressive Conservatives did not begin on September 4, 1984. They began before then.

I would like to ask my friend if he recalls the Budget brought down by the Minister of Finance who is currently the Opposition House Leader in the Senate, Senator MacEachen, who in 1981 brought in a Budget which purported to broaden the base of the tax system and at the same time resulted in a very substantial drop in tax rates on wealthy Canadians.

Does he recall as well the fact that the loopholes that were being plugged by that Budget eventually got opened up again, and that in fact the Minister of Finance of the time gave way in front of the interests so that the broadening of the base that he was proposing did not take place but that it did not take away the reductions to wealthy Canadians?

What is the difference between the Liberal Party which cut tax on wealthy Canadians in 1981 without notice that it was dropping the base and the Conservative Party which in 1988 is proposing to cut taxes on wealthy Canadians while still leaving a number of loopholes?

[*Translation*]

I noted that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance had indicated that there are no more tax shelters in the tax system. Of course, he did not mention the capital gains tax exemption on the first $100,000 earned by the rich people as provided under the Conservative tax system.

My question is the following: Didn't this regressive tax, whose history began with the Conservatives, exist under the Liberals?

Naturally, Mr. Speaker . . . I realize that the Hon. Member told us there is a lack of funding, a lack of support by the government for research and development. But, this lack of funding, wasn't it something the Liberals proposed in the first place? History didn't start on September 4, 1984. So, how can we distinguish between his Party, which decreased the tax rate for the rich and did not properly finance Canadian research and development, and the Conservative Party which is now doing the same thing?

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, my colleague stated that not everything in taxation started under the Conservatives. It would be true to say that nothing has started under an NDP Government because there has never been one, and there never will be one. Thus we have to start off with that particular premise since it is a reality that all Canadians know and certainly all Members in this House know as being a fact.

That being the case, let me remind the Hon. Member that it was indeed the Liberal Party which stood up for universality of

old age pensions when the Tories tried to cut old age pensions in the Budget of their Minister of Finance.

• (1800)

It was the Liberal Party that established a national health care system, the old age pension, and a guaranteed income supplement. Those were measures to more evenly distribute the wealth and to aid people who were in the position of having less financial wealth than others. Those are some of the examples of good social programs established by the Liberals in the past. Those very same programs have been threatened and cut back by the Conservatives who are in power now. One need only look at the issue of deindexation of income tax deductions.

Mr. Cassidy: What about six and five?

Mr. Boudria: Let me repeat this slowly. The deductions in income tax were indexed by the Right Hon. Member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Turner) in the days when he was the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Carleton, part of the riding that I now represent, and when that Member was the Minister of Finance for Canada—and a great Minister of Finance he was. He established a system whereby there would not be an inflation-causing income tax system the way we have now. In other words, if someone receives a 3 per cent cost-of-living allowance each year, that 3 per cent is now taxed. Under the Liberals it was not. The system was far fairer and was established by a more progressive Government than the one we have now.

I am glad the Minister of Communications (Miss MacDonald) is listening attentively. This information will come in handy in the election that we will soon have when Peter Milliken confronts her with some of those facts in the great riding of Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. Cassidy: I was a little puzzled when hearing the response of the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria). I recognize that he was in the Ontario House in 1981, and not in the federal House, but I do not recall his responding to my specific question. The question I asked is, what is different about a Liberal Finance Minister in 1981 cutting taxes on the rich, and a Conservative Finance Minister under tax reform cutting taxes on the rich? I find it difficult to distinguish between them. I listened carefully, but I did not hear the Hon. Member offer any credible distinction. I recall that in Opposition the Liberals seem to talk like New Democrats, and we welcome their support from time to time on issues that we feel to be important, but at the same time we find it somewhat inconsistent. The Hon. Member seems to forget that his Party deindexed Public Service pensions under the six and five program and turned around and attacked the Government for attempting to do the same thing in 1985. The Liberals are being a bit inconsistent.

What is different about the Liberals who cut taxes on the rich in 1981 in the MacEachen Budget, and the tax reform here which seems to be far more interested in cutting taxes on wealthy Canadians than it is in bringing in tax equity for average Canadians?

Mr. Boudria: The Hon. Member from the NDP states that he welcomes the Liberals in Opposition from time to time. I am glad that we are only in Opposition from time to time, which is certainly not the same as could be said for the NDP Members. They have a lot of practice at being in Opposition. They have been there and will be there forever.

The Hon. Member asked what the difference is between a Liberal Finance Minister and a Conservative Finance Minister. The Hon. Member raised the issue of a Budget in 1981 which he says was unfair toward average Canadians. The Tories criticized that Budget because it was unfair toward rich Canadians. It is difficult to reconcile the views of the Tories and the NDP. Each one is polarized with tunnel vision and they cannot see the rest of the world around them. That is unfortunate.

I described how in the past Liberals attempted to make the tax system fairer by redistributing wealth throughout the country. Many of the valuable social programs, supported from time to time—but always when they were in Opposition—by members of the NDP.

I have described how all this has happened for the benefit of the Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) who, by the way, was not here before 1984 either. I was in the Ontario Legislature, and so was he as the Leader of the NDP.

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words in support of Bill C-139 which deals with the question of tax reform. You and I, Mr. Speaker, have heard a lot about tax reform over quite a number of years. In fact, when I first considered standing for Parliament, I can remember that the whole issue of tax reform was in the forefront of public discussion and debate. I can remember a leadership contender in our Party by the name of Mr. Peter Pocklington who made that one of the prime objectives and thrusts of his efforts to become the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party in 1983. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, the debate that raged around the issue of tax reform. As a nominated candidate for office, knocking on the doors of many people, I found a great interest in and a great desire for tax reform.

However, tax reform means different things to different people. As we talk to different people, they send us the message that tax reform does not always mean the same to everybody. If there is one thing that people have in common about tax reform, it is the whole question of its conveying the meaning to them that they will be paying less taxes under some sort of reformed system than they were under the present or past system. That is what the Bill before us this evening is all about. This Bill means that most people will pay less in tax than they have been paying.

I had the opportunity of sitting here today and listening to the comments of the Opposition with respect to this Bill. I listened to the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau) speaking on behalf of the Liberals. I listened to the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) speaking on behalf of the NDP—the new dinosaur Party. I also listened to the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria). Frankly, as I listened to their comments, I was astounded. I wondered if we were talking about the same thing. I have a friend who was the Mayor of the Borough of East York where I hail from by the name of Leslie Saunders. He used to describe some things as being "out of this world". As I listened to the comments of the Liberals and the new dinosaurs, I had to agree with him that they were "out of this world". In fact, I thought that perhaps they were "out of this world" by many of the comments they made on tax reform. I could spend all my time commenting on all of the things that they said. However, I do want to comment on a few of the things, because they were and they are "out of this world".

• (1810)

One of the first comments the Liberals made had to do with the question of the progressiveness of the income tax system. Both Liberal Members who spoke in this debate indicated that under the former Liberal Governments there was a progressive tax system but that for some reason or other, the progressive tax system is now being done away with. Well, I can see the smile curving at the edges of your mouth when you hear those words about the progressive tax system under the former Liberal Governments. You and I know about all of those interesting tax shelters that the former Liberal Government had introduced and put into effect. You will remember the tax shelter for MURBs. That certainly was a very progressive measure. It allowed people with high incomes to invest their money and in fact to have a tax deduction and not pay any tax on the money that they had in that tax shelter.

You will remember, of course, the film investment tax shelters that were put in place by the former Government, again a tax shelter which enabled rich people to invest their money in the production of movies, shelter their income and not pay any income tax on it.

You will remember as well that there were similar tax shelters for things like hotel investments, similar tax shelters for things like recreational vehicle purchases. These certainly added to the progressiveness of the tax system in a big way. You know that as well as I do that the system that was in place under the former Liberal Government was anything but a perfect progressive tax system.

To top it all off, there was something called the scientific research tax credit, one of the greatest boondoggles that has ever been introduced into the income tax system by any Government. It was introduced by the former Liberal Government, and it milked and looted the Treasury of this country. It certainly could not be considered in any way, shape or form to be adding to the progressiveness of the tax system. In fact, it did just the opposite, as all of these tax shelters did.

What has happened to these tax shelters, as you and I know, is that they have been eliminated by the present Government, by the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson), and all of those steps in eliminating those tax shelters have helped to return the system to a progressive tax system, the kind of a system that the Liberals tell us that they want to see but the kind of a system that certainly they did not produce.

Another of the comments of the Liberal spokesman on this tax reform legislation had to do with the question of the simplicity of the tax system. Once again the Liberal spokesman seemed to imply that the tax system as it existed under the previous Government was far simpler than it is going to be under the present system.

You and I know that many of the complications of the previous system—complications which included some of these tax shelters—are being eliminated by the present Government. One thing that always strikes me about this whole question of simplicity—and several members of the Opposition have touched on this issue, whether they were Liberals or new dinosaurs—is that it seems to imply that it is some sort of a panacea, that there is some way of creating a simple system but still creating the same kind of a system that they want to see, one which takes into account rich Canadians, poor Canadians, and the question of a progressive tax rate. You and I know that that is very difficult and probably impossible to accomplish.

Certainly we can have a simple system, one where all of us can sit down, as we did 40 or 50 years ago, and work out our income tax on one simple page, but it does not take into account all of the complexities that have now been built into the system, which would cause a great furore and uproar if they were done away with.

One simple example, is the deductions for charitable donations. You know, Mr. Speaker, as I know, that under that very simple system that we used to have there was no such thing as making deductions for charitable purposes from income tax. That system was instituted in an effort to assist organized charities to raise money. A great number of organized charities doing very beneficial work for society have been created under that system.

Just think, Mr. Speaker, of the furore the Opposition would raise if we suddenly did away with the charitable donation or any charitable tax credit whatsoever. Certainly it would make the system much simpler, but at the same time it would devastate this system of charitable giving and the system of charitable expenditures that have been built up over many years. It would make the system simpler, but it certainly would devastate the present charitable scheme that has been established over many, many years.

Another comment of both of the opposition Parties had to do with the fact that although the Government has indicated

that there are some 850,000 taxpayers who will be taken off the tax rolls by this tax reform legislation, in fact there are a million people who are now paying taxes that were not when the Government took office.

Again, Mr. Speaker, you and I know that there is a very simple answer to that, and that is the fact that when the Government took office, there was an unemployment rate across this country of something approaching 12 per cent, whereas that has now been lowered very substantially.

Miss MacDonald: Thirteen per cent.

Mr. Redway: Into the 7 per cent range. You and I know, Mr. Speaker, that most of those people who are new taxpayers are people who were not working before but now have jobs. No wonder they are paying taxes. I guess they are happy to do that. They were not happy when they did not have a job. They wanted a job, and they knew that with a job they would have to pay some income tax. That is in fact what has happened.

As you know, there have been over 1.2 million new jobs created since September, 1984. In fact, it is interesting to note that unemployment has fallen since 1984 by 430,000. The number of unemployed youth has fallen by 201,000. The number of unemployed women has fallen by 150,000. That means, very simply, that these people now have jobs which they did not have before. It is no wonder that they are paying taxes where they were not paying taxes before.

The Opposition in their criticism went on to deal with a number of other items as well. One of the things that they talked about was the unfairness of things like the capital gains tax exemption and the dividend tax credits. In a recent newsletter I published an outline of how this new tax reform legislation would impact on the average taxpayer. I published in effect a tax return for 1988, and I left it to the reader to work out their own income tax in terms of that income tax return for 1988. I invited them to contact me if in fact they were going to have to pay more tax or have to pay less tax. It is interesting to note that 100 per cent of the people who contacted me and who felt that they were going to have to pay more tax under this system were either people in a high-income bracket to begin with or people who were presently taking advantage of the dividend tax credit, whether they were modest-income people or whether they were high-income people, and it is that that concerned them.

• (1820)

Some modifications had been made to this legislation which the NDP says is helping the rich get richer. Those modifications concern people with high incomes because with the changes in the dividend tax credit and the change from what was anticipated in the capital gains tax credit, they anticipated that they would be paying less income tax with the present system than they would be with the new system. It is significant to my mind, Mr. Speaker, that these so-called assists to the rich, the dividend tax credit and the capital gains tax credit, are really the main source of criticism on the income tax reform package. People in the higher income tax brackets feel the substantial change in the tax system and feel they will be paying much more tax than they paid in the past whereas I, at least, am not hearing from the lower income people because, I assume, having worked out their tax, they find that they are saving money. It is not costing them any money under the new system.

Finally, let me comment on the criticism which the opposition Parties have levied regarding the sales tax changes. The opposition Parties said that people are now paying tax on potato chips but were not before. I have a company in my constituency by the name of Wrigley's Gum. Wrigley's Gum became very exercised with me and with the Government a couple of years ago when it discovered that under the sales tax system people who bought Wrigley's Gum had to pay sales tax whereas those people who bought potato chips did not.

The Wrigley's Gum people felt that potato chips were a direct competitor to them and said that everybody should be paying sales tax on goods or no one should be paying sales tax. I suppose the Government could have said: "Well, we will eliminate sales tax on everything". As you know, Mr. Speaker, that would have meant tax on something else.

Another comment which the opposition Members have made and make regularly has to do with the whole question of the increases in taxation over the last four years. There is one simple answer. Under the previous Government, supported by the New Democratic Party, the deficit in this country rose enormously to frightening heights, approaching $40 billion on an annual basis. When our Government came to office, we started off by suggesting we would cut some of the expenditures so as to reduce the deficit. Every single solitary suggestion that was made for a cut was opposed vehemently by the Liberals and by the new dinosaur party. In each case, both opposition Parties opposed anything that would cut expenditures and now, of course, they are opposing and have opposed anything that would change the tax system in any way. You know, Mr. Speaker, and I know that when you are in Government you cannot have it both ways. Unfortunately, the Opposition wants to imply that you can have it both ways. That just does not work and we all know it. Even the opposition Parties know it in their hearts.

I did not hear the Opposition commenting on the results of tax reform. The Government has said that the net personal income tax revenues to the Government will be reduced under this package by about $12 billion over the next five years. I did not hear either of the opposition Parties dispute that in any way. The federal Government said the income taxes will be reduced for 9.7 million households for over 85 per cent of all households by an average of $490. I did not hear either of the opposition Parties or any of the opposition spokesmen dispute those facts.

The Government says that about 850,000 low income Canadians will have their income tax rates reduced to zero or will receive refundable tax credits in 1988. I did not hear

either of the opposition Parties or their spokesmen dispute those facts. The Government said that income taxes will be cut for about 1.3 million of the 1.4 million households. About 250,000 elderly Canadians will have their income taxes reduced to zero. I did not hear either opposition Party dispute that nor any of their spokesmen dispute those facts.

All in all, it is interesting to note that as the Government has indicated, under this tax reform package there will be a very substantial reduction. In fact, a very, very substantial number of people will be cut off the tax rolls entirely. A very, very substantial number of people will have their taxes reduced, but we did not hear any of those facts disputed. All we heard disputed was the past. That is where both opposition Parties stand on this issue and on all issues. They are deeply rooted in the past. They do not seem to be able to look forward or get their heads out of the sand. It is time that both opposition Parties admitted, as they know in their hearts, that this is good legislation. It will be good for Canadians and we should see the Bill passed quickly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has considered the subamendment moved by the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) and finds it to be in order. I will, therefore, propose it to the House. Mr. Boudria, seconded by Mr. Grondin moved:

> That the amendment be amended by deleting the "and" before (6) and the period at the end of thereof and by adding the following:
>
> "and (7), that imposes a higher burden on small manufacturing corporations and unnecessary red tape on the self-employed."

The debate will continue on the subamendment. Questions and comments, the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway) for his speech. I found it a bit difficult listening to him to recognize how progressive his Party really was. I noted the number of people whose taxes would be cut. I do not dispute the figures particularly, but what I noted was that a cut, after you have had a big increase, is hardly a cut at all. It reminds me of the story of somebody who goes to the store and he or she—I will be catholic about this—comes back and says: "Well it was 33 per cent off. I could not afford to buy it". You still wind up paying something for whatever it is you bought. That is very much the same with Conservative tax reform.

If your taxes go up by $1,500, which is what has happened for the average family since 1984 under the Conservatives, and you get a tax cut of $300, should you be grateful for the tax cut or should you not recognize the fact that you still wind up paying $1,200 or more in taxation compared to when the Government came to power. That seems to me a very relevant figure. I do not think it is a very progressive type of tax reform if the Conservatives wind up soaking the average family $1,200 more after four years and after tax reform than that family was paying before.

I heard the Hon. Member trying to blame the Opposition that the Conservatives could not cut expenditures where they felt like cutting expenditures. We make up 32 Members in the House of Commons. There are a few more Liberals, a total of some 70 Members in Opposition. The Progressive Conservative Party has three times our number. If they could not cut expenditures, it was because they did not know how, they did not want to, or it was politically unfeasible.

• (1830)

However, my question is whether it is progressive, in his view, to cut taxes on the average person earning more than $100,000 a year to a level lower than in 1984, but to raise taxes on all other Canadians higher than they were in 1984? Is it progressive to have three-quarters of the taxpayers earning over $100,000 a year receiving a tax cut of $4,165, whereas the average taxpayer earning under $15,000 a year gets a cut of only $140? If he thinks that is progressive, I am not in agreement with him and I find it very difficult to associate myself with the so-called tax reform put forward by his Party. It is not fair reform, it is Tory tax reform.

The Hon. Member suggested his Party had done away with a number of tax shelters and therefore deserved a certain amount of praise. He neglected to mention the $100,000 total tax break for capital gains which is available largely to high income Canadians. Is that not a tax shelter worthy of being enshrined in the pantheon of Liberal tax shelters which the Conservative Government inherited? If that is the case, why did the Government, if it is so progressive, not eliminate it?

I would conclude by saying that since the Hon. Member insists on referring to my Party by a name unfamiliar to me, and I always thought the dinosaurs were in the Progressive Conservative Party, and given the retrogressive nature of the tax reform proposed by the Progressive Conservatives, they should be renamed the "prehistoric coprolite party".

Mr. Redway: Mr. Speaker, I wish the Hon. Member had listened carefully to my comments before he launched into his own dealing, first, with the tax increases that occurred before this tax reform package. If he had, he would have heard me say that those tax increases preceded the package we are talking about now and therefore he should be addressing the legislation we are dealing with now. He apparently is not interested in tax reductions now because he finds that a tax reform package that actually cuts taxes should be criticized. He apparently would have been much happier had there not been any tax cut whatsoever. He then could have said that all we have had is tax increases over these years.

In addition, the Hon. Member obviously was not listening when I spoke about the enormous deficit that was in place when this Government came to power. He and his Party and the Liberal Opposition criticized and vehemently opposed every suggested spending cut. It is interesting that under a government of the Hon. Member's Party there is no way anything could be cut. There is no way you could raise taxes.

At the same time, somehow or other they want the deficit to mysteriously disappear or else they do not care about it whatsoever.

The economic policies put in place prior to this tax reform package have rejuvenated the country. They reduced unemployment and increased economic growth. We have had the greatest job-creation in the western world for each of the last four years. We have had the greatest economic growth for each of the last four years.

It is interesting to note as well that there has been a decrease in the number of Canadians living below the poverty line since 1984. It has fallen by 525,000. This, apparently, under these terrible economic policies of the present Government. Not only have people been put back to work, not only were 1.2 million jobs created since 1984, there are also 525,000 people who are now above the poverty line who were below it in 1984.

In addition, with all the Hon. Member's criticisms about the economic policies and taxation policies of the Government, the average family income in this country has climbed in real terms since 1984 by some $1,600. That is very interesting in light of the Hon. Member's comments with respect to this package.

I am sure that on reflection the Hon. Member is really supportive of this package. He really wants to see taxes cut and he really feels this is a good piece of legislation and wants to see it put in place as quickly as possible so Canadians can benefit.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate. The Hon. Member for Regina East.

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I definitely wish to participate in this debate this evening. I might say, however, being a member of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, that we have discussed tax reform for almost two years now and it is not until the dying months of the Government, in the middle of the summer, that it finally brings in its legislation. It seems to me the Government has waited for some of its most important legislation in order to try and ram it through Parliament when at least half of the Members are not present and most Canadians are either on holidays or at the cottage. I think the Government's intention is quite clear. It is not interested in the Canadian people having too close a look at what is in the legislation, and I do not think it is interested in having a full debate in the House on this legislation.

When we first heard from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) about tax reform, he stated in his speech on June 18, 1987, page 7360 of *Hansard*:

> Mr. Speaker, tonight I am proposing sweeping changes to Canada's tax system. These changes will directly affect all Canadians for many years to come.
>
> Our tax system should be a strong force in meeting the challenges that face our country.
>
> It must help individuals and businesses deal with the challenges of the 1990s and into the next century.
>
> It must reinforce our ability as a country to continue to provide the social programs needed by our people.
>
> It must generate the hope and opportunity that will motivate Canadians to build a strong country in a very competitive world.
>
> But to do this, the tax system must have the respect of Canadians. We know that it does not. And we know why.
>
> We all know that the tax system allows many profitable corporations to avoid paying a fair share of tax, year after year.
>
> We all know that it allows some people with very high incomes to pay less tax than the average Canadian wage earner, year after year.
>
> We all know that it allows those who are able to use special tax breaks to shift the burden to others less able to carry it.
>
> Canada needs a tax system that raises revenues in a fair and reliable way; a system that supports our national effort to promote economic growth and create more and better jobs.

Those were the comments of the Minister of Finance. By these comments I and all Canadians will judge the legislation before us today.

• (1840)

Since the Conservatives were elected, corporate income tax has increased by 8 per cent, personal income tax has increased by 45 per cent and sales tax has increased by a whopping 67 per cent. I ask again, is this equity, is this fairness? It is obvious to the Canadian public that the tax burden, particularly under a Conservative Government, has been placed on the shoulders of income earners, mainly the middle-income earners. They are the ones who are carrying an increasing load of the tax burden. Again, corporate income tax has only increased by 8 per cent since the election of the Government but personal income tax has increased by 45 per cent and the sales tax has increased by 67 per cent.

Conservative Members, including the Minister of Finance, made much to do about how this tax reform proposal will take some 850,000 low-income earners off the tax rolls. They are right, but they do not mention that since the election of this Tory Government some one million low-income Canadians have been put on the tax rolls. What we have is a revolving door, smoke and mirrors. The Government made low-income Canadians liable to pay tax and is now taking some of them off the rolls. However, that is only temporary because the Government failed to reintroduce full indexation and many of the 850,000 Canadians taken off the income tax rolls this year will be back on next year or the year after.

One million Canadians were put on the income tax roll because the Government took away indexation. Therefore, as incomes rose, because of inflation, they all of a sudden found themselves paying tax whereas before the election of this Government at least the thresholds kept pace with inflation. The Government took that away and that is why one million Canadians who should not be paying taxes because of their low incomes are paying tax for the first time. The Government is now attempting to take credit for removing 850,000 of them for this year only. I emphasize the fact that it is for this year

only because full indexation has not been introduced and many of these 850,000 low-income Canadians will be paying tax again next year or the year after.

The Minister talks about fairness, he talks about removing the tax load from the backs of poor and middle-income people. I ask again whether he has done it. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that he has not. He has reduced the rates of wealthy Canadians from a top rate of 51 per cent to 44 per cent. In other words, a stockbroker earning $200,000 a year is going to save $15,000. Is it fair that a secretary earning $28,000 per year should have a marginal tax rate 5 per cent lower than someone earning over $1 million a year? Is is equity that a secretary or labourer earning $28,000 a year should have an effective tax rate only 5 per cent lower than a person earning over $1 million a year?

What we have before us today is a sham. Let us look again at the savings. A household earning $15,000 a year saves $90 with this tax reform proposal. A household earning up to $100,000 a year saves $1,615 in taxes. A household earning over $100,000 will save $4,365 per year in taxes.

Is this fairness? Is this equity? It is not, it is a sham. It is a sham that the Tories are hoping to perpetrate on the Canadian public. I suspect that the average savings in income tax of $8 per week which the average Canadian received on his pay cheque in the month of July will not make up for the many tax increases that the Government has imposed on many of those Canadians.

One should also mention that much of these income tax savings will be lost. In fact, most of it will be lost because of the increases in sales tax which the Government has introduced for this year. There is a $1.1 billion increase in sales taxes for 1988. Therefore, most of the poor will lose out.

When the Minister of Finance announced his tax reform proposals, he also mentioned that many Canadians have lost respect for the tax system because many large corporations did not pay any tax. In his White Paper he stated that in the year 1983, 110,000 profitable corporations did not pay a cent of tax. He was proud to point out that had his proposals been in effect, some 50,000 of those corporations would now be paying tax. Why, under these proposals, will there still be some 60,000 profitable corporations which will not pay one cent of tax?

Is this fairness? Is this equity? Is this what the Minister of Finance meant when he said: "We all know that the tax system allows many profitable corporations to avoid paying a fair share of tax year after year"? The rhetoric is great but the reality, I am afraid, is something else. The fact is that some 60,000 very profitable corporations will still not pay a cent of tax. That means that $10 billion to $12 billion in profits do not create one cent of tax. Is that what the Government means when it talks about equity and fairness and restoring confidence in the tax system? It is no wonder that many Canadians feel ripped off by our tax system.

We hear Tory Members talking about the need to raise taxes because of the terrible deficit that the Liberals left behind. I sympathize with that. I think we have a problem with the deficit. It is much too large. The amount of interest we have to pay on the deficit every year is unacceptable, it is scandalous. However, I do not accept that we have this deficit because we have been spending and living beyond our means.

The OECD figures show that Canada spends less on social programs than any industrialized country in the world with the exception of the United States. We spend the second lowest percentage of our gross domestic product on social programs; old age pensions, housing, education, health, family allowance, and income support programs. We spend less as a percentage of our gross domestic product than Holland, Ireland, Italy, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, Japan, France, or Belgium.

Why is it that little Holland, with hardly any resources and an over-population, can spend more on its senior citizens, its education system, and its health system than can Canada, a young country with a population of young people and an abundance of resources? That is, I suggest, because the wealthy in this country have not been paying their fair share.

• (1850)

We have the deficit because there is $10 billion to $13 billion that does not generate one cent of tax. The deficit is not a result of overspending on senior citizens or the unemployed, or because we are spending too much on education or housing. I hear the Tories complain day after day that we are living beyond our means and must tighten our belts. There are food banks in every major city of this country. Yet the Tories still have the gall to tell us we are living beyond our means. I find that obscene. It is also obscene when the spokespersons from the large and wealthy corporations tell us that we must tighten our belts because we are living beyond our means and must reduce the deficit.

One year I received a letter from the President of the Royal Bank of Canada who advised us that we must tighten our belts because the deficit is out of control and government spending must be cut. Yet in 1982, I believe, the Royal Bank of Canada had over $365 million in profits and did not pay one cent in tax. In other words, a woman teller at the Royal Bank of Canada would have paid more in dollar and cents in tax than the Royal Bank of Canada. In fact, in that particular year the Royal Bank of Canada received a tax credit of some $20 million.

That is why we have a deficit. Yet we see a letter like that from the President of the Royal Bank of Canada saying that we must cut back on old age security and pensions, cut back on the benefits to the sick and elderly, cut back on social assistance and cut back on education while there are food banks and hungry people on the streets. That is obscene.

The Royal Bank of Canada is only one example. We asked the life insurance companies when they appeared before the committee when was the last time they paid tax. Most of them

could not remember because the last time they paid tax was in the mid 1970s. Billions of dollars in profits did not create one cent in tax. I suggest to the Tory Members that when they are concerned about the deficit, as they should be, they should examine why it exists. It is not because we are spending too much on social programs. It is shameful that we are second to last among all other industrialized countries in the world in terms of the amount we spend on social programs. When the elderly, the sick and the kids are blamed for the deficit, I say double shame.

The New Democratic Party Members on the Finance Committee co-operated with Government Members. I thought we produced a relatively good report. Unfortunately, the Government chose to ignore many of the recommendations of the committee. For example, it chose to ignore our recommendation of an advance corporate tax. It chose to ignore the recommendation of a minimum corporate tax to ensure that a company will indeed pay some tax if it makes a profit.

These companies enjoy a good business climate in this country. They depend upon educated young people to make profits for them and it is the public that has paid for their education. Is it not about time that the corporations paid something back to the public?

These corporations enjoy the road system and railway system in this country. Is it not time they paid for some of that? They enjoy many of the incentives governments have given them in grants and subsidies. Is it not time that they help pay for that?

We have seen the wealthy receive most of the tax breaks under the present Government. Despite all the rhetoric of the Minister of Finance about the unfairness of the existing tax system in which the rich were not paying their fair share and corporations making good profits were not contributing to the national purse, when it comes to the bottom line in Tory tax reform the Minister is taking the same action that he is denouncing. After tax reform, the rich in this country get even greater tax breaks than before.

Although the Government claims it will create more revenue from the corporate sector, already some of the Minister's estimates are out of whack. It is a farce for Government Members to talk about tax reform. It does not even measure up to the Minister's own standards.

It is true that compared to last year many Canadians will pay less tax. However, when we compare that to when the Tories came to power, most Canadians are paying more in tax. The corporations will be paying proportionately less in taxes than before.

When the Tories were elected, corporations made up some 20 per cent of tax revenues. In 1987-88, it was 15.6 per cent. After tax reform, it is projected that 17.2 per cent of all revenues will come from corporations. That is a far cry from the measly 20 per cent that existed before the Tories were elected.

The Minister has not introduced genuine tax reform. In fact, the tax system is even more regressive. Canadians will easily see through this sham, and I suggest they will reject it as they will reject the Government when it gets the courage to call an election and face the electorate. At that time Canadians will make a pronouncement on this Government that the Tories will not like.

Ms. Dewar: Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment my colleague on his analysis of this Bill. We need to consider further the kind of progressive tax policy that is needed in this country. The Government has considered using tax credits rather than tax expenditures. Does a policy of tax credits rather than tax expenditures give a break to the poor?

There are more people living below the poverty line and paying tax now than ever before in the history of Canada. I do not believe it is acceptable to anyone that we ask the poor to pay our bills. We must give consideration to a tax reform system that redistributes income on an equitable basis. Has the Hon. Member considered the difference between tax credits and tax expenditures? Does it make this legislation any more progressive?

• (1900)

Mr. de Jong: That is a very good question. In theory, yes, moving from a deduction to a credit is more progressive. It works in this way. Let us take a $1,000 deduction. If one is paying a tax rate of 50 per cent, a $1,000 deduction is worth $500. However, if one is a low-income earner and only paying, let us say, 25 per cent rate, that $1,000 deduction is only worth $250. The Government is taking away certain items as deductions and making them into credits so that the value of the credits are the same whether one is earning $100,000 and is in the 50 per cent bracket or one is earning $25,000 and is in the 25 per cent bracket. If the credit, let us say, is $200, it will be worth $200 if one is earning $100,000, and it is the same $200 if one is earning $25,000.

Having said that, it is interesting to see what the Minister of Finance and the Tory Government decided to move from a deduction to a credit and what they kept as a deduction. Those items that are important to lower and middle-income Canadians such as the personal exemption, the dependent's exemption and so on became credits. These are not too important to those earning $100,000 and more a year. What is important to them, of course, are the capital gains. What is important to them is the retirement savings plans, the RRSPs. These were not made into credits. These were still deductions.

It is interesting to note that 1 per cent of all taxpayers whose incomes are over $100,000 receive 34 per cent of all the capital gains. Capital gains do not become a credit. That still remains a deduction. Those with the higher incomes are the ones who will benefit. It is the same with retirement savings plans. These were not made into credits. They are still deductions. Those earning $100,000 per year will eventually be able to deduct $15,000 a year. If those people are in the 50 per cent bracket,

that means the Government will forgo some $7,500. Even if one is earning $30,000 and puts half of that into a RRSP, the way the Government has it rigged, they could not even claim that $15,000. But let us say for argument's sake that they could, and they are in the 30 per cent bracket. That $15,000 is only worth one-third or $5,000. It is worth $7,500 to the guy in the 50 per cent bracket but only $5,000 to the guy in the 30 per cent bracket. Again, in terms of capital gains and in terms of retirement plans, these did not become credits, they are still deductions, so while on the one hand we can say that moving personal exemptions into credits is progressive, where it really counted, the Government did not move.

The Government also took away some tax deductions that are important to middle-income earners. It just wiped them out. It did not even change them into credits. For example, the $500 deduction that was previously able to be deducted because of employment expenses is gone. The $1,000 interest deduction is eliminated. These are two deductions that are important to middle-income earners. They are not as important to those earning $100,000 or more per year. Deductions that are important to middle-income earners are gone and deductions that affect the poor have been turned into credits, but deductions that really benefit the rich still remain a deduction. I think that proves my thesis that this legislation is making the income tax system not more progressive but less progressive. It is making it regressive despite what the Minister of Finance initially claimed.

Mr. Redway: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is aware, and I do not think he disputes the fact, notwithstanding his comments, that income tax under this legislation will be reduced for 9.7 million households, over 85 per cent of all households, by an average of $490. He knows, and I do not think he disputes the fact, that about 850,000 lower-income earners will have their income taxes reduced to zero or receive refundable credits in 1988. He knows as well, and I do not think he disputes the fact, that income taxes will be cut for about 1.3 million of the 1.4 million households with at least one person aged 65 or over and about 250,000 elderly Canadians will have their income taxes reduced to zero. I do not think the Hon. Member disputes any of those facts, but he does dispute a good many of the changes that have been made in the legislation.

Would the New Democratic Party eliminate flow-through shares? Would the New Democratic Party eliminate the $500,000 capital gains tax exemption for farmers? Would the New Democratic Party eliminate the deduction for Registered Retirement Savings Plans?

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, in his rhetoric, the Hon. Member wants us to look at 1987-88. He does not want us to look past 1987. He says we are dinosaurs if we talk about 1986 and 1985. Does the Hon. Member want me to totally blank out and not consider the full record of this Government since it was elected in 1984? I do not think that would be quite fair. We have to look at where things were when the Tories were elected and where things are now. It is true that compared to last year, all these people are off the income tax rolls. But did the Hon. Member not hear my address? Perhaps he did not. I pointed out that since 1984, the Tories have added a million people to the income tax rolls.

Mr. Redway: Did you hear my comment about that?

Mr. de Jong: Yes, but that happened before 1987 and I am a dinosaur for looking back prior to 1987.

Mr. Redway: They did not have a job before.

Mr. de Jong: The fact is that you guys dropped the deindexation of the income tax and so all at once a whole bunch of people got moved onto the income tax rolls.

Mr. Redway: Those people were unemployed before.

Mr. de Jong: That is the reason why more people, poor people, ended up paying income tax. For example, let me put on the record that the $3.1 billion that is going to be taken out of the income tax system, or the $3.1 billion that is going to go back into the pockets of people because of the changes in the tax regime because of tax reform, means a savings of $3.1 billion to taxpayers in this country, but with respect to the bottom income group that means 26 per cent of all householders will receive some $257 million in total as a tax break. That is 8 per cent of $3.1 billion.

Twenty-six per cent of all householders will receive 8 per cent of the benefits. The top income group, which represents 2 per cent of all householders, will receive $379 million in tax breaks, or in other words 12 per cent. Twenty-six per cent of the low-income earners will receive 8 per cent of the total tax benefits whereas 2 per cent of the top-income earners will receive 12 per cent of the tax breaks that the Minister of Finance has introduced in this budget.

• (1910)

Is this fairness? Is this equity? Is this what the Minister of Finance talked about when he said: "We all know that the tax system allows many profitable corporations to avoid paying a fair share of tax year after year. We all know that it allows some people with very high incomes to pay less tax than the average Canadian wage earner year after year"? Is that what he meant when he said that the average Canadian taxpayer is paying more taxes than the wealthy? It is a sham.

What this is about, as my figures have indicated, is that low-income Canadians are still paying more and that high-income Canadians are getting even more tax breaks than before tax reform. It is a sham. It does not hold water.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for External Relations): Mr. Speaker, I would point out that my Conservative colleague asked a question to the last NDP Member who had the floor, wanting to know whether an NDP Government would do away with the capital gains tax

exemption for farm producers, whether the NDP Government would abolish—no, he ought to listen instead of shouting—whether an NDP Government would abolish flow-through shares or boost corporate taxes. There was no answer, Mr. Speaker. The NDP Member chose to criticize something else.

But I want to go back a bit further in the debate because my Conservative colleague did raise a very good point, particularly when he referred to the capital gains tax exemption for agricultural producers who, in my opinion and in the opinion of most Members who are genuinely concerned about the nation's business and the public weal, know full well that their $500,000 capital gains tax exemption is not a $500,000 capital gains tax exemption for wealthy people.

This is something our Government had promised in 1984 to help Canada's farm community get back on an even keel, and that is the way we forged ahead thanks to the generosity of the Minister of Finance.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for giving me this opportunity to take part in the debate this evening. I think it is a very important debate, precisely because it deals with the tax reform as set forth in Bill C-139.

Mr. Speaker, some people have their own peculiar vision of what a tax reform should be, but as a responsible Government, a Government whose budgets follow a logical sequence, we simply could not come up with a tax reform featuring every single change which should have been made to the Canadian tax structure. That is so because over the last 20 years there was no major overhaul of our tax system despite the fact that we made significant economic progress and that tax rates underwent some changes, in the sense that corporate taxes declined while personal income taxes increased.

The Opposition, headed by the father of the federal deficit, the leader of the Opposition, not to name him, has accused the Conservative Government of not having done enough. Mr. Speaker, a little history lesson is in order. When we came to power in 1984, the deficit was already over 200 billion dollars divided among all Canadian taxpayers including low-income families and our future generations. In the final analysis, that amount was spent for purely partisan purposes and in an irresponsible manner by a Governement supposedly willing to defend the interests of Canadian consumers.

When we were elected in 1984, Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of our Minister of Finance, we said that we were going to clean up public spending and the facts have proved us right. First of all, we had to bring our spending under control.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) brought down his first budget. Liberal and New Democratic Members said that we would never be able to recover our expenses. They were wrong. We recovered our expenses and we brought the deficit under control.

With the second budget, we reduced the deficit. This year we cut the deficit even further and we introduced tax reform.

Myself and many of my constituents do not understand the New Democrats and the Liberals when they say that tax reform penalizes the poorest families.

Mr. Speaker, I have read the documentation in French and English and found that 850 000 Canadians will no longer be paying any income tax. Indeed, 850 000 low income earners in Canada will not pay taxes any more. And I would respond to my NDP colleague who just made a stupid statement which I find beyond comprehension when he said that the rich are the ones who benefit. Mr. Speaker, those 850 000 low income Canadians are ordinary people who live in my riding, in his riding and in those of my colleagues and who are getting some relief thanks to a Governement which has been able to take charge of public finances, thanks to a Finance Minister who has been able over the last four years to manage budgets rigourously, to lay down within the Civil service, within the departments, budget restraints, more than 70 percent of which have been absorbed by the Governement, regardless of what the two opposition Parties would have us believe . . . That is why, Mr. Speaker, our Government is able, along with the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), to put in place a tax system, a fiscal framework, because we do not claim, as a Government or as a Party, that all problems can be solved in one fell swoop.

We leave the magic wands to the Wonderful World of Disney, which is to say the "World of Broadbent". We act in a rational fashion, Mr. Speaker, and that means controlling spending first and then moving forward progressively with legislation.

We have thus seen over the last four years the Conservative Governement put in place an allowance for widowers aged 60 to 64. The Liberals had promised as much but it took a Conservative Governement to deliver the goods. We have seen an increase in the child tax credit. We have seen social measures for senior citizens. We have seen social measures put in place for low income families. We have also seen, Mr. Speaker, incredible benefits. We only have to think of what our Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) just announced about child care, a very important program for all Canadian families, for all low-income families, for all families that need government assistance. That is the thrust of our tax reform. And that is why we can rightly say in all honesty that the tax reform presented by the Minister of Finance will give low-income Canadians major tax benefits.

People on low incomes, Mr. Speaker, have always been and will always be a special group for our Government, special in that the Governments of our industrialized countries must do their best to help these people.

Despite what the Liberals and New Democrats say about tax reform being meant for the wealthiest individuals and for big corporations that pay no tax . . . For us, Mr. Speaker, as the figures clearly show, tax reform means that 2 million Canadian families will be entitled to a higher refundable credit. Two million Canadian families will have a refundable

credit of $70 instead of $50 for adults and $35 instead of $25 for children.

• (1920)

Mr. Speaker, under this tax reform eight Canadian families out of ten will pay less tax. Certainly the Liberals and the NDP will not make me believe that eight Canadian families out of ten were rich families, privileged families. Certainly there must have been some that were low and middle income families. Eight Canadian families out of ten will pay less tax—this is a courageous move from a responsible Government and it will benefit the neediest, those who deserve a greater amount of Government support.

Mr. Speaker, tax reform in my view is of direct benefit to senior citizens, especially since nine out of ten senior citizens, people of 65, will pay less tax. As a responsible Government, as a Government that has a concern for the last phase of the productive life led by senior citizens, we were obligated, as is the Minister of Finance, to ensure that our senior citizens could profit from that very significant tax system.

Mr. Speaker, we do not boast we will solve or have solved everything. But let me come back for a moment to the income levels at which individuals used to start paying income tax before that tax reform. For a single taxpayer below 65, it was $4,940 before the reform, and after reform it is $6,220. Mr. Speaker, $6,220 does not involve the rich. For a couple under 65, with one source of income, two children of 18 or less, it was $16,670 before tax reform, and after reform it becomes $18,890. For singles 65 or over, before tax reform it was $10,785, and after tax reform it is $11,430. For a married couple 65 or over, it was $16,945 before tax reform, and after tax reform it is $19,010.

Mr. Speaker, I see a Liberal Member opposite who seems to find the reference to those figures funny, but let me tell you that the tax reform provided by this legislation helps Canadians much more than the tax framework under which the Liberals had led us over these last twenty years.

Mr. Speaker, when we say on this side of the House that we took our responsibilities, this is true. And how did we do that? There is the minimum tax for high income-earners. The removal of tax havens for high salaries did not exist under the Liberals, because under the Liberals, Mr. Speaker, people could go and buy yachts, they could buy houses in Florida, they could split capital, they could do almost everything, and they paid no income tax.

Under their Government, Mr. Speaker, people who paid no income tax were the rich. Under this Government, Mr. Speaker, people who pay no income tax after tax reform are the neediest. We can prove that because the supporting figures say that 850,000 low income Canadians no longer pay income tax.

Mr. Speaker, the tax system we knew for years hit Canadians hard. Just think of the billions of dollars Liberals squandered under their infamous scientific research tax credit program, where companies sent billions of dollars through that loophole supposedly for research but which in fact remained in their coffers. Such was the Liberals' social justice.

The Liberals' social justice, Mr. Speaker, also let interest rates jump to 16, 20 and 22 per cent, froze pension increases to 5 and 6 per cent when the inflation rate was 12 or 16 per cent. Such was the Liberals' social justice—letting Canadians sink lower and lower below the poverty level, creating an increasing gap between the rich and the poor, a gap that increasingly favoured the richest to the detriment of the poorest. And now, all of a sudden, as if by a miracle, because this is the appropriate word to be used after 1984, we see on the Liberal side, or what is left of it, Members like the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) who overnight became the champion of widows and orphans.

Mr. Speaker, where was the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie when the Montreal refineries closed their doors? He was sitting comfortably in his office, saying: «I don't bother to defend the workers. I don't bother to defend those who need help. I stand behing my Government. Nowadays, the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie is traveling across Quebec and Canada to say that the Conservative Government in unfair. But, Mr. Speaker, Canadians, and I have met a large number in my riding, are not that easily taken in. They know how much the old tax system established by the Liberal Government has hurt them in recent years. They know about the new tax structure we will apply, which we will have to change from time to time because it is not perfect, we admit it. They know that the better system is the one we proposed through the Minister of Finance, since the Minister thought that the corporations should be paying more. How will we do it? By expanding the tax base and telling corporations: You will now have to bear a larger burden of the expenses incurred by the State, and assume greater social and economic responsibilities towards the State. Canadian taxpayers have done their share during the last years, and, unfortunately, in some cases, they have done too much. It is now your turn to pay your share of the taxes.

At the same time, we said, and the Minister of Finance has confirmed it in writing: Taxpayers will pay less. When they fill in their income tax returns, Canadian taxpayers will owe less money to the federal taxation authorities. Why? Because we have to restore the balance. In order to do so, we cannot change everything at once and redress the system, in other words, go completely into reverse. We have to change things progressively, and that is the object of the tax reform. When applied, the tax reform should, immediately, increase the tax share of corporations and diminish it for individuals. That is why I am proud to say that 850 000 Canadians will no longer pay income tax, that 9 out of 10 Canadians over 65 will no longer pay income tax, that this Government, through its Minister of Finance, will work to make it possible for every

Canadian to save money and increase its purchasing power. We are setting up a new balance.

A while ago, I heard a NDP Member tell us that the Government was favouring corporations at the expense of the needy. One of his colleagues nods in agreement.

Mr. Speaker, some months ago an NDP Member moved a motion in this House blaming the Government for maintaining flow-through shares; now, a few months later, he moved another motion this time calling on the Government to maintain flow-through shares. Mr. Speaker, the situation is such that nobody knows exactly where the New Democratic Party stands any more! Yet, that is exactly what happened and the official record of this House can back me up. A NDP Member rose in the House and accused the Government of being too generous with Canadian corporations with flow-through shares, that it should get rid of them because they favoured the rich at the expense of the poor . . . It is a member of this same party, with a very slight possibility of becoming the next government, who rose and said that the House should blame the Tory Government for removing flow-through shares. That is a blatant evidence of intellectual cowardness at the decision-making level and shows that Canadians should not trust the New Democratic Party.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is also true when we consider that the $500 000 capital gain tax exemption mostly benefits farm producers from all parts of Canada. Our Party does not feel that they are rich, contrary to some high-income people who could certainly afford to pay income tax. No, Mr. Speaker! This is a sector of economic activity which we must assist. And it is for these people that we have implemented the capital gain tax exemptions.

NDP members and some Liberal members are saying that we should abolish that capital gain tax exemptions. Personally, I am against removing the capital gains tax exemption for our farm producers because they need protection and their economic interests should be promoted. We should assist them through regional development and the capital gains tax exemption is a way to achieve that.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I want to say just how proud I am of the Minister of Finance, of the responsibility he has assumed over the past few years, especially through his tax reform, because he has managed to stand on his own two feet, contrary to all the Ministers of Finance before him over the past 20 years. He has given this House and Canada a new direction, a new approach based on income tax fairness, which means that corporations will pay more, that taxpayers will pay less, that the rich will not enjoy tax exemptions and loopholes as they did under Liberal governments, and that this way we will be able to give Canadians a more equitable social system, more suited to their needs and an economy made for them where they will be treated with fairness from coast to coast.

• (1930)

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate.

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for this opportunity to participate in this debate. Perhaps before we proceed much farther we ought to remind ourselves of some of the comments that were made by Conservatives in the election campaign of 1984 in relation to tax reform. We all know that politicians, particularly Conservative politicians, have a tendency to speak with great compassion, in great urgency, but when the time comes to seek concrete and specific action, something is left wanting, something is omitted.

Tax reform. I wonder what Joe Howe would have said of the Conservatives' promises with regard to tax reform. For Members opposite, Joe Howe was a great Nova Scotian. He fought for responsible Government. One of the underlining pinnings of democracy and of responsible Government, as Howe defined it, was the foundation of accountability. When we look at the Government's action, and indeed omissions, as it relates to tax reform, we see very clearly that they must be accountable for their actions and for their lack of actions in other areas of tax reforms to the Canadian people.

Prior to the end of their mandate we have before us Bill C-139. By the words of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson), it is a piece of legislation which supposedly is to be tax reform, but in its substance and in its essence there is not much that will benefit the Canadian people.

Tax reform, as touted by the Leader of the Conservative Party during the last election, was going to be major, substantive. It was going to be effective and equitable for all Canadians. Bill C-139 does not live up to the billings of some four years ago. We should remind ourselves, as well as Canadians, that it was four years ago and then some in the campaign in July and August of 1984 that promises were made to the Canadian people with regard to tax reform. They have not moved with great urgency, they have not tried to facilitate an agenda which would result in major substantive tax reform for Canadians.

It has come at the end of their mandate and just prior to a federal election. The Conservative Government is trying to make Canadians believe that it has been concerned about tax reform and has done something very substantive, hoping that the first 36 months of their administration will be forgotten by the majority of Canadians. Well, it has not been forgotten by the majority of Canadians. That is why I remind government Members that, as Joe Howe fought for the principle of accountability, that principle of accountability will be brought to the forefront in the next election as it relates to their lack of action with regard to the subject of tax reform.

My colleague, the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau), has outlined the reasons and the rationale for

our opposition to some of the measures which are being put forward by the Conservative Government of the day.

In summary, they can be stated in seven reasons. First, we oppose this reform because its intent is merely to have Canadians forget four years of massive tax increases. I will come back to that. It is massive tax increases. Second, because it is unfair, mainly to middle-income Canadians. Third, it does not improve the progressivity of the tax system. Fourth, because it is incomplete. Sales tax reform has been delayed until after the next election.

Is that not a buzz word for this Government? We had the smoke and mirrors, the singing of *When Irish Eyes Are Smiling* in Quebec, with the President of the United States, only to find out some time later that Canadians would be entering into an arrangement with the United States where we would in effect be selling many of our natural resources and, in particular, energy, at a very, very low price.

We oppose this legislation because it makes the tax system more complex, not simpler. It discourages capital formation and it reduces the competitiveness of our corporations, mainly those in the manufacturing sector.

In summary, those are the seven reasons as enunciated and spoken at length by my colleague from Laval-des-Rapides. The new structure of tax rates and tax breaks is not progressive enough. Hon. Members opposite know, and only know too well, that these rates are not enough. The gap between the second and third rate is not large enough—three points only—in comparison to the nine-point difference between the first and second rate.

If you want to be fair and equitable, you must put in place a system which is fair and equitable in order to achieve the end result. Even some Republicans have tried to be progressive, people like Theodore Roosevelt. He talked about tax reform. Yet, there is nothing here to equal some of the statements and sentiments expressed by Ministers of the Crown and Members of Parliament with regard to equity in the tax system.

• (1940)

Three brackets are all there is. Even after tax reform, 60,000 profitable corporations will still pay no tax. I remember posing a question to the Minister of Finance. His response was: "Well, you know, we are trying to do better". Is that what this is all about, Mr. Speaker? I thought there was a substantive package being put forward by the Government of the day.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I think if the Member checks the record he will find that the Minister of Finance's (Mr. Wilson) answer was to the effect that those 60,000 companies lost money at least one if not two or three years prior to that.

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether or not you ruled that that was a point of order.

Mr. Friesen: A point of correction.

Mr. Dingwall: A point of correction says the Hon. Member. Perhaps he could read carefully what *Hansard* reported on that particular day and dissect the response of the Minister of Finance, who often puffed and shifted feet from one day to the next and from one answer to the next and did not respond with any degree of clarity other than to say in terms of his conclusion: "We are trying to do better". Quite frankly, from a Government which promised tax reform, which campaigned on tax reform and received the largest majority of any Canadian Parliament, it has fallen far short, far short, of the promises made to the Canadian people.

Even after the implementation of a minimum tax, 5,220 taxpayers who earned over $50,000 did not pay one cent in tax in 1986. You cannot in all fairness say to the working people, to those people on fixed incomes, that the system is fair when they can readily and easily point to situations where Canadians are not paying one copper in tax. What about the working man or woman who puts in a good day's work for a fair rate of pay? At the end of the week or the end of the month when they collect that pay cheque and find that there are taxpayers making in excess of $50,000 paying nothing while they are paying a substantial amount of taxes, particularly under this Conservative administration, how are they supposed to have faith in the system? There is no faith by many Canadians in this tax system which the Government promised to reform so as to give us some equity.

Of these 5,220 taxpayers, some 40 earned in excess of $250,000. That is a lot of money. It may not be a lot of money to the Minister of Finance, but it is a lot of money to average Canadians across the country whether they reside in Newfoundland, British Columbia, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario or in many parts of western Canada. Contrary to the promises made by the Minister of Finance, the tax system has not been simplified by tax reform at all. We have not seen, although we have asked to see, some demonstrable proof of tax simplification. I think all Members would concur that that has not taken place. Even my colleague who rose on a bogus point of order would concur with that particular sentiment.

Mr. Friesen: Careful now.

Mr. Dingwall: In October, 1986, the Finance Minister affirmed in the document Guidelines for Tax Reform in Canada that one of the guidelines was to make the tax system simpler to make it more readily understood by more Canadians. That has not been achieved. The House of Commons Finance Committee concluded its chapter on simplification by stating, and I quote for the Hon. Member who rose on the previous point of order: "It is disappointing for the committee to draw the inevitable conclusion that the proposed tax reform has not successfully addressed the problem of simplifying the tax system". That is found at page 136 of that report. An all-Party committee clearly, and by a process of consensus, reached that conclusion.

I commenced my remarks, and I believe I have only a few moments left, by referring to a principle enunciated by a great

Nova Scotian in the person of Joe Howe who fought for responsible Government, particularly for the principle of accountability. Let us today as a Chamber account for the Conservative record over the last four years with regard to taxes. The record must be corrected, as I am sure the Hon. Members opposite would at every opportunity. With regard to sales tax, in October, 1984, we had a 1 per cent increase in that tax. The effect was $1 billion in revenues for the Government of Canada. In January, 1986, that tax went from 10 per cent to 11 per cent, which brought in another $1 billion for the Government of Canada. This tax rose from 11 per cent to 12 per cent on April 1, 1986, which brought in another $1 billion. Since the Conservatives have been in power, the sales tax has gone from 9 per cent to 12 per cent, costing Canadians some $3 billion. Where is the fairness, Mr. Speaker? We know that the sales tax affects and hurts those Canadians least able to afford it.

The Government extended the sales tax to such things—old Mr. Scrooge himself, the Minister of Finance—as candy, soft drinks, health goods, dental instruments and snack foods. That is what the Minister of Finance did. On July 1, 1985, this cost Canadian taxpayers $400 million. In July, 1987, there was an additional $60 million in taxes collected, for a total of $460 million. That is what the Minister of Finance did for kids. He put tax on candies for children. That shows you how tough, how determined our Minister of Finance is with regard to fairness in the tax system. He said to the four and five year olds and to the nine and ten year olds across this country that the Government would have to charge them more for their Crispy Crunch. What a complete and utter joke.

Yesterday I referred to the Conservative Cabinet as the Keystone Kops. Another prime example of the Tories wonderful achievements in the last four years was to say to four and five year olds: "I am sorry, the deficit has to be cleared up and you will have to pay for it. Get into line. We need to have more taxes on candies".

We have had increases in sales tax from 8 per cent to 12 per cent on paint and wallpaper and, oh, yes, a tax on toys. It was not enough to hit the kids for candies, the Government had to go after kids' toys. That was done in January, 1988, for a total of $60 million. Of course, there were increases in the excise tax on gasoline. Listen to this, Mr. Speaker. On September 3, 1985 there was a raise of 2 cents a litre on gasoline for a total of $900 million. On January 1, 1987, we had a 1 cent increase for a total of $450 million. That was duplicated again on February 19, 1987, for another $450 million. Again on April 1, 1988, there was another $450 million. That is some accountability on the actions of the Government of the day. It goes on and on and on.

• (1950)

In conclusion, Sir, it is quite obvious that when Canadians stop and reflect on what has taken place over the last four years and the proliferation of tax increases, compared to what is proposed in this Bill, they will find that the Government has again broken its promise to them. I find it very upsetting indeed that the Government would place an undue burden on certain elements of our society while it allows certain others, the more fortunate, further tax benefits and holidays. The Government does not care enough to try to resolve the problem.

Those are some of the reasons why I oppose this measure and why it is important that we make the Government accountable for all its actions over the last four years, not just the last few months because we are nearing an election.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments.

Mr. Redway: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member quoted Joseph Howe, a famous politician and statesman from Nova Scotia, and said that he fought for the principle of accountability. That is a principle I certainly believe in very strongly and I was most interested to hear the Hon. Member refer to it. He also indicated that this Government should be held accountable for its record of the last four years.

It is also interesting to note, and I know the Hon. Member will find it interesting also, that his leader served as Minister of Finance from January, 1972, to September, 1975, a period of four years similar to the period of time the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) has served. I know the Hon. Member will be aware that during the time the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) was Minister of Finance the deficit rose by $4 billion, while during the current Government's four years the deficit has been cut by $9 billion.

He will know as well that total spending when his leader served as Minister of Finance increased by 107 per cent, whereas during this Government's time in office total spending has increased by only 21 per cent. He will know as well that when his leader was Minister of Finance the prime interest rate rose 3.75 per cent, while in the last four years it has fallen 3.25 per cent.

He will know as well that the inflation rate while his leader was Minister of Finance doubled from 5.1 per cent to 10.6 per cent, but over the last four years it has remained stable at about the 4 per cent range.

He will know as well that while his leader served as Minister of Finance the number of unemployed climbed by 164,000, while in the last four years the number of unemployed has fallen by 430,000.

He will also know, I am sure, that during the four years the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition was Minister of Finance, personal income tax revenues rose by 76 per cent. During the last four years, personal income tax revenues will have increased by only 55 per cent. That means that personal income tax revenues rose 38 per cent more under his leader than under the current Government.

Does the Hon. Member agree with me that his leader, his Party, and he himself should be held accountable for those things as well?

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member alluded to certain figures which he may have pulled out of his hat or the hat of a colleague, but it is very clear to anyone who has entered Parliament in the last 10 to 15 years that we have been held accountable, just as the Hon. Member and his colleagues will be held accountable in the next federal election. He will, as we have in previous elections, have to account for the expenditure plan, account for deficits, account for tax increases, account for social programs introduced, account for assistance given to the elderly, account for the various programs dealing with housing, energy, and a host of other things that were put before the Canadian people who will adjudicate accordingly.

However, I suggest to the Hon. Member that if he is going to try and provide bogus arguments about a previous government, hoping that Canadians will somehow forget these last four years, he is making a mistake. His Government was given the largest mandate the Canadian people have given any Government based on a promise of, among other things, substantive tax reform. Yet the complete opposite has occurred.

What has happened? On January 1, 1986, family allowances were deindexed along with the income tax rates at a cost of $635 million. We had the elimination of the federal tax reduction on January 1, 1986, $650 million. We had elimination of the deduction for the registered home ownership savings plan, $105 million, on May 22, 1985. The list goes on and on and on. It is obvious to Canadians that this group which was trusted to run this country has clearly and unequivocally come down on the side of the corporate sector. That infringes, in many instances, on the average working man and woman in this country.

The Hon. Member can twist, do the limbo, rock and roll, the Crosbie shuffle or the Wilson two-step, but it ain't gonna help because he will be held accountable for the four years his Government has spent in office.

The Government has fallen miserably. It has lost the trust of Canadians from one coast to the other. They think you are shysters. They do not believe you. All they remember of the Government is scandal, not tax reform. Hon. Members are coming to life now because the truth hurts. It hits them in the heart because Canadians have seen time after time, whether it be deindexing senior citizens' pensions, or a proliferation of goodies for the Conservatives' corporate friends, this has been a rape of the middle class. You shall be accountable and we shall run in the next election shoulder to shoulder on what you have done over the last four years.

• (2000)

Ms. Dewar: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member was talking about accountability. I certainly think that accountability is important. However, I am wondering whether the Member has considered the accountability of the Government's response to the deindexation of the family allowance and the increase in taxes for families with children versus working couples with no children.

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, that is a very sensible question regarding a very important problem which had a dramatic and devastating effect on a lot of low-income families across the country. I know there are big shots in this House of Commons who make a lot of money, or have made a lot of money. However, we must recognize that a lot of Canadians are living from paycheque to paycheque and scraping by. Some of them are going to food banks. Some of them find it very difficult, as a result of the legislation and actions of the Conservative Government, to find enough money to buy snowsuits and boots for their kids in the wintertime and to provide them with enough money to go to a show on the weekend. Of course, if you are a Conservative and are poor you should not have any entertainment; entertainment should only be for the select few who can afford it.

The impact has been very substantial indeed. People who are scraping to make ends meet are, in some instances, aided by provincial and municipal Governments, but the fact remains that they are not living on the types of salaries referred to earlier in debate which go by tax-free. Not as partisan politicians, but as thinking Canadians, we must realize that it is no wonder that large numbers of Canadians believe they are being ripped off and have legitimate and profound concerns about the tax measures of the Government.

It does not take a very tough Minister of Finance to tell a four-year old that the tax is going to be increased on Juicy Fruit gum. However, it underlines that the Government has no heart, that it does not care. It cares only about its friends, its corporate Tory friends.

The Minister of Communications (Miss MacDonald) rose in this House one time when in opposition and read a letter from a constituent from another part of the country, I think it was North Sydney, who talked about the lack of heart of the then Government. What about the Government's attempt to deindex the pensions of senior citizens?

Mr. Nunziata: She's leaving; she can't take the truth.

Mr. Dingwall: The truth hurts. The fact is that not on one occasion, not on two occasions, and not on three occasions but repeatedly the Government has singled out the middle-class Canadians, the poor, and those on fixed incomes to bear the brunt of government action while its corporate Tory friends get away scott-free.

I could name those friends but I do not want to get into a game of sleaze politics prior to an election. We will save that for the hustings. In the election campaign the Government will be accountable for its actions and inactions with regard to its corporate Tory friends. What John Diefenbaker said that dogs do to poles is what is going to happen to the Government.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate. The Hon. Member for Abitibi (Mr. St-Julien).

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take part in the debate on the advantages of tax reform and to go on to more serious matters, after listening to the Hon. Member for the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, I think I can safely state that most Members in this House are in favour of tax reform, in other words, a thorough revision of our tax system. Today's debate is about choosing the approach that is fair to the largest possible number of Canadian taxpayers.

The new legislation on tax reform is simply a reflection of the basic principles of lower tax rates and a broader and fairer tax base. The fairness of our system is the main concern of Canadian men and women. In fact, they will judge the new system in terms of this fundamental principle.

During the last ten years, Mr. Speaker, the system has failed to meet the legitimate expectations of Canadians with respect to fairness. So many people are wondering why their neighbour, who earns more than they do, is paying less in taxes. And why does the system contain so many loopholes that are of little benefit to the average Canadian unless he or she can afford to spend a lot of money on accountants and lawyers?

When the present Government came to power, we asked ourselves the same questions and, like so many Canadians, we were not satisfied with the answers. Consequently, we have eliminated a number of loopholes. The scam of the century was the scientific research tax credit program introduced by Marc Lalonde. We can say today, and we will say it again during the election campaign, that this was the scam of the century in Canada during the past twenty-five years.

Mr. Speaker, we introduced a minimum tax for Canadians on high incomes. We limited the option of redistributing income among members of the same family. We got rid of certain tax shelters involving investments in consumer goods such as yachts and pleasure vehicles. We put an end to the serious abuse of tax credits mentioned earlier, the scientific research tax credit of Mr. Lalonde.

However, in order to provide for a system whose fairness and effectiveness would be in line with the expectations of Canadian men and women, a complete revision of personal and corporate income tax and sales tax was necessary.

Mr. Speaker, Canadians told us that above all, they wanted their system to be fair and that they didn't want the majority of taxpayers to be deprived of certain advantages for the sake of a small group.

They told us that corporations and private citizens on high incomes should pay their fair share of income tax. They told us that people in the same income bracket should pay substantially the same amount of income tax. They said that above all, Canadians on low incomes, especially the elderly, deserved fairer treatment.

Mr. Speaker, our tax reform reflects the desires of Canadian men and women. Perhaps I may point to one particular aspect of the reform which I feel illustrates the general principle of fairness which has been our constant guide. I am referring to benefits for the elderly.

Tax reform certainly meets the needs and aspirations of all Canadians, but it is especially beneficial for people 65 and over.

As of 1988, nine out of ten senior households will pay less income tax. In other words, about 1.3 million of the 1.4 million households that have at least one person aged 65 or over will pay less income tax. Furthermore, nearly 250,000 seniors will no longer pay income tax. That is what this Government has done and what is really important for our seniors.

The minimum income subject to income tax for seniors has also been changed. Depending on the type of income, the minimum for single people will be $11,430, or $645 more. For married couples, the minimum will rise by more than $2,000, to $19,010.

These changes are due to the reduction in tax rates and the conversion of personal exemptions and some deductions into tax credits.

This conversion is particularly beneficial for people aged 65 and over. Indeed, it is largely because of the greater value of credits that more than 90 per cent of senior households will pay less income tax.

Mr. Speaker, income tax credits will make the system fairer and more progressive. Members of this House know that exemptions are worth more to high-income individuals because they can reduce income that is subject to a higher marginal tax rate. On the other hand, credits directly reduce the amount of tax that seniors have to pay. They are worth the same for all taxpayers. For example, the new age credit for people 65 and over will be $550 in 1988. This represents a tax decrease of $550, whatever the level of income. It is a considerable additional tax saving for most seniors, because the exemption that the new credit replaces would only have been worth $450 for an individual declaring a taxable income under $25,500.

But for senior citizens with income of $55 000 or over, the former exemption would have been $775. Since some 80 per cent of senior taxpayers are at the bottom tax bracket, the new credit for the great majority of them means a significant improvement in terms of system fairness. Also, the basic personal exemption, that of the spouse and the disability credit all are worth more for most senior citizens than the exemptions they replace. Converting the pension income deduction into a 17 per cent credit up to a maximum $170 will still benefit those senior citizens whose taxable income is below $25 500. For most Canadians 65 and over, those credits will largely compensate for the elimination of the $1 000 deduction for investment income.

Mr. Speaker, certain other deductions involving senior citizens also will be converted into income tax credits:

-The deduction for medical expenses becomes a 17 per cent credit. All taxpayers whose medical expenses are not covered by insurance will also enjoy the same income tax reduction;

—The new credits for tuition fees and student expenses applicable to post-secondary students involve a significant change: The unused portion of the first $600 of those credits can be transferred to the spouse, parent or grandparent who assumes the maintenance costs of the student;

—The new, two-tier credit for charity is not only fairer to all taxpayers, it should also generate higher charitable contributions.

Low-income seniors also benefit from the increased sales tax credit. The level of family income at which that credit begins to decrease in value has been raised by $1 000 to $16 000.

I would also like to take this opportunity to mention the fact that the Minister of State (Seniors), the Hon. Member for Northumberland (Mr. Hees), recently published a book.

> This publication was made possible by seniors themselves. They suggested that I publish a complete, detailed guide with every possible information on federal programs available to them.
>
> This idea . . .

As he states in his message . . .

> . . . strongly appealed to me and you can now see the results. Your comments on that guide will furthermore be welcome because they can be included into the later revised editions.

As maybe seen in this book, reference will be made to income security, such as Old Age Security programs, Old Age Security pensions, Guaranteed Income Supplement, spouse's allowance, the Canada Pension Plan and all other provincial programs.

This is a publication the Hon. Minister of State (Seniors) had prepared for every Canadian man and woman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure all senior citizens that tax reform will not affect the Old Age Security program. The Guaranteed Income Supplement and the spouse's allowance will remain tax free. Canada Pension Plan and Quebec Pension Plan benefits will not be affected. Finally, the unused portion of the age credit and pension income credit will remain transferable, just as the exemptions they replace.

Mr. Speaker, some senior citizens who earn high dividends or capital gains or have access to other tax benefits will have to pay a fairer share of taxes. However, those people usually earn high incomes. They will still benefit from the reductions in the tax rates and will have an advantage over wage-earners and those who receive basic pension revenues, but they will pay an amount of tax which is closer to what people with comparable earnings make. That is only fair.

As my colleague from Champlain (Mr. Champagne) was saying earlier, the entire $500,000 capital gains exemption will continue to apply to allowable agricultural equipment. This will be of great benefit to retired farmers who often cannot build up a pension fund. This exemption also covers capital gains from small business shares.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Government's tax reform lives up to the high expectations of Canadians as far as fairness goes. All things considered, it will allow the vast majority of Canadians to pay less tax, senior citizens being the main beneficiaries.

As I mentioned at the beginning of my speech, our Government has eliminated the tax shelters. To think that the Auditor General of Canada stated in September 1987 that under the Liberals billions of dollars had been wasted. Indeed, the then Minister of Finance learned, in early 1984, that there were problems with the R&D Tax Deduction Program. He was warned again of the situation around the middle of the year, and several warnings were made by public servants to all the Federal Liberal Members under the Trudeau and Turner régimes. Public servants had warned them that a lot of money was being wasted through this tax shelter. Had they intervened earlier they could have saved a lot of money, and I am talking about billions of dollars.

I noticed as well that there was a feature article that same year in the magazine *L'Actualité*, and my colleague and friend from York East (Mr. Redway) told the standing committee it was the fraud of the century, an unprecedented embezzlement carried out by the Government itself.

That is quite a conclusion . . . when the Liberals raise the spectre of scandal and immorality. We too will have a chance during the election campaign to say exactly what happened concerning this $1.9 billion swindle. We could have built 50 hospitals throughout Canada with that kind of money, we could have built community centres for elderly Canadians, we could have built social centres for senior citizens. Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of deals we must unveil before the public. That is what happened in 1984.

In conclusion I would urge all Members of the House to join me and support the tax reform, an outstanding initiative for Canadian men and women as well as for all elderly people in this country. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

• (2010)

[*English*]

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a comment and then pose a question to the Hon. Member. My comment concerns the scientific research tax credit.

I agree with the Hon. Member's statement that the scientific research tax credit turned out to be a complete waste and an abuse. This initiative that first began under the Liberals was a scam that resulted in a loss of roughly $1.5 billion.

The Hon. Member was quite right that the Liberals were warned. However, I do not quite understand why the Conservatives took almost a year to shut down this tax credit. The Conservatives were elected in September, 1984. In October,

1984, the Minister of Finance tried to implement a restriction, but he also allowed a grandfathering clause. This meant, for example, that if the Hon. Member and I had a scientific research agreement written on the back of an envelope, the research credit would be honoured.

Statistics will show that of the approximate $3 billion lost on the scientific research tax credit scheme, over $1 billion of it was while the Tories were in power. Had they shut it down completely in October, 1984, we could have saved $1 billion. However the Minister waited until May, 1985, when he finally realized the types of abuses that were occurring, to shut it down. What he did in May of 1985, he should have done in October of 1984. Had he done that in October of 1984, he would have saved over $1 billion. We made that point in the fall of 1984, but the Minister of Finance said that a commitment was made, that after all this was the law, and that the liberals had allowed it to be. In other words, he was saying that a commitment was made and even though there was all this abuse he could not shut it down. He left in the grandfathering clause and that cost Canadian taxpayers a further $1 billion. This went on until it became so obscene that he finally just had to shut the whole thing down, regardless of what previous agreements had been made.

• (2020)

That was the comment I wanted to make. I come now to the question I want to pose to the Hon. Member. The Hon. Member stated what all government Members state when they echo the Minister of Finance. We all know that it allows some people with very high incomes to pay less tax year after year than the average Canadian wage earner. The Hon. Member stated as well that higher-income earners should pay more taxes. Therefore, is tax reform fair when it results in a family which earns over $100,000 a year receiving a tax break of $1,615 and families with an income of between $30,000 and $40,000 receiving only an income tax break of some $320? Is that what the Government means by "higher-income Canadians paying more tax"? Tax reform in this form means that those earning $100,000 or more receive a tax break of $1,600 while the average income earner earning between $30,000 and $40,000 will only receive a tax break of some $320.

Is it fair that under this particular tax proposal 175,000 families whose incomes are over $100,000 a year will be receiving an average tax break of $365, compared with a $90 tax break for families earning less than $15,000 a year? Is it fair when the tax reform so obviously favours the rich and is only of minimum help to the poor?

Ms. Dewar: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we have a quorum in the House at the moment, do we?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We do have a quorum now. The Hon. Member for Abitibi.

[*Translation*]

Mr. St-Julien: Mr. Speaker, it is a good intervention on the part of the NDP Member. She forgot to count Government Members, she counted Members on her side only and we can see for ourselves that the NDP does not have a quorum. That is what we understood. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before answering the question of the Hon. Member of the New Democratic Party, I should like to point out something to him, particularly in connection with Marc Lalonde's scientific research tax deduction program. Referring to *La Presse* of Wednesday, September 30, 1987, for we know Opposition Members in the House often draw inspiration from daily newspapers or the *Quorum* . . . I will go back a little further, back to Wednesday, September 30, 1987 where it says:

> The Liberals are responsible for the fact that Canadians lost billions of dollars.
>
> In a statement yesterday Auditor General Ken Dye said that without valid reason the former Liberal Government, mesmerized by the political situation, made Canadian taxpayers lose billions of dollars.

During his press conference, Auditor General Dye went on to say:

> Had they intervened earlier they could have saved a lot of money. I mean a lot of money.

It was stated in the motion from my NDP colleague that the Government of the day, the Conservative Party, had done nothing! But I have to say, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect for my colleague from the NDP that what is mentioned in the news report is as follows, and I quote:

> But so far the program, which was cancelled by the Conservative Governement shortly after it came to power, amounts to $3.5 billion . . .

It is clearly stated in the *La Presse* article. We must rely on articles written by newspapermen and in this one which is written by Canadian Press, it is clearly mentioned that this is shortly after the Conservative Governemnt came to power, the Canadian Governement, under the leadership of the one who has been showing us how to run an economy in the last four years, how to take up the challenge at home, how to build an economy with the future of our children in mind, the right Honourable Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney). In other words, this is a $1.9 billion rip-off.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell my NDP colleague that he is right to say that this has cut into . . . Mr. Speaker, I have not finished . . .

In my speech, and I am aware of the fact that many are looking forward to speaking . . . I spoke mainly about senior citizens. And that is what is really important.

M. Boudria: Fine, say no more!

Mr. St-Julien: Single people over 65 years of age . . . for a 65 year old couple with two children, the base was $4 440 before the reform and $6 220 after.

But to answer his question, in the case of senior citizens in Canada, not many are earning $100 000 in pension income. Not many have $100 000 in the bank.

The subject of my speech was senior citizens and fiscal reform, a reform which was put in place by a very competent government and which is truly fantastic for Canadian men and women, for seniors.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate with the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain.

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate on tax reform. I have in front of me some criteria on how we should test tax reform. First, the burden of income and consumption taxes should be removed from low-income families and individuals. Canadians with incomes below the median or mid-way point for 1987, an estimated $13,000 for a single person and $42,000 for a family of four, should pay less total taxes, both income and consumption taxes. Only the taxpayer with an above average income should bear a heavier over-all tax burden under the new system. Tax reform must restore full indexation of tax brackets and credits, and the tax mix should not be altered to get more revenue from the regressive sales tax and less from income tax, which is the only progressive part of the over-all tax system. That is fairly clear. It is not too complicated a way of being able to judge legislation for tax reform.

We have looked over the years at what has happened to the tax system in Canada. There is no question in our minds that we certainly have ourselves into such a boondoggle that it is very difficult to get out of it. I think we need to look at some kind of criteria to see how we are to do it. Canadians must be terribly insulted by the kinds of reform the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) has brought before this House. It is not reform. One thing we have done is to recognize the fact that additional revenues should not dependent on sales tax. As we look at the Bill before us, we find that more and more people with adequate incomes will have their taxes reduced. Sure, we have reduced the brackets from ten brackets to three brackets, but it is looking more and more like the flat income tax which the Fraser Institute, that right wing institute, wanted to implement over the years. The rich Conservatives certainly ascribe to that kind of philosophy and policy, but it is not the kind of policy average Canadians want to have implemented.

• (2030)

We must recognize that in 1984 when the Government came into office it said that it wanted to be fair and honest. It promised tax reform. If it had said since then that it had changed its mind and was not going to go ahead with it and that it would reduce taxes for the rich, then that would be okay. What is most upsetting is the sneaky way that this measure has been introduced. There has been a lot of rhetoric with respect to the introduction of this Bill.

If we look at what the Bill is all about, we see that what is being done is that a burden is being laid on the poor. A family earning $10,000 which was not paying any tax up until now will be paying about $1,100 to $1,200 in taxes in the form of sales tax in the next year.

What upsets me even more is that the return of taxes which was to be implemented January 1 will not come into operation until July 1. If the Government really thinks that Canadians are that gullible, then it has a great surprise coming to it. The electorate is not stupid. The electorate understands on what it is paying taxes and to whom it is paying them. Members of the public know that they will be getting a rebate even though they have been paying more taxes in the last four years than they have ever paid before. They will receive a rebate on July 1. That will be retroactive to January 1. That is an insult to their intelligence. It is a crass political operative type of program.

If we look at the loopholes about which the Government brags about closing, we know that some of them do not come into effect until 1991. What the Government is really saying is that perhaps after the next election we will be able to change the minds of some of the politicians and we will be able to continue with our tax breaks. That is not any way to run a railroad, and it is certainly not any way to run a country.

What Canadians have been looking at over the years in terms of tax reform is fairness and honesty. I travelled across the country when I was in another position which I held before I came here looking at the tax system. What I heard from Canadians right across the country was: "We do not mind paying taxes. But we really do object to knowing that people who are much better off than we are are paying less taxes than what we are paying". Canadians are not selfish or greedy. Perhaps the top 2 per cent of income earners might be. Perhaps their *modus operandi* is to ensure that they pay less tax and keep more for themselves. On the whole, as a society, we have clearly demonstrated over the years that we do not mind redistributing our income.

Another item which disturbs me is some of the rhetoric being used with regard to accountability and having to be careful in the corporate sector. The Auditor General for years has asked to have an accountability with regard to tax expenditures come forward to this House. In this way, for instance, if there was a tax expenditure in place we would know whether it was doing its job or not. The reason we have got into the science and film industry and other areas which have not necessarily worked is because there was no accountability and no measuring. To allow a tax exemption and not to look at its merits and not to see what it is doing to stimulate whatever industry it was put there for simply does not make sense.

We have heard that corporations are not paying taxes because three or four years ago they lost money and therefore they cannot afford to pay. If I had been unemployed for a couple of years and I consequently became employed, National Revenue would not say to me: "Because you did not have any

income for two or three years you do not have to pay any income tax this year". That is something which does not make any sense.

The rhetoric which has been used in the introduction of this Bill has been an attempt to make the system look very complex so that the ordinary person cannot understand it. The ordinary person can understand finances. They know how to run their country. They care about what happens to their public dollar. They will not be had by this type of façade that says that we now have in front of us tax reform. We do not have that.

I have heard members of the Government say that they cannot tax corporations too high because if that is done there will be no incentive for reinvestment. It has been said that initiatives will be discouraged. Studies have shown that a measure of this type does not provide incentives to business. The level of taxation on corporations has no effect on whether or not they will reinvest.

In this respect we need only consider Japan, which has a very high level of productivity. The tax level in Japan is at 86 per cent. We realize that with this policy we do not have to be afraid to redistribute the income where there are massive profits being made. I will never understand the reluctance of people after they get into public office who say that, yes, it is an unfair system and, yes, we have to do something about it, and lo and behold they do nothing about it.

I know that there is a heavy dependency on the bureaucrats and the advisers when we have these types of Bills put before us. I think that our professionals should be well paid. I think politicians should be able to live within an adequate standard of living. I am not into a martyr syndrome at all. However, if we look at the people who deal with this type of policy, as well as every Member in this House—and I am not talking in a partisan way—we see that we are living a lot better than a lot of people living in our constituencies. The people who draw up these Bills very often have not been in that two room or three room accommodation where there are two or three children. They do not recognize that those people are still paying taxes.

I cannot express to Hon. Members how much it upsets me when I realize that very low-income people are paying taxes. By flattening out the tax system and by going to a consumption tax what we are really doing is saying: "Okay, poor, you have paid some now but we are really going to get you every time you buy something—and you can't wait for a sale because you do not have any extra cash. We'll get you then. You'll have to pay at that point in time". That is not a compassionate type of policy. This is not a compassionate type of Bill.

More important, this is not an intelligent piece of legislation when we consider it in terms of reinvestment in our country and in terms of stimulating the economy through the tax system. What we have in front of us is a Bill that does not provide us with the type of accountability for which we are looking. It is a Bill which states that we do not have to measure what the incentives were.

A great many of my constituents in Hamilton Mountain are over the age of 65. I have heard various Members of the House address the income of senior citizens. Wiping out the $1,000 investment exemption does not mean a thing to people who have large incomes and large investments. For the ordinary working person who has invested, for example, seniors who are receiving $1,000 annually, they have looked at it as part of their income. As one gentleman said to me, it has been the way in which he has been able to provide Christmas for his family. He knows that with this money he can get things for his grandchildren and feel comfortable about it. Now that $1,000 is gone. It is being taxed. When bureaucrats look at those types of things and decide that they have to get rid of some exemptions, they take a whole page and get rid of them. Not a lot of thought went into the recommendation to take away that $1,000. It is not the upper-income earner who is hurt, it is the ordinary person who is hurt by that type of policy.

• (2040)

There has been much talk about the number of people who will drop from the tax lists. We must look at the number of people who came onto the tax roll since 1984. All of a sudden they are to be dropped and we say that that is good. That does not make any sense. That is not reform, but regression to where we were. I hear the Conservatives saying that they want to be different from the Liberals, and they are going back to where the Liberals were. That is not what we want.

Certainly, if we are going to look at tax reform, we must look at starting to pay taxes at the upper end of our society so that income tax is used as a real tool for redistribution of income. We should not play games with each other. We have a very rich country with many resources. Yet 40 per cent of the clients of the soup kitchens in our major cities are children. Here we have a tax Bill in front of us that is putting a burden on families with children, and is kinder to a two-income couple who are childless. That is not the type of tax reform that Canadians are looking for.

To redistribute the income we must look at who taxes are hitting most. When we burden the poor we are making society non-functioning, and putting a bigger burden on people generally. The cry for more housing is heard. Surely no one present does not recognize the fact that soup kitchens are a cancer in our society and in our cities. People are lining up at soup kitchens and are beholden to each one of us for the crumbs from our table, and we are sitting here with a tax Bill where our own tax rate will be reduced. Most of us are at the upper end of the scale and we will pay less. Sure, it is great for us, but what is happening to the population is really hurting. They are not getting any breaks from this Bill. All they will receive are more burdens.

Further, there is an attempt by the Government to put a veil around all of this. It states that it will go to the second step after the election; the second step after we know we have you

and we will really lay it on you. I have news for the Government. Canadians are not that gullible and they certainly will not swallow that.

We must seriously look at some of the companies that are not paying any tax at all. I have here a list for 1986 of income figures for certain companies. In 1986 Alcan Aluminum on income totalling $220 million received a tax credit of $32 million; Brascan on income totalling $187 million received a tax credit of $2.3 million; Power Financial on income of $132 million received a tax credit of $1 million; Xerox Canada on income totalling $115 million received a tax credit of $10.8 million. I am sure we all contribute to that company's income in our offices. Bramalea on an income totalling $51 million, no taxes were paid; Wardair on an income totalling $70 million, no taxes were paid. In 1987 Carena-Bancorp on income totalling $37 million, no taxes were paid. Hudson's Bay Company, a company we all contribute to as consumers, had income totalling $50 million, and a tax credit of $15.7 million; Seco-Camp on income totalling $43 million, no taxes were paid; Union Carbide Canada on income totalling $28 million, no taxes were paid.

These are not the types of policies that we think are tax reform. We certainly do think that there are resources in this country, and that we can redistribute that economy in a more fair way in order that every Canadian citizen has the ability to have a quality of life with some dignity.

I am certainly not giving any credit to the Liberals because they got us into this mess. They started with the tax expenditures and there was no accountability. When the Carter Commission was conducted in 1967 it was appointed by a Tory Government. When it came to reporting predominantly business commission and it was decided that there must be accountability in the tax system, Bay Street got into the act. The lobbying took place and they all backed away. Who was hurt? The ordinary Canadian. We knew in 1967 that we were in a mess and we dug ourselves deeper and deeper into it. We are giving more corporate give-aways and consistently putting a greater burden on the poor. That is not tax reform. The people of Canada will not be fooled by it.

Mr. Redway: The Hon. Member had quite a bit to say on the question of fairness of the tax reform package with respect to low-income Canadians. I know that the Hon. Member would not want to leave the impression that this particular Bill and the tax reform package before the House is not going to be of assistance to low-income families, and to all families.

Miss MacDonald: Of course they would like to leave that impression. That is exactly the impression they would like to leave.

Mr. Redway: I certainly hope that we can correct that tonight, if that's the impression that they want to leave.

The Hon. Member is well aware that, for a single individual under 65 before tax reform the threshold of tax, that is, where the income that can be earned by a single individual under 65 before he or she starts paying any taxes prior to tax reform was $4,940; after tax reform it is $6,220. In the case of a married one-earner couple under 65 with two children 18 and under, which is a pretty typical case, prior to tax reform that family started paying tax when their total income was $16,770. After tax reform they will not start paying tax until the income is $18,890.

Mr. Cassidy: That is $5,000 before the poverty line.

Mr. Redway: I know the Hon. Member wants to talk and he will have the opportunity to ask a question when I am finished. I hope that he will allow me to ask my question.

In the case of a single individual aged 65 and over prior to tax reform he or she started paying tax at $10,785; after tax reform it will be $11,430. In the case of a married couple aged 65 and older, before tax reform they started paying tax at $16,945; after tax reform they will not start paying tax until they have earned some $19,010. There is a substantial difference, and the Hon. Member is quite well aware of that. I am sure that she does not want to leave a false impression.

• (2050)

There are some other facts as well that I know that she is aware of and that she would not want to leave a false impression about. One has to do with what is happening again with the tax cuts for couples, both earning income, with two children 18 and under. In fact, the tax refunds go up for people earning a family income of $10,000, by $280 for a $15,000-a-year couple. They go up for a $20,000-a-year couple by 59 per cent. That is a percentage of tax of 59 per cent.

In the case of a family earning $25,000, it goes up by 21.6 per cent. I am drawing to a close, but as your income goes up the percentage of savings goes down. At $30,000, it is only 11.4 per cent. At $75,000 it is only 5.9 per cent. I know that the Hon. Member does not want to leave a false impression. I know that she wants to stand up now to correct that false impression and to make it quite clear that not only are Canadians going to benefit under this tax reform package, but they will have already benefited under the economic policies of the Government as there has been a reduction in the number of Canadians living below the poverty level since it took office of 525,000 people.

In addition, the average family income has climbed, in spite of tax changes, by $1,600 in real terms since this Government took office. I know that the Hon. Member wants to correct the record and to applaud the Government for its fine work.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Dewar: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do want to correct the Hon. Member's record. One of the things that I opened with was looking at five basic points of what good tax reform is. One of them was was that tax reform must restore full indexation of tax credits, in brackets.

Certainly, if you look at the falling threshold you recognize that tax reform will provide only a temporary respite from the downward trend in the tax-paying threshold for the simple reason that deindexation has taken place. It also depends on where you are comparing it from, whether from 1984 or from 1988. After all the regressive policies have been put in, from 1984 to 1988 you will see that it makes a big difference. However, if you just take 1988, you will see that it lifts the tax threshold up to $5,971, or 54 per cent of the poverty line. But partial indexation of the tax system pushes it back down after 1988. By 1991, federal income tax applies to earnings of $5,448, or just under half the poverty line.

I think that it is an absolute disgrace that this Government is constantly trying to mislead the Canadian people, and when they are talking about a tax threshold that has been—

An Hon. Member: What is the assumption?

Ms. Dewar: The assumptions are the deindexation that has taken place, and we are looking at about 4 per cent. It is the same as you are doing. What you are saying, if you wanted this tax reform to be able to sustain itself so that people would be better off, is you would keep the deindexation in place. By deindexing, what you have done is wiped out the ability to be able to sustain that plateau. Of course, if there is no inflation, your index rate would be there. But you have taken that away.

An Hon. Member: What is the difference?

Ms. Dewar: What you have done is made everybody vulnerable. It is insidious that this Government is constantly attempting to tell the people of Canada that they are going to be better off when they know that this kind of policy is in front of them. I think it is important to recognize that it is the upper level, about 2 per cent of the people of this country, who are going to be better off after this is through, and the rest of us are going to be carrying the burden for the mismanaged Government that we have in this country today.

Miss MacDonald: Such virtue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for York South—Weston on a question or comment.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway) drew me into this debate. I was content to sit back and listen. One cannot help but to stand up when you listen to the nonsense coming from the Member of Parliament from the Conservative Party. I would like to ask the Member from the Ottawa area if she can comment on the credibility. It is Hamilton. I am sorry. You were formerly from Ottawa and you went to Hamilton. In any event, I would like the Member to comment on the issue of credibility. In the election campaign, the credibility and the integrity of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the Conservative Government will be at issue. She knows that even after tax reform 60,000 profitable corporations will still pay no tax. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Ms. Dewar) knows that even after the implementation of a minimum tax, 5,220 taxpayers who earned over $50,000 will not pay one cent of tax, or did not pay one cent of tax in 1986. Of these 5,220 taxpayers, 40 earned $250,000 and more. She knows as well that if we compare the total amount of tax paid by taxpayers in 1988, after tax reform in 1984, when the Conservatives took power, we realize that only families with incomes of over $117,000 a year paid less tax in 1988 than in 1984.

These families account for the top 1 per cent of all Canadian families. The Member for York East said that he does not want to leave a false impression. I put my question to the Member for Hamilton Mountain: Would she not agree that the Member for York East was really stretching it in terms of credibility? I recall very specifically, when the—if the Conservative Members opposite would grant me the courtesy of listening, maybe they will have the opportunity to stand up and defend the Conservative Budgets and their economic policy. I appreciate that we are nearing the bewitching hour of nine o'clock. Perhaps the Member for Hamilton Mountain could comment on the Conservative Government's attempt to deindex senior citizen pensions when they talk about fiscal responsibility and social justice.

Ms. Dewar: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question from the Hon. Member. What we really have to look at is what has happened to senior citizens, what has happened to a lot of people in this country and what will happen after 1988. What I was really attempting to do was to help the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway) understand the Bill that we have in front of us, because obviously he has difficulty with the figures that he is using, comprehending what the implications are of this Bill. Certainly Canadians are going to be worse off after 1988 than they were before. When we are looking at the reduction of taxes, all we are doing is reducing the taxes that we have already increased in the last three years. It seems to me that the Hon. Member needs to read the legislation so that he will understand.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill S-18, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1966, to which the concurrence of this House is desired.

Pursuant to order made earlier this day, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 9 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, July 20, 1988

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

THE FRANCHISE

OPPOSITION TO PENITENTIARY INMATES ACQUIRING RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of Ontario has decided that prison inmates in Ontario are entitled to vote. The court ruled that a provision in the Ontario Elections Act that disenfranchises prisoners is contrary to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The effect of this decision is that all inmates, including federal inmates, will be allowed to vote in provincial elections. The effect of this decision is that inmates such as Helmut Buxbaum, Colin Thatcher, and Clifford Olson will be allowed to vote and to participate in the democratic process. That would be unconscionable, Mr. Speaker.

A Canadian citizen who is incarcerated and deprived of his freedom for committing a crime should also forfeit his right to vote. The right to vote should belong only to those who are Canadian citizens and to those who have respect for the rule of law.

• (1405)

I call on the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) to request that the Attorney General for Ontario immediately appeal the decision. As well, I call on the Government to seek an amendment to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to exclude inmates specifically from the franchise.

[*Translation*]

QUEBEC MUNICIPAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

INVESTMENTS—JOB CREATION

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec-Est): Mr. Speaker, in order to promote and encourage job creation, the Québec Municipal Economic Development Board has been associated with many projects in the industrial zones and parks of Quebec City.

In 1986, this resulted in some $41 million of investment. In 1987, the value of projects in which OMDEQ was involved reached $62 million, an increase of over 50 per cent. In two years, more than 2,000 jobs were maintained or created.

This performance reflects the dynamism of Quebec enterprise, small and medium-sized companies working in the service and high-tech sectors.

For 1988, we expect nearly $100 million in industrial and commercial investment for Quebec City. That is encouraging, Mr. Speaker! The very healthy economic climate resulting from the policies of the Conservative Party in Quebec and throughout the country is certainly responsible.

Like André Joncas, the director of OMDEQ, I would like to thank all those investors for openly showing their confidence in the promising future of the province's second most important economic centre, Quebec City, the capital.

* * *

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

CALL FOR INTRODUCTION OF LONG-TERM DISASTER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Government announced some *ad hoc* drought assistance for western cattlemen. Being *ad hoc* in nature, the program is being designed and implemented on the run. It is already experiencing administrative problems.

First, cattlemen will have to wait several weeks before they can even get application forms. This means that they will experience cash flow problems well before the Government will be ready to pay out the promised assistance.

There is concern because the assistance rates are based on geographic areas which are too large to reflect drought damage accurately. Farmers on one side of a road may get less assistance than their neighbours on the other side of the road, even though both are equally affected by the drought. Other similar problems are coming to light.

If the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) would implement a long-term disaster assistance program as he promised he would do three years ago, farmers would not be faced with these administrative headaches. New Democrats call upon the Government to act now to develop a long-term disaster assistance program for Canadian farmers.

* * *

LABOUR RELATIONS

BELL CANADA STRIKE—APPOINTMENT OF MEDIATOR URGED

Mr. Barry Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the Bell Canada strike by some 19,000 members of the Communications and Electrical Workers of Canada has to be resolved. I have here a letter from the Government Relations Department of Bell Canada which reads in part:

> Despite the general walkout, the company is making every effort to maintain reasonable service to its customers.

The company should tell that to the people of Elmvale Acres and Chapel Hill in my constituency where serious sabotage has taken place in the last 24 hours which has knocked out the phone services there. In fact the people there cannot even get access to emergency services in the event that they are required.

Phones are an essential service in Canada now and should not be disrupted by sabotage. I am led to believe that neither party is talking. There is no expression that the parties want to get together. They are both unwilling to make concessions on key issues.

I call upon those concerned to stop burning cables and to start talking like intelligent, mature, responsible people. I also call on the Government to be prepared to appoint a mediator within 24 hours if no progress is made on this issue.

* * *

FISHERIES

CLOSURE OF HIGHLAND FISHERIES PLANT IN GLACE BAY, N.S.

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, last weekend, Highland Fisheries Ltd., a subsidiary of Clearwater Fine Foods of Halifax, closed its processing plant in Glace Bay, Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, throwing 310 people out of work in a town where there is already chronic unemployment.

The company closed this plant without proper reason and with a total disregard for the contributions the federal Government has made to the company and its predecessor in the last number of years. The manner in which this company has gone about this closure shows a total lack of corporate integrity and will not be forgotten by the workers.

In light of the closure, the responsibility now lies with the federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon). He can, using the many tools at his disposal, encourage senior management of that particular plant to reassess this closure and to have a business plan put in place in order to make the plant operational. The community and the workers want this to take place. They want co-operation. They want employment. They want the Government of Canada to come in on their side and fight for their economic interest by having this plant reopened.

* * *

• (1410)

HOUSING

TORONTO—USE OF FEDERAL LANDS

Mr. John Oostrom (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, the housing crisis in the greater Metropolitan Toronto region becomes more acute as each day passes. Families are having a very difficult time buying a home due to high costs. In fact the perception beginning to set in is that, if you do not already own a home, you never will unless you have solid financial resources.

As a Government we must ensure that affordable housing is available to all. Presently the Town of Vaughan is in the process of negotiating with the federal Government the purchase of a 107-acre property owned by Environment Canada. The Government should sell the land with the condition that the majority of the site be used for affordable housing.

I believe that all surplus federal land which is to be sold must have affordable housing as its main usage.

* * *

SPORTS

APARTHEID—TREATMENT OF BLACK AND WHITE SOUTH AFRICAN ATHLETES

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, the 1977 Gleneagles Agreement which Canada signed specifically requires the signatories to discourage participation by their nationals in events involving South African athletes, and to withhold support for organizations promoting such contact.

Tennis Canada, a federally funded organization, invited two white South Africans to participate in the Players Cup next month in Toronto. Meanwhile, Albert Ramovha, a black softball player from Soweto, sought a visa on his own to attend, as a mere spectator, a tournament in Saskatoon. What was the Government's response? It was to deny the black softball player a visa because he might be mistaken for an official of his virtually all-black softball association.

There was no mistake with the white South African tennis players, for they were treated differently, and the invitation by Tennis Canada was legitimized. Why? Because $815,000 in prizes available to the South African tennis players make them admissible as entrepreneurs.

That is a policy so inconsistent with the Gleneagles Agreement, a policy based upon the greater weight of private profit over professional principle, a policy so discriminatory as to proclaim the victory of hyprocrisy over commitment, a policy intolerable to all opponents of apartheid that it must be changed so that Canada lives up in full measure to its commitment under Gleneagles.

* * *

TAX REFORM

BENEFIT OF INCOME TAX REDUCTIONS

Mr. Bill Tupper (Nepean—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was talking to my daughter who remarked "Dad, I got a raise". "Great", I said. "How much?" She replied, "About $55 a month". I asked her if she had checked her pay statement to discover the source.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Listen!

Mr. Tupper: In doing so, she discovered there was no change in her gross pay but that the increase was a result of her income tax reduction. On checking with other members of my family I found similar results.

In a major parade that I was in last Friday evening, several constituents called out "Thank you, Mike Wilson". The Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) promised that some 80 per cent to 85 per cent of all Canadians would pay less income tax under tax reform. Canadians are discovering that he was correct.

* * *

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

CANADIAN COMMITMENT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, during each fiscal year the Opposition in the House of Commons has a total of 25 days to bring forward items and issues it feels should be debated. On March 4, 1988, I introduced the following motion for debate:

S. O. 21

> That this House recognizes the pivotal role that NATO continues to play in mutual security and defence and in furthering progress in arms control and disarmament and, therefore, reaffirms its commitment to continued Canadian participation in and active support for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a primary instrument of Canadian defence policy.

At the end of the day's debate a vote was taken on the motion. The NDP voted against it. We did not expect a Conservative Government to do the same thing, but every Conservative MP and cabinet Minister did vote against the motion. Only the Liberal Party voted for this reaffirmation of the NATO alliance. The Government had been strong in its rhetoric about NATO and then stood up in this House and voted against this reaffirmation on behalf of Canada.

* * *

NATIONAL REVENUE

EDMONTON TAXI FIRMS—UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. William G. Lesick (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks Revenue Canada officials in Edmonton announced their intention to assess selected Edmonton taxi firms for unemployment insurance contributions for taxi drivers, based upon existing federal tax jurisprudence. Such assessments will be retroactive to January 1, 1987.

• (1415)

Edmonton taxi brokers have expressed deep concern that the introduction of such unemployment insurance contribution assessments on a selective basis will create instability and, mostly, unfairness in the Edmonton taxi industry as drivers will move to unassessed taxi firms.

The taxi industry is an essential component of the Edmonton transportation network, especially now as Klondike Days, a major tourist attraction, start tomorrow in Edmonton.

I urge the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. MacKay) to introduce a UI premium contributions moratorium until all Edmonton taxi brokers have been assessed and properly notified of Revenue Canada's policy intentions in this regard.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

LAND CLAIMS—OBSERVANCE OF SASKATCHEWAN FORMULA ADVOCATED

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, Indian people from all over the country, and especially from Saskatchewan, are becoming increasingly frustrated with the Conservative Government.

This week the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations is hosting a forum at the Beardy Reserve to express their outrage at the Government's failure to settle outstanding land claims. Once again I and the New Democratic Party join Saskatchewan Indians in demanding that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. McKnight) honour the Saskatchewan Formula, an agreement which was signed 11 years ago.

Much time and thought have already been spent on negotiating land claims. What is needed now is the political will and backbone to live up to those agreements. These treaties were not negotiated so that a Conservative Government could replace them at whim. Indians should not have to go to court to have these land claims respected.

By failing to commit itself to settling land claims quickly the Government is demonstrating its lack of commitment to the Indian people of this country. This country needs a New Democratic Party Government which will respect the rights of all its people.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

DEMOCRACY

FUNDAMENTAL CHANGES TO CANADIAN LIFE—OBLIGATION TO GO TO THE PEOPLE

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Only the Canadian people have the right to change the fundamental nature of this country. Canadians have the right to vote on the trade agreement with the United States, but the Prime Minister has no mandate from Canadians to implement this agreement. Will the Prime Minister call an election and let the Canadian people decide?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the House of Commons is now considering and discussing a great piece of legislation on free trade, and we intend to continue our work. To answer the Leader of the Opposition, I can inform him that when I came in I heard about a statement he just made, and I was surprised to hear that the Leader of the Liberal Party would offer the leadership of his elected Party to a handful of Liberals appointed to the Senate. This violates the most fundamental principles of our democracy, and the people of Quebec and Canada are watching.

[*English*]

PRIME MINISTER'S POSITION

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, only Canadians right across this great country have the right to change the fundamental nature of how we live in this country.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): This is a basic democratic issue, allowing the people of Canada to decide on a matter which is critical to our future.

I have not requested the Senate to reject the deal, I have asked the Senate to allow the people of Canada to reject the deal.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): The issue is a simple one for the Prime Minister. Let the people decide. Why does he not call an election on this trade matter and let the people decide?

Mr. Rossi: Don't sell Canada.

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that it was the fundamental principle of parliamentary democracy that the House of Commons was supreme.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gauthier: The people are supreme.

Mr. Mulroney: We have today a violation of one of the most fundamental precepts of British parliamentary democracy. The Leader of the Liberal Party has asked the Senate of Canada, a bunch of appointed people, to hijack the most fundamental rights of the Canadian House of Commons.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1420)

Mr. Mulroney: The Leader of the Opposition wants me to run against Allan MacEachen, but I want to run against the Leader of the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—REQUEST THAT ELECTION BE CALLED

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, you know that I love and respect this House of Commons. But I say to the Prime Minister that the people are supreme and we will take this issue to the people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rossi: Call an election.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Neither the Prime Minister as Leader of the Government, nor his colleagues, nor, with the greatest of respect, the Members of this House

received a mandate from the people of Canada to change the nature of this country the way that trade deal does. I call on the Prime Minister once again to let the people decide. Call an election today and let the people make up their minds.

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has introduced a very novel concept into our constitutional considerations. This issue came up in another way during the life of this Parliament. On November 20, 1987, *The Toronto Star* reported that the drug Bill was approved as Senators surrendered. It stated at the end: "The entire process was extremely awkward for Liberal Leader John Turner who said both that he supported the proposed Senate amendments to the Bill but that he also believed the will of the elected Commons should prevail at the end of the day".

Of course, the will of the elected Members of Parliament must prevail at the end of the day. This is an unacceptable new concept that the Leader of the Opposition is introducing, that the will of the House of Commons should prevail at the end of the day, unless and until he asks Allan MacEachen if it is all right. It is all right. The contrary is not all right. The people of Canada will deal with the Leader of the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

An Hon. Member: You're a fraidycat, Brian.

MANDATE TO LEGISLATE—PRIME MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Raymond Garneau (Laval-des-Rapides): Mr. Speaker, what is at stake is not the supremacy of the Senate or the House of Commons, but the fact that Canadians should be allowed to decide on a fundamental question, the free trade agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. The Leader of the Government, during the campaign for the leadership of his Party, took a very clear position against free trade when he said, and I quote: "Free trade with the United States is like sleeping with an elephant; Canadian factories will be unable to compete with American firms operating on a much larger scale, without some form of protection . . . ". Since that was the message he gave Canadians, where did he get a mandate to adopt legislation without consulting Canadians first?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, Quebecers are going to be very interested to hear what the Hon. Member just said. In fact, he is telling Quebecers and Canadians that despite the signing of the agreement, despite the fact that the Government of Quebec and seven other provinces have approved the agreement, and despite the solemn commitment of the Government of Canada and the favourable reaction of our elected representatives, the Liberal Member would have this impressive authority make way for the Liberal Senators, the same Liberal Senators who, when they were considering Bill C-22, tried to strangle economic expansion in Montreal. It didn't happen with Bill C-22 and it won't happen with free trade!

• (1425)

LIMITS OF PRIME MINISTER'S MANDATE

Mr. Raymond Garneau (Laval-des-Rapides): Mr. Speaker, we are beginning to see how the Prime Minister wants this fundamental debate to be held. Instead of letting free trade be the order of the day, he is trying to change the course of the debate. I will ask the Prime Minister again, since he did not answer my question: Where does he claim to get his mandate to change the very fibre of the country in a fundamental way by bringing in such an important piece of legislation, a law that will profoundly affect the future relations of Canadian men and women with the United States, when he held a totally different position during the leadership campaign and during the 1984 election campaign?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on November 18, 1987 in *Le Journal de Montréal*, the following was printed: "Last August, John Turner said that the Senators appointed by a Prime Minister had to accept the decisions of elected representatives. The Liberal Senators were appointed by a Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, and they must bow to the will of the people." Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a new and interesting strategy!

[*English*]

This is a new one and an interesting one, Mr. Speaker, because last week, on July 7, on page A4 of *The Globe and Mail* we read:

> The Liberal majority in the Senate will not block the federal Government's legislation to implement the free-trade agreement with the United States, Liberal Senate Leader Allan MacEachen said yesterday.
>
> "I would think not twice, but 20 times before I would recommend the Senate kill the Trade Bill in one plunge of the dagger," Mr. MacEachen said—

Now, in an act of desperation, the Leader of the Opposition no longer wants the House of Commons to consider this important matter. He wants to resign his leadership in favour of the Senate, and I say that is not good enough for the Canadian people.

REQUEST THAT PRIME MINISTER SEEK DISSOLUTION OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister will recall that in 1983, when he was asked whether the kind of deal he has now negotiated with the President of the United States would be desirable for Canada, he said no. The former Secretary of State said no at that time. The Secretary of State for External Affairs said no. The Minister of Finance said no at that time. The issue is, should the people of Canada have a right to decide on this deal before the Prime Minister signs? Will he agree now with the majority of Canadians who want

an election on this and do the right thing, dissolve the House and go to the people of Canada?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Let's go! Let's go!

Some Hon. Members: Go! Go! Go!

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is a first, the NDP defending the Senate.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Right on! Absolutely!

Mr. Mulroney: We are in the process of debating free trade. We are in the process of creating new jobs.

An Hon. Member: Yes, for Tories.

Mr. Mulroney: We have announced, on Monday, the Hibernia development, so important for Newfoundland and Labrador. We are getting on with the business of creating new wealth and prosperity for all Canadians—

Mr. Riis: Buying new subs.

Mr. Mulroney: —we will do that. The House will consider all appropriate legislation and at an appropriate time I will be happy to oblige my hon. friend.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Prime Minister that we are not defending the Senate of Canada, we are defending the people of Canada. That is what the Government should be doing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: If the Prime Minister had wanted Senate reform—

Mr. Gormley: Twenty-seven per cent.

Mr. Broadbent: —we offered the Prime Minister not once, not twice, but three times, a measure that would substantially abolish Senate power, and the Prime Minister refused it three times. That is the reality.

PRIME MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, since the Prime Minister is now clearly reneging on what his views were in 1983, and the Cabinet itself, most of the Members of which opposed this kind of approach in 1983, has betrayed its trust to the people of Canada, does the Prime Minister have one good argument for not going to the people of Canada after almost four years into his mandate, a mandate in which he has betrayed his most serious commitments to the people of Canada?

• (1430)

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the NDP asks if I have one good reason for not calling an election.

Mr. Manly: Besides being afraid.

Mr. Mulroney: The work of the first mandate has not been done. As I have already indicated, our four years will not be up until September 17 next. I know my hon. friend is very exercised about the fact that people may have had a change of heart in respect to policy. Canadians can consider that. They will consider as well the change of heart of the Leader of the NDP in regard to NATO.

[*Translation*]

DEMAND THAT A GENERAL ELECTION BE HELD

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister wants to debate and discuss external affairs, domestic affairs, and the Free Trade Agreement with the Americans, the New Democrats are ready. The Conservatives are the ones who are not ready for an election now.

And so I ask, for the third time: If the Prime Minister is confident in this approach to relations with the Americans, why does he not want to call an election, not in September, not in October, but right now?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the socialist leader is calling for a general election. He had asked during the winter that the population be given the possibility of expressing its wishes through a vote. And so I called a by-election in the Lac-Saint-Jean riding.

The Leader of the NDP expressed his point of view at the time. We saw the results of his intervention in the Lac-Saint-Jean riding and I will give him the opportunity of measuring up, not only in the Lac-Saint-Jean riding, but in all of the ridings of Quebec and Canada.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION

HIRING OF FILIPINO WORKERS ON THE *MARY NOUR*— MINISTER'S POSITION

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

For two years now, the Miron Company in Montreal has been hiring Filipino workers for its factory ship, the *Mary Nour*, at an hourly rate of $1.74; they work nearly 80 hours a week in deplorable conditions, in violation of our labour and immigration laws.

Is the Government prepared to investigate this situation? What does it intend to do to stop this deplorable practice?

[*English*]

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, we did look into this matter. The Coast Guard investigated the situation as it arose. I am informed that this does comply with our immigration laws and with our employment laws concerning the crews of foreign ships. We are continuing to monitor the situation.

I can assure the Hon. Member that, should we discover that there is something that is outside the law, we will be happy to do something about it.

REQUEST THAT MINISTER INTERVENE TO PREVENT EXPLOITATION OF WORKERS

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, this is a clear contravention of Canadian labour laws and Canadian immigration laws. The Canadian public and the Minister should know that.

In this case we have people not simply acting as sailors but acting as industrial workers. Since they are acting as industrial workers, they should be subject to our labour laws and our immigration laws.

I ask the Minister this question once again. Will she immediately take action to stop this deplorable practice of exploiting workers employed by a Canadian company in a Canadian port?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I can simply repeat my first answer. We have taken a close look at this situation. My officials inform me that they are operating within the law, both within the immigration laws and within the employment laws of Canada.

I assure the Hon. Member, the House, and the people of Canada that I will ensure that my officials continue to enforce the law.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—REQUEST FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister a question. In view of the fact that there are now considerable obstacles which are going to exist before his trade deal is accepted, I want to ask him in a very straightforward way if he is prepared to give a commitment to the House that there will be an election called before January 1, before the trade deal comes into effect, so that the Canadian people will have the right to pass judgment on this deal which is so harsh for their future.

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I thought that I had already answered that question in my response to the Leader of the NDP. In fact, the answer was such that it has driven him right out of the House. One shot and right back to the swimming pool!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Riis: The usual Mulroney cheap shot! It's no wonder you're a scumbag Prime Minister in the eyes of most Canadians.

Mr. Mulroney: I just want to tell my hon. friend that at an appropriate time there will be an election. He will have a chance to put forward his point of view. The Canadian people will have a chance to judge him.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

REQUEST THAT ELECTION BE HELD PRIOR TO AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, after that belly-flop into his swimming pool, I would like to ask the Prime Minister the question which he has not in fact answered. Will he see to it that before this trade deal comes into effect, that is, before January 1, 1989, there will be chance for Canadians democratically, through an election, to pass judgment on whether the Bill makes sense to Canada or not?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend and anyone else co-operates in getting the Bill through committee, I will invite him and others for a swim.

Mr. Riis: What a funny guy!

Mr. Nystrom: Smart ass!

Mr. Mulroney: And then we can move on. I have already answered my hon. friend, and I have answered his Leader—

Mr. Riis: That's the kind of Prime Minister we have, a Johnny Carson Prime Minister.

Mr. Mulroney: —and I am trying to answer the Hon. Member but, unfortunately, I am being heckled by a member of the NDP who should know better, the so-called House Leader of the NDP.

All I am trying to do is tell the Hon. Member from Windsor that we have negotiated an important treaty with our friends, the United States of America. The House of Commons is considering it. A committee is paying attention to all the details. Once it comes back to the House and is passed, at an appropriate time we will take a look at future actions. But all of them will be consistent with the point of view that the House of Commons and not the Senate—

Mr. de Jong: And not the people?

Mr. Mulroney: —is the body that was elected by the people and should prevail.

Mr. Riis: You forgot that this is a democracy.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN THE GALLERY OF GOVERNOR OF STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. Speaker: I wish to draw to Hon. Members' attention the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Tommy G. Thompson, Governor of the State of Wisconsin.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

LEBANON—POSSIBILITY OF REOPENING CANADIAN EMBASSY

Mr. Barry Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. In light of the apparent truce evolving between Iran and Iraq, and the recent government decision to normalize relations with Iran, and recognizing that in Canada there is a very large and very important Lebanese community, as the Deputy Prime Minister knows so well, can the Minister indicate what progress is being made by the Government of Canada to reopen our embassy in Beirut?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Hon. Member's question and the interest that he has shown in this very important subject.

The Government is very favourably disposed to reopening the Canadian Embassy in Beirut. However, it would do so only after it was convinced that the personnel would be safe and could reside there in relative security.

• (1440)

I can tell my hon. colleague that the situation is being monitored very closely. When it is considered appropriate that our people would be safe and secure, then we will initiate positive action toward achieving the goal to which the Hon. Member has referred.

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

BANKRUPTCY OF SHAWBEC PLANT—GRANT MADE TO PLANT—QUERY WHETHER MONEY UTILIZED ACCORDING TO SPECIFIED CONDITIONS

Mr. Gilles Grondin (Saint-Maurice): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Yesterday, I heard to my great concern that the Shawbec plant in Shawinigan went bankrupt, when only two years ago the Conservative Government approved a grant of $2.3 million for a company that until yesterday employed nearly 150 people.

I therefore want to ask the Prime Minister how much of this $2.3 million has been paid so far? What were the conditions and what steps were taken to ensure that the amounts paid were used in accordance with the conditions agreed to when the grant was awarded?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism) and Minister of State (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)): Mr. Speaker, not having received prior notice that the Hon. Member would ask for details about a very specific question, I will take his question under advisement, and we will transmit the information requested as soon as possible.

Mr. Grondin: Mr. Speaker, it is a specific question, it is a very currrent issue, and the people of my riding are very concerned.

REQUEST THAT INQUIRY BE INSTITUTED

Mr. Gilles Grondin (Saint-Maurice): Mr. Speaker, as my supplementary, I would like to ask the Minister whether following this bankruptcy and considering the involvement of the Conservative Government, he intends to order an investigation to find out exactly what happened and why grants allocated only two years ago ran out so quickly, and also to find out whether there were economic reasons for the bankruptcy or whether it was the result of a management quarrel.

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism) and Minister of State (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)): Mr. Speaker, I will take the Hon. Member's statement as a representation to the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion. I will bring the Hon. Member's comments to the attention of the Minister, and we will advise him if any action will be taken.

[*English*]

MARINE TRANSPORT

CANADIAN CARGOES CARRIED IN FOREIGN REGISTERED SHIPS

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Under Canadian law, Canadian companies, through their subsidiaries can move Canadian cargoes on foreign flag vessels thereby bypassing Canadian labour laws, Canadian safety laws, and Canadian health laws, as in the case of the *Mary Nour* which is the Panamanian registered vessel now in the port of Montreal.

Will the Minister tell the House what action the Government of Canada is going to take so that in future Canadian cargoes, whether they be cement, potash, or grain, are carried from Canada to other countries on Canadian-crewed and registered vessels?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, marine shipping in Canada is subject to a set of regulations, and I have not been advised of any violation of these regulations by any vessel whatsoever. Considering the Hon. Member's request, I believe this is a normal situation. I will make the necessary inquiries to ensure that the law has been observed. If that is not the case, I will take the necessary action to ensure that there is no recurrence.

[*English*]

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT ACT

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, the problem is that no law has been violated. It is the approach of the Government of Canada, starting with the Liberals and continuing with the Conservatives, that allows Canadian cargoes to be transported on non-Canadian vessels, thereby allowing 80-hour weeks and $1.75 an hour, and vessels such as *The Paul Martin* transferred to foreign ownership.

Will the Minister, whose Department has been examining the issue, finally give an indication to the people of Canada, particularly the marine sector, of what action will be taken to prevent this from occurring in the future?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Hon. Member that as I said earlier, and as he himself has confirmed, no law was violated. We are talking about a policy. We intend to look into the application of this policy. Now I make no commitment that it will be changed. However, I have no objection to considering the implications, and once again, if there are any factors that are detrimental to the development of the Canadian merchant marine, I will consider his proposal.

[*English*]

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

EASTERN ONTARIO—REQUEST FOR INTRODUCTION OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to whomever is answering on behalf of the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion. On June 30 the Government allowed all regional industrial development incentive programs to lapse and disappear from eastern Ontario.

Large parts of the Ottawa Valley are now without an industrial and regional development plan for the first time since 1970. Industrial parks were developed by previous Liberal Governments. Tourism projects are in need of help to get off the ground, agricultural and forestry projects need a shot in the arm, and jobs are needed.

When will the Minister bring in a regional development program to address the dilemma in which the Conservative Government has placed the Ottawa Valley?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism) and Minister of State (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member states that there are no programs left in that part of Ontario. He should do his homework, look at the books, and he will see that there are many programs still applicable to all of Ontario.

Some Hon. Members: Name one.

Mr. Valcourt: As to the question of the new Department of Industry, Science and Technology, and what type of programs will be available to Ontario and to all of Canada, the Minister should be in a position very soon to make the announcements.

ECONOMY OF OTTAWA VALLEY

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, the Minister should do his homework because as of June 30, as I said, there were no industrial development incentives left for that part of eastern Ontario, and there are not.

Will the Minister bring in an industrial development plan that would include promoting the opening up of the Ottawa River under a tourism plan, together with industrial incentives, in order that we could have a combination of tourism and industry in the area, and introduce a larger element of small craft and recreational boating to the area? This would improve the over-all economy of the Ottawa Valley which needs diversification in its economy.

Instead of saying that no one has done his homework, will the Minister give his commitment that he will now bring in an incentive program for eastern Ontario?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism) and Minister of State (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)): Mr. Speaker, the best industrial development program for Ontario has been the economic policy of the Government which has seen the rate of unemployment drop in Ontario to 4.6 per cent. That has been a good program for Ontario.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Valcourt: The Hon. Member is talking about homework. I will advise him that the tourism subsidiary development agreement is always in effect in Ontario with over $20 million in it still to commit. There is a defence industry productivity program which has seen tens of millions of dollars invested in Ontario.

Most of all, we will keep on pushing for the free trade deal, because Ontarians know that this is in their best interest, and that is a good program for Ontario.

* * *

AIR CANADA

PURCHASE OF AIRBUSES—BENEFITS FOR WINNIPEG

Mr. George Minaker (Winnipeg—St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Today Air Canada announced that it would be purchasing 34 Airbuses to modernize its fleet, and will also have the aircraft maintained in Winnipeg.

Does the Minister concur with both decisions by the board of Air Canada? How will Winnipeg benefit from this decision?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport always agrees with that type of decision by Air Canada. We are delighted, and we approve of the decision by Air Canada, particularly because the people of Manitoba will now trust—not the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry—but the Government of Canada. The Government of Canada has always stated that the overhaul centre will be retained in Winnipeg.

Moreover, I wish to tell the House that this decision by Air Canada will give Winnipeg and Manitoba, already having the best expertise in terms of the maintenance of all Boeing 727 aircraft, not only for Canada, but also for the United States and North America, maintenance for the Airbus 320. It is what we said three months ago to the people of Manitoba.

* * *

• (1450)

BANKS AND BANKING

CHARTERED BANKS' SERVICE FEES

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Finance. On June 30 the Minister announced with great fanfare that a voluntary agreement had been made with the banks to drop several service charges and provide basic banking service to their customers. In the last few days my office has surveyed a series of banks across the country. It found that some branches had not yet dropped the NSF charge and most banks had not yet introduced a basic account which met the Minister's conditions.

In light of the fact that the Minister raised the expectations of consumers across the country that finally we would have justice for them, I think it is only fair for us to ask, "Where is Tom?"

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Hon. Minister would like to answer that question.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Speaker, Tom is not a Johnny-come-lately to this issue.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hockin: As the Hon. Member knows, on June 30 the banks, after some pulling and hauling, agreed voluntarily—by the way voluntarily on the suggestion of NDP Members as well as Liberal Members. They supported the voluntary agreement in committee—

Mr. Rodriguez: Never.

Mr. Hockin: They did, indeed; the banks agreed voluntarily to ban these obnoxious charges. A number of these charges have already been removed and the others will be removed in the next few weeks.

In terms of the basic account, my understanding is that of the eight major financial institutions in Canada almost all of them now have a basic account and two more will be moving toward having one in the next few weeks.

VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE PROGRAM

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is for the same Minister. I would rather be a Johnny-come-lately than a Tommy-come-never.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Rodriguez: Settle down, guys.

It has been three weeks since the Minister introduced a so-called voluntary compliance, Mr. Speaker, and, in fact, my survey discovered that at best compliance is uneven across the country. I think it is summed up in the words of one of the bank tellers from Sydney, Nova Scotia, who responded to my survey, when she said: "Not much will be done about bank service charges until the Government legislates. We are only doing what we are doing out of good faith".

Will the Minister not agree, in view of the fact that he seems to have more faith in the banks than the people who work for the banks, that the time has come now to act, to legislate, and make changes to the Bank Act so that Canadian consumers can get justice with respect to their services at the banks?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Speaker, it seems that the Hon. Member's research is faulty. My research indicates almost comprehensive compliance already. I would like to see his results, and if they are different from mine I will find out why.

More important, we have put in place a compliance mechanism which together with enforcing compliance will give us a report on the level of compliance right across every branch in Canada. We have done that for the consumers of Canada. The Party of the Hon. Member opposite wanted this done voluntarily in agreement with the Liberals and the Conservatives a month ago, but having done it voluntarily they stand up and criticize. The banks will comply and we will make sure they comply.

Mr. Rodriguez: That is not true.

* * *

AIRPORTS

PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—LIMOUSINE SERVICE PERMITS

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. It again concerns the issue of limousine service at Pearson International Airport in Toronto.

The Minister knows that the public is being ripped off by limousine service at Pearson International. He knows that the fares are exorbitant, that the delays are inexcusable and the service is terrible. It is all because of the monopoly that exists at Pearson International which the Government refuses to break up.

The independent drivers and owners at this very moment are protesting that this Minister issued 35 permits without tender to friends of the Government. Will the Minister stand up and explain why he gave to five limousine companies 35 permits worth over $4 million—a gift of $4 million—to friends of the Government, without tender and without advertising? Is that the Conservative way of conducting the business of the country?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): I answered that question yesterday, Mr. Speaker. This Member is used to giving that kind of spectacular reaction. I told the House yesterday, and I repeat what I said, that we needed urgently to issue 35 limousine permits at the Lester B. Pearson Airport in Toronto to companies which are considered good companies which give the service that is expected in Toronto.

I said also that in the fall there will be a tender for 35 other permits and the tender will be opened up to everyone who wants to tender. I think it is a fair process.

Once again, we have more than what the Hon. Member has in mind. He has in mind a political issue. I have in mind the service to people at the Lester B. Pearson Airport at Toronto.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, we want to ensure that the system is fair. Can the Minister explain why he intends to put out the tender for 35 permits in the fall while the 35 permits he issued a few days ago were not tendered? Is that fair? Is it fair to the independent owners and drivers that 35 permits should be given to five companies while the additional 35 permits are put out to tender? Can the Minister explain in no uncertain terms today why he issued those 35 permits without tender? That is the issue, Mr. Speaker. Why did he issue those 35 permits without tender?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the Member wants to make this a political issue but it is not a political issue. There was an urgent situation. We made a decision, and we have made another decision for the fall and we will maintain that decision.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

EXCHANGE VALUE OF CANADIAN DOLLAR—INTEREST RATES—MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec-Est): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of State for Finance. It concerns the relative value of our dollar and the level of interest rates. Can the Minister tell Canadians how he feels about the constant increase in the value of the Canadian dollar?

[*English*]

Is our Canadian dollar currently too high? Could the Minister comment on the Canadian interest rate level compared to that in the United States, and has he noticed any difference over the last months in these rates?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Speaker, the value of the Canadian dollar is the result of the strength of the Canadian economy.

[*English*]

The strength of the Canadian economy largely accounts for the strength of our dollar. It has risen slightly in the last few weeks because of the intrinsic strength of the economy. Retail sales are up. Housing starts are strong. The expansion of credit in this country has been growing very strong in the last two months as well. Basically we have an economy in which the world has confidence.

Second, there has been some repositioning of monetary positions taken regarding the U.S. dollar with the co-operation of the United States Federal Reserve. In the sell-off of the U.S. dollar some of this value has been repositioned in the Canadian dollar which technically lifts our dollar to a slightly higher level.

More important, the Hon. Member asks about interest rates and their effect on the Canadian dollar. I think the Hon. Member should know that the spread now between Canadian interest rates and U.S. interest rates has narrowed significantly in the last three months. Therefore, the exchange rate presently for the Canadian dollar is in no way a function of the spread. If anything, the spreads are narrower. The result is a strong economy. The world is confident, and that is why our dollar is strong.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

LANGUAGE TEACHERS—LABOUR DISPUTE—REQUEST THAT ALL DEMANDS FOR IMPORTANT CONCESSIONS BE WITHDRAWN

M. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa-Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of State for Treasury Board. It concerns the fact that negotiations between the Government and its language teachers are at a standstill; the deadlock is due to the Government's stubborn determination to obtain major concessions that would adversely affect the quality of language teaching at a time when the Government has just passed a new Official Languages Act. Is the Government willing to withdraw its request for major concessions from the language teachers in order to allow negotiations to resume in good faith, with no strings attached, so that we might see a settlement of this conflict that has already dragged on too long?

[*English*]

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate what we said earlier. A settlement was reached last September. The parties agreed to go back and sell the settlement. Unfortunately PSAC did not. The finding of the arbitration tribunal was that PSAC had not bargained in good faith.

I reiterate what we said, that the Government is ready to go back to the bargaining table and to work on either the old agreement of last September or on any new suggestions which the language teachers have.

• (1500)

REQUEST THAT NEGOTIATIONS RESUME

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, whatever happened last September, the Hon. Minister knows that even if the Alliance had tried to sell the settlement it could not sell it today. That is why there have been sit-ins and demonstrations from a group of language teachers who normally would go along with things. Why is this group being singled out among all the bargaining units by the Government of Canada, and asked to make major concessions which the Government has neither sought nor achieved in its negotiations with other groups?

Why will the Government not agree to go back to the bargaining table, without pre-conditions, without having a fixed idea of what it should achieve, and bargain in good faith, rather than trying to insist on unacceptable conditions which it knows the language teachers cannot professionally accept and will not accept?

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, their negotiators accepted that position last September. I do not know for a fact how many times the employees' association was found to have been bargaining in bad faith by the Public Service Staff Relations Board but that in fact is what was found here.

We believe that the agreement reached was fair. We are prepared to go back to the bargaining table and discuss the matter. That is where we would like to be now.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last question. The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST THAT MINISTER MEET LANGUAGE TEACHERS

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue in the same vein. The 800 or so language teachers have been wanting to meet with the Minister for some time now. He systematically refuses to meet with them, to explain his position clearly, and to lay out conditions that might be negotiated. Can the Minister tell the House now whether he is willing to meet with the language teachers tomorrow, or this very day, in order to solve this labour dispute?

[*English*]

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, I reiterate that we have

skilled bargainers whose job is to meet and to negotiate. We believe the negotiating should take place at the bargaining table, not with the politicians.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, the Minister is abdicating his functions. He is the Minister of State for Treasury Board and he has obligations. He has along with the employees of this Government a strong commitment to help them come to a conclusion in a conflict of such importance. Four years have gone by without a contract signed by these employees. Will the Minister sit down with them and negotiate a fair settlement? Never mind all this nonsense about, "I have professionals helping me". Do it yourself, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Rossi: He has to ask Brian.

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, we are carrying on the policy of the previous Government of letting the negotiators do the negotiating. Our position is that we want them to come back to the bargaining table. We have no pre-conditions. We want them back at the bargaining table.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to 27 petitions numbered as follows: 332-4927, 332-4928, 332-4958, 332-4970 to 332-4972 inclusive and 332-4974 to 332-4994 inclusive.

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

* * *

TRANSPORT

TABLING OF GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO FIFTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 99(2), I have the honour to table today the Government's response in both official languages to the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Transport.

Introduction of Bills

[*English*]

CO-OPERATIVE ENERGY CORPORATIONS

TABLING OF AUDITOR'S REPORT

Mr. Jack Shields (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 67(2), I have the honour to table in this House, in both official languages, the auditor's report and consolidated financial statements for the Co-operative Energy Corporations for the year ending December 31, 1987.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-310, an Act to amend the Criminal Code, (cattle rustling and range cattle).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall the Hon. Member have leave to introduce the said Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill that does not have a lot of interest in many of the urban areas of Canada, but in many of the rural areas we have a serious problem, particularly in those areas that raise stock. It is interesting to note that each year virtually thousands and thousands of cattle are rustled, stolen, shot, mutilated, poisoned and so on by various people. It seems to me that the House would be well advised to take a position showing our outrage at these kinds of acts.

For example, in the Thompson-Okanagan area of British Columbia alone, last year 927 cattle were stolen or disappeared, and dozens more were shot or injured by hunters and poachers and so on. This Bill would essentially provide up to a five-year sentence for anyone who was convicted of cattle rustling, and if they were convicted of mutilating or poisoning or injuring cattle, they could be liable for up to 10 years imprisonment.

I think that we have to send a very clear signal that, while stock producers are having a difficult time these days, losing thousands of head of cattle to cattle rustlers is something that should stop, and perhaps the intent of Parliament along these lines should be to send a clear signal to those unscrupulous people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present today from constituents. The first petition indicates the petitioners' opinion that the Government appears to lack a mandate from the people of Canada to conclude this trade deal with the United States. They believe that the trade deal seriously compromises Canada's sovereignty, and they are asking that Parliament dissolve to enable the people of Canada to have an opportunity to accept or reject the proposed trade deal during a national general election.

I also have another petition, which is quite differently worded, from a number of constituents who believe that the trade deal as such will result in a loss of many jobs in many sectors and regions of Canada, and that the trade deal between Canada and the U.S. would have a fundamental impact on our country's economic, cultural and political independence.

They have many other concerns, but fundamentally they are asking that the Government of Canada to enable the people to voice their opinion on this trade deal through a national general election.

RESEARCH INTO PREVENTION AND CURE OF SCHIZOPHRENIA

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions to present today. The first one is on behalf of a number of residents of Manitoba who have explained their concern with the issue of schizophrenia. They believe that it is a major illness in Canada, affecting about 1 per cent of the population, causing severe mental anguish and suffering to the patients and their relatives and costing Canadian society more than $3 billion annually in direct health care and other support costs.

They believe that the research effort that has been undertaken is not enough to limit this problem and not sufficient to meet the burden that this illness imposes on Canadians. Therefore, the petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to ensure that research efforts related to schizophrenia will in the future be sufficient for the seriousness of this illness.

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I have a second petition signed by residents of my constituency, expressing their concern regarding the issue of abortion. They believe that the Supreme Court decision has left Canadians without any law restricting abortions and that nothing in the Supreme Court decision has established abortion as a right. And whereas human life is a continuum from the moment of conception to the moment of death and there is no point of time between conception and the birth of an infant at which point we could say that this is not a human life, therefore the undersigned, your petitioners, ever pray and call upon Parliament to pass into law legislation that will protect the life of the unborn child from conception and through all stages of development, with the exception of the extremely rare situation in which the abortion is performed in order to save the life of the mother.

• (1510)

DOOR-TO-DOOR MAIL DELIVERY IN THOMPSON, MANITOBA

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my third petition is from residents of my constituency from the City of Thompson. These are the people I mentioned in Question Period earlier who are being forced to move from one trailer court in the City of Thompson to a new trailer court just a few blocks away. At the present time, these people receive door-to-door daily mail service, but because of the rules of Canada Post resulting from the Canadian Government's policy, these people will not receive personal door-to-door delivery in the future even though it is the same population moving from one part of the city to a very close neighbourhood. Therefore, the people who have signed this petition humbly call upon Parliament to demand that this cut-back in service not be allowed to proceed and that daily door-to-door mail service continue for all the residents of the trailer court regardless of its forced relocation.

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour and duty to present two petitions, the first on behalf of constituents of Prince Albert who call upon the Government because they do not believe that the Government of Canada had a mandate to make a free trade agreement with the United States, to dissolve and allow the people of Canada the opportunity to accept or reject the proposed free trade agreement during a national general election. This petition, of course, forms the basis of questions we have asked in the House.

OPPOSITION TO FOOD IRRADIATION

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my second petition comes from people who are mostly from Ontario, places like London and Chatham. They suggest that food irradiation not become part of the food processing system in Canada and that our children not become guinea pigs for hazardous processes like food irradiation. They call upon Parliament to have an unbiased, independent agency of scientists to complete studies on the safety of consuming each food that has been irradiated, the effects of long-term consumption and the environmental dangers involved. In the event that any food irradiated be allowed, it should be clearly labelled as being treated with ionized radiation. Labelling should include packaged, bulk and imported foods as well as spices and other ingredients in prepared foods.

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I have the duty and the obligation to table a petition from constituents and people from Manitoba as well to the effect that they disagree with the Government's intentions of

proceeding with the Mulroney-Reagan trade agreement and humbly submit that the Mulroney Government has sold out Canada and has received nothing in return. Whereas Canadian industries are still not protected from U.S. trade laws, whereas the United States obtained everything it wanted in all key sectors including agriculture, energy, auto trade, financial services and investment, whereas thousands of Canadian jobs are threatened and the Conservative Government has not provided for any adjustment assistance for Canadian workers, wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to denounce the Government for signing the Mulroney-Reagan trade agreement and they add that we should have an election on that issue.

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a duly authorized petition from a number of Canadians concerned that the Government had no mandate from the Canadian people to negotiate a trade deal, that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) in negotiating the deal promised that Canadian sovereignty would not be compromised, pointing out that the trade deal compromises that sovereignty in three specific ways: by removing the power of the Canadian Government to control foreign ownership effectively, to develop Canadian energy resources in the best interests of Canadians, and to equalize opportunities between the regions. Therefore, the petitioners call upon Parliament to dissolve and to allow the people of Canada the opportunity to accept or reject the proposed trade agreement during a national general election.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST FOR RETENTION OF 10-WEEK QUALIFYING PERIOD FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Fernand Robichaud (Westmorland—Kent): Mr. Speaker, it is also my duty to present to you petitions from people in my riding, more particularly, from Sackville, Dorchester, Aulac and Middle Sackville.

The petitioners deplore the decision of the Department of Employment and Immigration to again change the qualifying period for unemployment insurance . . .

[*English*]

The petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to bring justice to the situation by keeping in place the 10-week qualifying period for the rural areas of southeast New Brunswick.

[*Translation*]

NORTHERN TAX ALLOWANCE

Mr. John Parry (Kenora—Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure and the duty to present to this Honourable Chamber a petition duly certified under Standing Order 106.

[*English*]

This petition is signed by some 70 residents, largely of the community of Ignace, and humbly prays and calls upon Parliament to designate all communities in Tier 3 ridings as eligible for the northern residents' tax allowance.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Shall all notices of motions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the Parties, and we have made some changes to the order of business today, changes which were communicated to the Parties earlier in the morning. It is our intention to call for debate the item on the Order Paper No. 35 under government business which begins:

> WHEREAS the fur industry plays a vital role in our traditional rural economy;—

There has been an understanding between the Parties that there will be one speaker for each Party and that the question will be put after the third speaker. We would then proceed to resuming debate on Bill C-139, the tax reform measure.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

FUR TRAPPING INDUSTRY

REAFFIRMATION OF SUPPORT FOR INDUSTRY

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)) moved:

WHEREAS the fur industry plays a vital role in our traditional rural economy;

AND WHEREAS well-managed trapping, as practised in Canada, is in accordance with the principles of the world conservation strategy;

AND WHEREAS Canada is a world leader in humane trap research;

AND WHEREAS this House has previously affirmed its opposition to a proposed resolution before the British Parliament on the labelling of fur products from Canada;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the House of Commons reaffirm its unanimous support of the Canadian fur industry in recognition of its economic importance to the country and its importance in sustaining resource development economies of both native and Northern communities;

AND THAT the House of Commons reaffirm its opposition to trade distorting measures by foreign governments, such as are now being proposed for consideration by the European Parliament.

Mr. John A. MacDougall (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on this motion introduced by the Minister of State for the Treasury Board (Mr. Lewis) on July 18. It deals with the vital role the fur industry plays in our traditional rural economy.

All Hon. Members recall the emergency debate that took place in the House on June 1. Members from all Parties spoke on the concerns we all had that the British House of Commons was currently considering legislation which would require fur products to be labelled clearly to restrain in effect and check retailers from selling furs from Canada and the public from purchasing them.

That evening, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. McKnight) gave eloquent speeches defending the trapping and fur industry in Canada. They, along with all Hon. Members, gave a clear and strong message to the British Parliament.

We all know that the British Government scrapped that Bill on June 18. All Members of the House were very pleased with the news. However, I, along with other Members, realized at the time that it was just a small victory in a very long and determined battle with a group that was intent on destroying an industry and a way of life for so many Canadians.

• (1520)

Today we have another threat to the livelihood of many Canadians connected with the fur industry. The European Economic Community has put forward a motion which, if approved, will have the effect of moving forward the same legislation which the British Government scrapped on June 18 concerning the tagging of Canadian pelts.

I would like to take a few moments to speak about the economic aspect of the fur trade for Canadians. The industry is worth approximately $600 million annually. There is a spin-off of $200 million for allied industries. For the last two to three years, Canadian fur exports totalled approximately $350 million annually, much of that going to the European market. To put those figures into perspective, 105,000 Canadians earn all or part of their income from the fur industry. Approximately 100,000 are trappers, half being aboriginal people. More than 80 per cent of the retail fur sales in Canada are made through privately owned, family run, one store businesses.

Above and beyond the economics of this issue, and even more important, are the social and cultural factors involved when considering the native people and our northern communities. As you well know, in December of 1986 the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development presented the House with *The Fur Issue Report*. The committee heard from many Canadians who depend directly on the fur trade. The report said that, for native people, trapping involves more than simply trying to earn cash income. It implies a unique social, spiritual and cultural relationship with the land and its resources. For northern communities, trapping and trade are the activities which hold the people together, creating a bond of belonging, and providing all of the inhabitants with a purpose. Those comments were echoed time and time again in our committee hearings.

May I remind my colleagues in the House that this is not the first time we have been charged with defending our fur industry. Both in 1979 and 1982 we considered the serious threat and implications of the anti-fur campaign with respect to the seal hunt. Then the European Community banned imports of seal pup pelts as a reaction to a lobbying campaign based on an emotional appeal which was very shallow in its facts. Through an effective use of the media, the animal rights movement was successful. The devastation caused by the collapse of our industry, especially in the Maritimes, is well recorded.

There are towns today which are economically ruined, where families have had to move or have been torn apart. An entire way of life was altered because we were unable to put an effective case forward for our seal hunt. The loss of that hunt and what it meant for thousands of Canadians can still be seen today in family break-ups, bankruptcies, needless suicides, alcoholism, the loss of individual self-worth, dignity, and sense of belonging. We cannot allow those tragedies to reoccur.

The impact of the animal rights campaigns and the anti-fur campaigns, particularly those in Europe, have been felt by many Canadians. Our Government, in partnership with the Canadian Fur Institute and other representatives of the industry, has taken steps to address these concerns. In the past decade we have become increasingly active in the conservation and management of our wildlife, in the development of humane trap testing and design, trapper education, and education of the public on the trapping advancements which have been made in Canada. However, it is evident from the ever-increasing and constant pressure being applied by the animal rights groups and anti-fur lobbyists in Europe on their elected members that our efforts are not being fully recognized or appreciated.

Succinctly put, the animal rights groups are unrealistic in their goals, and if those goals are met it will undoubtedly be extremely harmful to the many Canadians who depend on the fur industry for their livelihood. What the British and European Parliamentarians and public must recognize about our fur industry is that it is the responsible harvesting of a renewable resource.

I raise this issue today because I feel it is extremely important at this time to send a strong message to the European Parliaments and public. What those elected representatives are being told through the animal rights lobby groups are distortions and manipulation of fact. As they did with the pup seal issue, these interest groups have singled out Canada and our export industry as their initial target. The European public is being fed videos, billboards and posters filled with misinformation and half-truths.

The time has come for Canadian Parliamentarians to act together. I say to my colleagues that we must remain steadfast in our support for the fur industry, for trappers across our country, and for our native communities and peoples for whom the fur trade is an integral part of their lives.

Canada is in the forefront of humane trapping research. The Canadian Government and the fur industry have already committed over $8 million to scientific research programs. The results of this research in terms of improved humane trapping technology, including leghold systems, is extremely positive.

Meetings with officials from the Department of External Affairs, the Department of the Environment and the Department of Indian Affairs have been ongoing. There have been meetings with European officials to gather support for our position. I call on all Members in this House to join together in sending to the European Community members the strongest support possible for the 105,000 Canadians who are directly and indirectly employed in a vitally important industry.

I believe it is fitting to close with this final comment on how important this industry is to Canadians. I wish to draw into focus what this debate is all about. This reflects not necessarily on an economic industry or an export commodity, but on the sense of being, livelihood and way of life of individual Canadians. During our hearings a trapper came before us and this is what he had to say about trapping:

> I have been a trapper all my life. I had a family, but I lost my wife. I am just by myself now. I am 69 years old. I draw the old age pension and I am still trapping. I have never been to school. I just live in the bush. All I know is how to sign my name on a cheque. I cannot read one word, but I love the way I live.

That is what we are talking about, the livelihood of individuals, and it is being jeopardized. I want to thank my colleagues for the support they have given on an issue vital to all northern Canadian communities.

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane—Superior): Mr. Speaker, I, along with the other members of my Party, wish to indicate to the House that we support both the thrust and objective of this government-sponsored notice of motion regarding the fur trapping industry in Canada. We in this Party believe that the wording could have been even stronger but, leaving that aside, we believe we must convey a message of opposition to the European Parliament with regard to the misguided and destructive proposal to label fur products imported into the European Economic Community. These labels would have no purpose other than to create, in the minds of some consumers, a false and completely wrongly-based sense of guilt.

• (1530)

I regret that time allows for only one speaker from each Party because there are many other Members in my Party who would want to express their views on this important issue of the fur industry in Canada. The Member of Parliament for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke (Mr. Hopkins), who is in the House today, would certainly have spoken in his usual eloquent way. In fact, he has spoken on this issue. He has raised questions in the House and is giving leadership in his own constituency to those for whom the fur industry is important.

My friend and colleague, the Hon. Member for Gander—Twillingate (Mr. Baker), would also have spoken. He would have told the House about the devastating effect the EEC ban on the seal trade has had on communities of which he is aware. The same could be said for the Member of Parliament for Grand Falls—White Bay—Labrador (Mr. Rompkey). They would all have spoken from personal experience and with considerable emotion on this important issue.

A mammoth new volume entitled *Wild Furbearer Management and Conservation* has just been released. It was published by the Ontario Trappers Association under a licensing agreement with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. It is an important piece of work. It is a large volume and costly to purchase, but I hope that many libraries will be able to buy it in order that more Canadians can be well informed about the fur industry in Canada.

This volume quite correctly points out that the fur trade played an important part in the economic development of North America. However, more to the point of today's debate, the fur trade remains a dominant industry in the vast boreal forest of the Canadian sub-Arctic which is the largest region in Canada. I have the good fortune to represent a significant part of that important region in our great country.

Climatic conditions favour the production in this region of very high quality fur pelts. Trapping for these pelts is a means of wildlife harvesting. I cannot emphasize that too strongly. It is wildlife harvesting. This means harvesting a resource which is renewable. Trapping for these pelts means that those who engage in the industry must be very conservation-minded because conservation is an essential aspect of this activity.

Fur Industry

The vast boreal forest region of Canada does not lend itself to other kinds of industrial activity. For example, it is not well suited to large-scale agriculture. Although this region of which I speak is very well endowed with minerals, economically viable mineral deposits are found in only relatively small portions of that area. The forestry resource is substantial but commercial exploitation is generally restricted to the southern periphery of this region. Thus it is, Sir, that the fur trade is still the region's most extensive industry providing some income to the greatest number of people.

In Canada about 100,000 people are engaged in trapping. More than one-half of these are aboriginal trappers. We can safely estimate, given an average of four people in an aboriginal household, that nearly one-quarter of a million aboriginal people in Canada rely to some extent on the fur trade, a trade which in a good season may bring in between $5,000 and $10,000. That is not a great deal of money, but it is used to buy essential equipment manufactured elsewhere but needed in these modern times by our aboriginal people.

I say to you, Sir, and to all Members of the House, that if the fur industry collapses—and the proposal now before the European Parliament will, to a significant extent, contribute to that collapse if it happens—it is the aboriginal people of Canada who will suffer the most.

As many Members of Parliament know, the seal ban by the European Economic Community created serious social dislocation in a great many Inuit communities. The rate of suicide went up as did alcoholism and drug abuse. Mr. Gordon Wray, the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism in the Northwest Territories, recently indicated in an interview he gave to the Toronto *Globe and Mail* that:

> Animal-right groups opposed the slaughter of harp-seal pups in Newfoundland and succeeded in mobilizing the European Community to boycott seal skins in 1984. In the NWT, where most sealing is done, the hunt took only adult seals. Residents insist the centuries-old practice maintained a delicate ecological balance, as well as holding together Inuit communities.
>
> In 1980-81, sealers earned $884,000 but this dropped, after the EC ban, to only $77,000 in 1983-84, and then to a negligible $26,000 last year.

Mr. Wray said that the social dislocation inflicted on these communities is staggering. Children who were raised to revere sealing as an honourable livelihood saw television commercials portraying their parents as criminals. During the same period 21 of 29 Northwest Territories coastal communities received substantial increases in social assistance. Therefore, this European move created social chaos in the Inuit communities, took away the livelihood of these people, and placed them on social assistance taking away their self-respect and dignity.

In northern Ontario the Indian people who belong to the so-called Treaty Nine Area are organized as the Nishnawbe-Aski Nation. Many of these people depend on trapping as their only source of income. Recently there was an editorial in the *Wawatay news*, an aboriginal peoples' newspaper. That editorial said that trapping "means a way of life that retains a traditional economic activity".

Eighty-five to 90 per cent of the Nishnawbe-Aski Nation people are engaged in trapping to some extent. Many are only part-time trappers. In the western James Bay coastal communities 80 to 85 per cent of the people trap. The unemployment rate in these communities is between 80 and 85 per cent. These people trap in order to supplement their meagre incomes, to supplement their social assistance.

• (1540)

Trapping, hunting, and fishing are all part of living with the land, in harmony with the land, and off the land. Not to understand that is to lead one to a false and fallacious conclusion. It is that the furbearing animals of this country are systematically being destroyed because there is a fur industry and because people go out trapping. That is far, far from the truth.

I want to point out that animal-rights activists tend mainly to be urbanites and what they fail to realize in their misguided zeal is that it is the growth of cities, its building of superhighways and airports that have been far more detrimental to wildlife than trapping will ever be. It is the loss of habitat to overdevelopment and industrialization which is the real danger to wildlife, not trapping.

How ironic it is that we are today, in this House, I expect unanimously resisting and opposing a proposal that will go before the European Parliament, when in Europe we had those successive European wars in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with the slaughter of millions upon millions of young men. This paved the way for massive industrial expansion in Europe and pollution on a basis that was never known anywhere in the world before. Now these same European nations, at least speaking through some of their representatives in the European Parliament, want to restrict the importation of wild furs from Canada. It is more than ironic, it is crass hypocrisy. Trapping is not a threat to furbearing animals.

In fact, the Aboriginal Affairs Committee heard testimony that the furbearing population in Canada is at least as high if not higher than when Europeans first came to this continent. After 400 years of commercial fur trade, most furbearing species in North America are still flourishing, and those few species today that are in danger, are threatened mainly because their habitat has been destroyed. I believe that animal rights activists are best advised to focus their attention on the humane treatment of pets and other domestic animals.

The trapping of wild animals in Canada involves the survival of a culture, a way of life. I am speaking of the culture and way of life of aboriginal people. If these city-dwelling zealots who, in my view, constitute a part of the urban lunatic fringe, have their way, they will be responsible for nothing other than cultural genocide. The proposal planned for the European Parliament will contribute to the destruction of that culture and that way of life.

Let me speak about some of the concerns of these people, which they have inflated beyond all reason. In Ontario there is a native education program. It is sponsored by the federal and provincial Governments. In the past year over 500 aboriginal trappers were exposed to more modern and humane methods of managing and harvesting furbearing animals. Educational programs such as these, plus the millions of dollars that are being spent on trap research, are in my mind the effective ways to combat the anti-trapping movement. The labelling of products, the boycotting of fur garments are illogical and silly ways of proceeding.

It should be noted in addition that for many trappers, the food value of the animals that are caught often surpasses the value of the fur pelt itself. In many remote areas there are often limited options for food. Most beaver, snowshoe hare, muskrat and bear whose skins are sold, are also used as food. We have studies that show that the value of the meat thus harvested is in many cases greater than the value of the fur itself.

The issue here is not one of abuse. Not at all. The issue here is not one of non-use. Not at all. The issue is one of wise use of a resource. In my experience, trappers are among the most active supporters of wildlife conservation. Why would they not be? Their own livelihood is involved. Of course they are conservationists. Fur trappers tend to be among the most conservationist-minded of people.

Recently, the Cochrane Area Fur Council wrote to me about their industry. In their letter they said: "Conservation means the wise use of natural resources".

I conclude by saying to the House that Europeans must be helped in their understanding and appreciation of aboriginal culture. Trapping is a vital aspect of that culture and by supporting this notice of motion today in the House we are saying to European countries, to the people of Europe: "Turn your attention to the relevant problems that exist on your own doorstep. Please do not reach out in an uninformed and self-righteous manner and destroy an industry, a way of life and even a people which are indigenous to this nation of ours here in North America".

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. John Parry (Kenora—Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity again today to address some remarks on the question of measures that have been proposed in other jurisdictions with regard to the labelling of fur. The measures that were first proposed in the British Parliament have, very happily, been withdrawn. But they are now within the European Parliament of the European Economic Community.

I believe those proposed regulations are profoundly misleading and profoundly dangerous to the basis on which international commerce and international relations are undertaken. They are profoundly misleading to the people who might read them.

I am glad to join with my colleagues in all three Parties in extending thanks and recognition to the Government for the opportunity again to address this important question. As I recall, I was the second to the last speaker sometime after midnight on the morning of June 2nd when we were addressing the motion that had been put forward at that time. We heard from all three Parties, but I am glad to say that my Party participated most fully in that particular debate. I am pleased that all Parties and all Members who spoke were united in their concern for the impact these regulations might have on aboriginal people of this country.

• (1550)

Arriving very recently in Ottawa, I have not had the opportunity to research the exact procedure and stage of this proposed measure before the European Economic Community, but I think the specific stage is perhaps not so important as is the need and urgency for this House to get across to those major partners of Canada—and let them not forget it—in the European Economic Community that Canada does not appreciate this sort of interference and harassment of the longest standing, continuous commerce between our country and the European Economic Community.

I looked at the historical perspective in my speech of June 1 and 2, and I believe it is worth re-emphasizing. Let us remember that it was the European market that built up the fur industry in this country. Successive generations of European consumers, furriers, traders and merchants have dealt with successive generations of Canadian trappers, both aboriginal and non-aboriginal. This was done by means, of course, of the intermediaries the great trading companies and the co-operatives of today, such as the Ontario Trapping Association. Let us, above all, not forget that it was the fur trade that radically altered the economy, traditions and lifestyle of the aboriginal people, during what is considered to be a period of pre-history but about which more and more is becoming known. It led to some very drastic changes by the aboriginal people, by the Métis and by the early European trappers and traders in order to restructure the economy and life of North America at that time.

There was a time in this country when the fur trade was the largest part of the economy. There was a time when it was, so to speak, the *fer de lance* of exploration and economic development within Canada and the northern part of what is now the United States. Indeed, there was a time when the fur trade provided this country with its basic currency, its first universally accepted trading medium. That was the standard beaver, as it was known. The Hudson's Bay Company, and the Northwest company before it, kept their accounts not in pounds, shillings and pence, not in dollars and cents, but in what were called "made beaver", what we would now call a double-x large beaver pelt in prime, flattened and properly tanned. At one time it took a pile of made beaver as high as a musket to buy that same musket.

Let us not forget that even as Canada grew and developed, and exploration pushed back the frontiers of the imported European civilization, in many parts of this country it was trapping and the fur trade that provided not only the basic *raison d'être* of many communities but was the largest part of the economy in a whole region twice as large as the entire continent of Europe.

In examining this question today, we have to be very careful in our approach. We have to remember that mere oratory or rhetoric, and even, as important as it may be, the reiteration of the importance of fur trade to Canada's economy, particularly to the aboriginal people, is not the most effective thing we can do. What we have to do is to work towards an understanding of why these labelling regulations are being brought forward. We have to work towards a strategy to counteract the motives behind the introduction and proposals of such legislation or regulation.

I think it is worth spending some time to consider the psychology that underlies the attempts to have Canadian fur mislabelled, or, I would say, labelled in a misleading fashion that is designed to deter some consumers, although, frankly, I am surprised at the store that is set by this because I do not believe it would be terribly effective even if it went into effect.

As the Hon. Member for Cochrane—Superior (Mr. Penner), a defender of aboriginal people in this House over two decades, pointed out, it is primarily because of the psychology of urbanization. Urbanization in the European continent even since the Second World War, which was largely fought on that continent, has taken the proportion of urban dwellers to near double pre-war levels, somewhere, I believe, in the region of 80 per cent. That has led to a divorce between the people and their sustenance. It has led to a divorce between the people of the European Economic Community and their environment, a divorce between them and those who supply them with the means of everyday living.

Along with that divorce from nature has grown an unreal psychological environment in which people are raised. I should know because, after all, I was raised in what is still the largest city in the European continent. The feelings that arise very naturally within the minds of human beings are all too easily transferred and transmogrified because of the environment in which they live. We learn, and certainly people in Europe learn, to have respect for those who are near and dear to us, but increasingly that respect is set against an appreciation of the wider environment. It is said that there are children within the inner City of London who, at the age of nine years, have never seen a cow, yet drink milk every day. That does not surprise me because it is a long haul from that city out to the country where one could actually see a cow.

In an age of increasing affluence, people have come to identify animals not with the milk in the glass, the slice of roast beef on the table, the leather on the shoes they wear, but with the hamsters and the gerbil, the pussy-cat and the lap-dog, the pets they keep on an everyday basis and for which, understandably, they have feelings.

Another sad consequence of that divorce from the natural environment, even with television bringing the images to our homes on a daily and even hourly basis seems to be a divorce from an understanding of the plight of fellow humans. There are people starving on the sidewalks of Calcutta, there are the wasted fields of drought-scorched Ethiopia, the flood victims in Bangladesh and the victims of malnutrition and elevated child mortality rates in the Andes, among the aboriginal people of the southern American continent. It seems that as a society we are losing our understanding and compassion for our fellow human beings who live in those circumstances.

There has to be, of course, a specific spur to action, to mobilize the psychological factors I have described. We might very well ask, and would, I hope, ask our foreign Minister, who did such good work with his namesake, the junior trade Minister from Great Britain, Mr. Allan Clark, to ask these questions of the European Community. Why does the European community not take action against bullfighting? Why does it not take action against the obscene sport of fox-hunting which is still carried out in the United Kingdom? Why does it not take action against the barbarous practice of many French farmers who nail to the floor the feet of geese and force corn down their gullets in order to produce *paté de foie gras*?

• (1600)

Let us not be seen to be pointing fingers because we all are prey in some degree to such actions and such motivations. The fact is that the European Economic Community has decided to take action on fur trapping and fur products because it is much easier to try to beat up an external "enemy" than to address some of the grave divisions and dissensions within European society, whether it be on a single country or on a pan-European basis.

We should understand that motive. We should be very clear to the countries of the European Economic Community that we do understand those motives and that Canada is not without the ability to resort to trade sanctions and trade measures if indeed such regulations are passed within the European Parliament.

My hon. friends from Timiskaming and Cochrane—Superior have said it well already. The trapper is a conserver. The trapper is a harvester. There is no species on the North American continent that has been endangered by trapping. The passenger pigeon was exterminated because of the desire for food, not by trapping. The true enemy of the survival of wildlife species is indeed the destruction of habitat, the destruction that is carried out as a by-product of economic activity, it would appear, within the European Economic Community and, indeed, in many other jurisdictions because environmental protection regulations are not perfected here in Canada, not perfected in any jurisdiction.

Let us not forget the number of species that have been exterminated in Europe by habitat erosion. Let us point out to the Europeans that it is by protection of the habitat, of which having communities of people and having active trappers is an essential part, that species will be saved from extinction.

Turning briefly to the cruelty issue, nobody will pretend that it is in some way an amiable experience for the animal. But we have heard a great deal of dissimulation and misinformation from European sources, and even from so-called animal rights advocates in this country, as to the nature of what an animal does or does not feel, and particularly as to the nature of what animals are being trapped.

There is no large-scale problem with so-called unwanted or scrap species. Trappers came before our committee on the hearings that the Hon. Member for Timiskaming mentioned. They said: "Not once in my career as a trapper have I taken an animal other than the animal that I wanted to take in that trap". I believe that is a point which has to be made because, of course, the propaganda films show species that cannot be used by the trapper struggling in the trap. We have to emphasize just how rare that is.

I think that the Hon. Member for Cochrane—Superior also made the point very well as to the economic value of the non-fur part of the animal. I would say that it is no misrepresentation to say that all the trappers whom I have known respect the animals with which they deal. I say respect in terms of the aboriginal peoples' spirituality, the spirit of the animal that they are using, using because of their profound belief that the creator put the animals there for their use and that while the animals are used respectfully they will return. When they are abused, the animals go. This is something which runs through the legends of all the aboriginal peoples of Canada. That surely is the representation of the effects of successful conservation as practised by aboriginal trappers in the country since time immemorial.

Because of the shortage of time I must turn to the question of what will happen. The seal ban showed us what will happen. It showed us that the eradication of an economic base and the consequent deterioration of the social fabric of communities that depended upon that seal hunt constituted as an end nothing more than a cultural genocide of the people who were victimized, the people in the Arctic who were victimized by the eradication of that hunt. The people of Nishnawbe-Aski and the people of the Grand Council Treaty Three reserves whom I represent know that this could be the final straw, the final, destructive, demoralizing, alienating straw that would tell them that the people who came to their land, emissaries in a commercial sense of the European Market, have now seen them as having outlived their usefulness, and are preparing to discard them and to turn their communities into little more than welfare ghettos.

That is a consequence which I will always be determined to fight. I hope that all Members of the House will be determined to join me in that particular fight.

The fragile economic base of these communities, the terrifying pace of change that they have seen will be doubled and redoubled if this sort of measure ever takes effect. In a community of my experience, Weagama Lake, it went from one plane a week to five planes a day in three years. They went from paths to roads in a similar period of time. The blows, the psychological impacts, the sense of being hemmed in that the people of Nishnawabe-Aski, the Cree, the Ojibway of the communities of Grand Council Treaty Three have had to endure will be doubled and redoubled if this sort of measure ever takes effect.

In summation, we must examine what we can do—because it is of only limited usefulness to fulminate—to spread the information. It is only of limited usefulness even to undertake educational campaigns within the European Economic Community. We have to come down to the hard pragmatic measures that will have some effect in blunting this initiative.

To do so we have to call upon the support of our largest trading partner, the United States. After all, the United States does export more fur than does Canada. While the fur industry is of lesser significance proportionately in the United States, as a whole it is indeed larger than the Canadian fur industry, which must come as a surprise to some.

Above all, we must try to take away the main ammunition and the main thrust which is being used by these animal rights advocates which is, of course, cruelty. I believe we can do that by continuing the excellent programs of trap replacement that have been started, and the very well supported, particularly by the trappers themselves, trapper education programs. We must reach out to the people who are proposing these regulations. We must expand and intensify our research in humane trapping methods. We must spend some money and make some effort to ensure that those who have the opportunity to decide on these matters are brought to Canada and shown the economic, the social, the cultural context, and also the techniques of humane trapping as it is fast developing in Canada today.

If we can take those measures, then I believe we do have some chance of blunting this initiative which, if it is successful, could have some very sad consequences and some very tragic consequences in the aboriginal communities of this country for whom the fur industry is still the economic mainstay.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1610)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

INCOME TAX ACT AND RELATED ACTS

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed, from Tuesday, July 19, consideration of the motion of Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) that Bill C-139, an Act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and the Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contribution Act, 1977, and certain related Acts, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs; and the amendment of Mr. Garneau (p. 17724), and the subamendment of Mr. Boudria (p. 17770).

Mr. Bill Attewell (Don Valley East): Mr. Speaker, during the debate on Bill C-139 many of my colleagues discussed how tax reform benefits individual taxpayers, but comparatively little attention has been devoted to another vital area of reform, corporate tax reform. Canada needs a reformed corporate tax system that is competitive internationally, more efficient and market-oriented, and fairer.

In the past, Canada's corporate tax system suffered from serious problems. Its capacity to raise revenues was seriously eroded over the years by a multitude of special tax deductions and other incentives. While each special preference was introduced to address a particular problem, the number of these breaks has enabled many profitable corporations to reduce their tax liability or pay no tax at all.

As a member of the Finance Committee I recall that the life insurance industry in particular paid little or no tax for the last 10 years. At one point in the hearings a chairman of the board of one of the largest companies, when questioned on whether or not the company paid tax, stated that it did not. When corrected by a vice-president he admitted that the company had received oil royalties and had paid a bit of tax on those. However, there are some sectors where the tax system has become totally unfair.

One of the problems is that the sheer number of incentives distorted market signals and led to inefficient uses of Canada's resources. It got to the point where tax considerations directed investments instead of sound business considerations. Again, if I could direct my thoughts back a few years to my former company where, from time to time, I worked on acquisitions, it was amazing how often the number one consideration when looking at a possible acquisition would be the tax situation. We did look at the type of services and the market share, but time and again the number one consideration would be the tax situation.

Our corporate tax system must remain competitive in an increasingly competitive world economy. Many of our trading partners have overhauled their tax systems to reduce tax rates and improve efficiency. Canada's general corporate tax rate was much higher than that of the United States and the United Kingdom. If we fail to narrow this gap, firms can arrange their operations to pay their taxes at lower rates to other countries rather than to Canada.

From time to time our Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) may have been criticized for moving ahead with this. I can recall perhaps two years ago asking the Minister of Finance if he was going to move ahead with comprehensive tax reform. At that time his answer was that we were moving in that direction as a Government, but did not plan a comprehensive tax reform. But the world and realities change, and when the United States, in particular, moved ahead with its comprehensive tax reform, the Minister of Finance was wise to change his mind on that factor for the reasons that we have already touched upon.

Our proposals for reform of the corporate tax system will resolve these problems and achieve the three major goals we set out in the White Paper. First, profitable corporations will pay a larger share of the total tax burden. Corporate income tax will be a more predictable and reliable source of revenue.

Second, many special tax breaks will be eliminated or reduced. This will pay for the lower personal and corporate tax rates. It will return the profit motive to investment by rewarding success. It will encourage investment decisions based more on economic factors than on tax considerations. Certainly, some proposals of the previous Government went completely off the rails. I think particularly of the scientific research tax credit. When that was announced by the former Government it was believed that it would cost taxpayers something in the order of $200 million. We all know that that was poorly thought out, ill-conceived, and inadequately controlled to the point that the best estimate now is that this initiative will cost the taxpayers of Canada in excess of $3 billion. Some serious mistakes have been made. However, the Minister of Finance proceeds cautiously and carefully and he is making tremendous headway.

Third, corporate tax rates will be reduced. This will promote growth and job creation by maintaining a corporate tax system that is competitive with other countries.

There has been general support for the goals and the outlines of these proposals. We consulted extensively with the corporate sector and the public, and listened carefully to what they said. We considered all proposed modifications in the light of the goals of our reform, and as they would affect other elements of tax reform. We made some changes to improve the original proposals.

The rates of corporate tax are the same as those set out in the White Paper. Effective July 1, the general federal rate dropped to 28 per cent from 36 per cent. The small business rate fell from 15 per cent to 12 per cent. The rate for manufacturing will be phased down to 23 per cent by 1991.

The White Paper's proposals for broadening the corporate tax base will generally be implemented. While there will be fewer special tax preferences, not all tax incentives will be removed. The tax system will continue to recognize the importance of incentives for investment in resources, manufacturing, R and D, and small businesses, among others. The incentives that remain will be fairer and more effective in supporting economic growth and regional development.

For example, we improved our proposals on flow-through shares to ensure they remain an attractive investment vehicle and a benefit for junior resource companies; the proposed limitation on claimable investment tax credits has been increased to ensure that our tax régime for R and D remains among the most attractive in the world; and our proposal for capitalization of interest on vacant land will be modified so it does not affect small home building firms.

Concerns about the fairness of the system were aroused because of the number of profitable firms not paying tax. Our proposals, when fully implemented, will mean a substantial decline in the number of such companies. Tax reform will reduce by one-half the number of profitable corporations that pay no tax. Those that remain will either be firms in cyclical industries that have experienced significant economic losses in prior years, or will be firms in industries which receive incentives directed at important national priorities. These priorities include promoting regional development, ensuring a healthy and active resource sector, and encouraging research and development that will provide jobs for Canadians in the future.

A combination of a broader base and lower rates will produce more revenue, bringing the over-all tax system into better balance. Corporate tax revenues as a share of general tax revenues will increase from 15.6 per cent in 1987-88 to 17.2 per cent in 1991-92. In dollar terms, the federal corporate tax revenues will increase by about $5.5 billion over the next five years. That is approximately 10 per cent higher. Across the entire economy, corporate tax reform will strengthen the incentive for firms to invest in profitable ventures. The rate of tax on the return from new investment will be reduced. The tax treatment of capital will continue to encourage risk-taking initiative, growth and job creation. There will be less variation of tax paid by different sectors. Sectors which formerly paid below average taxes, such as finance and life insurance, will pay higher effective tax rates. Sectors that paid higher than average taxes, such as trade, services and construction, will pay lower effective tax rates. At the same time, the tax rate for small business will continue to provide a major incentive for entrepreneurs to create jobs and to promote economic growth.

• (1620)

The federal small business tax rate of 12 per cent is less than one-half of the tax imposed on large businesses. In addition, owners of shares in small businesses will also benefit from the full $500,000 exemption in capital gains on these shares, to reward success in private entrepreneurship.

Corporate tax reform is a key element of the Government's over-all plan to position the Canadian economy and to take advantage of the opportunities in the 1990s. I urge all Members of this House who want to see a stronger Canadian economy to vote with me in favour of Bill C-139.

Just before closing, if I might touch on a couple of other points, let me say that it is vitally important that we get on with this legislation. Those people involved in tax planning and running business know that one of the big problems on something like this is delays and uncertainty. We must get on with this so that people can plan confidently and not be wondering continually when this legislation might be passed.

I think that the confidence of our Finance Minister, as I mentioned earlier, grows by the day and by the month. We have here a Finance Minister who in the past three years has made projections of what the deficit would be. Every single year of the last three has come in on or under the projections. This latest one will be something like $1 billion lower than forecast. A lot of Canadians would not realize this, but that is the best three-year record in 45 years.

I think we have tremendous confidence in this Minister. Let us get behind him, let us get this legislation passed, and let us get on with the increases that will occur in the corporate sector, to help provide lower taxes for the consumers.

We know that four out of five consumers will be paying less tax, and nine out of 10 seniors will be paying less tax. This is a great over-all package. People will nit-pick on certain aspects of it, but on balance it is a super package, one that a lot of Canadians will benefit from, and I think we are moving in a very excellent way to a fairer system.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments. The Hon. Member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan).

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Member would be willing at least to acknowledge that what appears to be tax reductions that are contained in the Bill before us really do not, when looked at over the picture of tax increases of low and middle-income Canadians over the last four years, give back to low-income Canadians the amounts that this Government has taken away from them in the whole four-year picture.

Mr. Attewell: Mr. Speaker, of all Parties to start trying to slow down this Bill, that should be the last Party. It is the Party that put us into a deficit situation year after year, so much so that now the entire deficit of $29 billion to $30 billion is devoted not to reducing the debt but devoted 100 per cent to paying the interest on that debt.

Now, let us have our focus on moving ahead. I have described the package in the corporate sector, certainly. There is a lot being done. We must get on with the business and eliminate the uncertainty that exists out there. I will quote the following from *The Globe and Mail* issue of April 25th:

If an election were called before stage one became law, tax reform would die and the current system would stand until new legislation was introduced.

That would create chaos. "I hope Brian Mulroney isn't irresponsible enough to call an election before the bill gets through the House."

The person who made that comment was the Liberal finance critic, Raymond Garneau.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I think it must be obvious to everyone in this Chamber, including the large crowd in the gallery, that the Hon. Member made no reference at all to my question in the statement that he just made, or any attempt to answer it or to explain away, which I thought he might do, the point that I tried to make. I called on the Hon. Member and asked him to recognize that the reductions that are contained in Bill C-130, for most Canadians, lower and middle-income Canadians in particular, do not restore the tremendous tax increases that those very groups have sustained since this Government took office four years ago.

I know that there was a deficit to deal with and that it is a legitimate option to increase taxes. I am calling on the Member to recognize that the taxes that have been increased are not the taxes that are on the richest in society, on the highest income earners. The taxes that have been increased are on the lowest earners and middle-income Canadians.

I call on the Hon. Member to admit that this is the case, at least out of a sense of honesty.

Mr. Attewell: Mr. Speaker, Canadians are going to get a chance to judge fairly quickly what this Government has done.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Attewell: It has been a great package in total.

An Hon. Member: They cannot wait.

Mr. Attewell: They are going to see that four out of five Canadians are going to be paying less tax, and nine out of 10 seniors will pay less tax. Some sectors are finally going to be paying their share. I mentioned that some people might try to slow down this package in certain isolated areas, but in total I can only stress again—and you mentioned people watching this in the gallery and elsewhere—I know that they will be, but I know that they are also examining our record as a Government, the record of the Finance Minister, which I will just highlight again.

It is the first time in 45 years that we have had three successive projections of being on or below the forecast. That is a responsible performance compared to the totally irresponsible performance of the Liberal Government. I can remember the Liberal Government adjusting its projections on deficits by the week, not too many years ago. I think it is pretty clear in which Party, in which Government the people of Canada are going to have their confidence. They are not going to return it back to the irresponsible bunch that they had for about 16 years.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: Time for a change.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I will say a few words to the Hon. Member who sits from time to time on the Finance Committee and who does his work there. In a sense I think that there is something wrong with the Conservative tax reform. It seems to suit the residents of the Hon. Member's constituency perhaps more than the average Canadian. Is it fair to have a so-called tax reform which winds up leaving only one group among Canadians paying less tax on their income than they paid in 1984, namely people who are earning more than a $100,000 a year? Is it fair to have a tax system which will leave the corporate share of tax revenues to the Government of Canada, to drop it down to 17 per cent in 1991, which in fact is lower than the 20 per cent share that corporations paid of tax revenues in 1984? When the Conservatives came to power, corporations were paying a larger share of federal revenues than they will be paying in 1991, after this particular and so-called tax reform is mature.

• (1630)

Perhaps the Hon. Member could say whether it is fair to have tax reform which will give tax cuts of only $140 to poor people earning under $15,000 a year but which, according to the Government's own figures, will give a tax cut of some $4,165 on average to three out of four families earning over $100,000. Is that fair? Is that just? Could the Hon. Member take those facts into a pub in Kamloops or Newfoundland and defend that? Could he take that to a group of families and justify the unfairness of a system where the tax credit which people get if they have children is the magnificent sum of only $65 a year? Is that fair? Could the Hon. Member say, if he agrees with me that these things are not fair, why the Government is going ahead with a tax reform which essentially is unfair to families, unfair to average Canadians, and fair only to the rich and to corporations?

Mr. Attewell: Mr. Speaker, the system we are recommending, the package, I say is fair. The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) has been on the Finance Committee. I have been on it for almost four years now. We have had a tremendous amount of consultation and have done a lot of research. Our committee visited Washington. Every aspect of this package has been thoroughly looked at and analysed.

Let me highlight again some of the benefits and who will be paying less. Income taxes will be reduced for 9.7 million households, over 85 per cent of all households, by an average of $490. About 850,000 lower-income Canadians will have their income tax reduced to zero or will receive refundable credits. In other words, they will be coming right off the tax rolls. Income taxes will be cut for about 1.3 million of the 1.4 million households which have at least one person in them aged 65 and over. About 250,000 elderly Canadians will have their income tax reduced to zero. Personal income tax will be lower for all ranges of income. Most taxpayers whose income

consists primarily of salary or wages, family allowance or standard pension and retirement revenue will receive tax reductions. Last, net personal income tax revenue to the federal Government will be reduced by about $12 billion, not $12 million but $12 billion coming off the personal side. I say that that is a giant leap in fairness.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have to say that it is a giant leap backwards. When I talk to my constituents and to average Canadians and ask them what they think about this tax thing, whether they think this tax reform is a good idea, the reaction I get is: "You know, I am not sure what it is, but I am not seeing as much money at home as I was four years ago. I am not sure where it is going, but I know it is going".

This is a product of two things, Mr. Speaker. On the one hand, real incomes of Canadians have not been rising. On the other hand, the bite of the tax collector has been increasing on those average Canadians. As we calculate it, it is an average of $1,500 or so in tax increases on the average Canadian with an income of perhaps $30,000 or $35,000 a year since 1984, and tax reform will give about $300 or $350 back. If you have to give up $4 and you get $1, you are not better off; you are worse off. It seems to me that that is the situation which prevails with tax reform. The Government will say: "Look at last year and look at what is happening this year". The Government will ignore the consistent pattern of tax increases on average Canadians imposed by the Conservatives at the same time as they cut taxes on wealthy Canadians by the capital gains exemption and stuff like that.

Mrs. Mailly: And the farmers.

Mr. Cassidy: I would correct the Hon. Member's recollection as well. In committee when my colleague from Regina West and I raised the question about the rates and asked "why are we giving such cuts to people who are wealthy and doing so little for people on average incomes", the chairman simply said: "We are not discussing that here", and we went on to something else. My colleague and I had two choices. We could have either co-operated on the areas where the Finance Committee was able to co-operate productively, or we could have simply walked out and said: "This is a Tory show". We were constructive and chose to participate. I think the committee made some constructive suggestions, but in this area we were completely excluded from the game.

I am really surprised at my hon. friend from Don Valley suggesting that this was looked at. It was not looked at all. It was on the Tory agenda that the Conservatives wanted to give very large tax cuts to wealthy Canadians, a sharp reduction in taxes for many corporations, and to do that with a small cut for average Canadians, which is far less than the increases in tax they have had since 1984.

Mr. George Baker (Gander—Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I have a few words concerning this very extensive Bill. I have listened to Hon. Members argue about who is responsible for this tax increase or who is responsible for that tax increase. I have heard them argue that there was not a tax increase, there is not going to be a tax increase, there is going to be a tax decrease, or there is not going to be a tax decrease. For those of us who help people in our constituencies fill out their income tax returns, one thing is obvious. People are paying more income tax as the years go by than they did in previous years.

If you took the last four years and filled out the income tax returns for the same person, you would discover that the individual is paying more income tax as each year goes by. I do not know where Hon. Members are getting all these facts and figures about people paying less income tax. All I can see is that they are paying more income tax.

I suppose there are only two groups of people. I was thinking about this as I was glancing at some portions of the Bill a few moments ago. One group are millionaires. Of course I do not fill out income tax returns for millionaires; I do not know any. In the place from where I come on the northeast coast of Newfoundland we do not have any millionaires sitting around doing their income tax. They would not fill them out anyway. They would have a chartered accountant do it.

I want to make an honest to goodness logical suggestion for the Government of Canada on this one point about income tax. I have here in my hand a list of some 200 communities in Alberta, about 600 communities in British Columbia, about 400 communities in Newfoundland, and so on. This year these communities qualify for a new tax break. Granted, some of the communities are pretty small. If you live in these communities you will probably gain, if you pay taxes, about $2,000 to $2,500 on your income tax return when you fill it out. I noticed that some of the communities do not have anybody living in them. There is a community in Newfoundland called Exploits. Only two people live in Exploits. They are Richard Wells and Lydia. They have lived there all their lives. Richard is a pensioner. Also, some of the communities are quite large. If you examine the list here, you will find that there are perhaps 50 communities in my federal riding.

The Minister stood in this House the other day and spoke about fairness in taxation. He spoke about the fact that the Government of Canada has brought fairness into the tax system. It is a funny thing, but I noticed that some communities which have now been listed for northern benefits are on the border of Canada and the United States. Some communities listed for northern benefits are in southern Newfoundland, but there are none listed in northern Newfoundland. This tells me that there is something drastically wrong with the regulations the Government has brought in.

• (1640)

Granted, this is a very difficult situation. You know what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, because you know about that northern section of Québec and the Gaspé coast where a great many of these communities are located. It is very difficult to come up with criteria for the tax law as it relates to deductions

being administered fairly. In other words, how do we define an isolated community?

We do not define an isolated community the way the Government of Canada did a few days ago, that is, by saying that everything above the 55th parallel is isolated and everything below the 55th parallel is not isolated. It does not make much sense to have the entire Burin Peninsula and the entire south coast of Newfoundland getting benefits while the islands up North do not get them.

The Government of Canada, though it has appointed a commission of inquiry to look into the matter, could have come up with a more sensible way of distributing these benefits than it has. It has sent to each person living in those communities a special form to fill out to see if he or she qualifies. Looking at the communities and areas that qualify, one would have to say that the person who made up that list really used no common sense whatsoever in determining what was isolated and what was not. The commission of inquiry, as I understand it, is starting its hearings in Newfoundland next week.

There is another clause in the Bill that I want to comment on. That is the clause that deals with the Unemployment Insurance Act. The Minister, in his wisdom, has brought in an amendment to the Unemployment Insurance Act here dealing with amounts of money owed by the employer to the Receiver General for Canada, the Government of Canada. The Government is now imposing a penalty on the employer. The penalty is as follows: the employer shall pay to the Receiver General that amount computed from the day on which it was owed to the day of the remittance of the amount to the Receiver General for Canada, and the normal interest rate shall be charged.

If the Government is going to amend that Section of the Unemployment Insurance Act, surely to goodness it should have then revised the penalties that apply to the recipients of unemployment insurance benefits when that same Section is in violation. Let me tell Hon. Members what that is under this particular Section of the Unemployment Insurance Act. The recipient of unemployment insurance would have to have his unemployment insurance reduced over a period of time to satisfy the debt owed the Crown. The employer, in the case of uninsurability, gets no penalty whatsoever except that he gets back the money that he paid in.

The Government of Canada, in changing the law as it relates to Subsection 68(6) of the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, certainly should have addressed the problem in relation to the recipients of unemployment insurance as well as the employers. As I say, the principle of fairness in the Unemployment Insurance Act goes out the window when one examines the Northern Benefits and Isolated Posts Act. It goes out the window because I do believe that politics came into play very recently when some Members in this Chamber got a hold of two Ministers and had whole areas designated as being eligible for these particular allowances.

The Bill itself also amends the Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, 1977, and the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act. I do hope that more Hon. Members will address these very important subjects as the day goes on.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I am just curious. I know that the Hon. Member has been here before, and I know that the Liberal Party has been critical of the Government because of a tax reform which favours too much the rich and wealthy corporations.

I seem to recall that back in 1981, when Senator MacEachen was the Minister of Finance, the Liberal Party came in with a Budget which was ostensibly meant to broaden the base and at the same time lower the tax rates for wealthy Canadians by a substantial amount. I seem to recall as well that after a good deal of pressure from the business community and other friends of the Liberal Party, the loophole plugging exercise, the broadening of the base that was meant to take place, was in fact reversed. At the same time, the Liberal Party did not put back up to previous levels the reductions of taxes for wealthy Canadians.

I also recall that when the Liberals were in power, beginning with the present Leader of the Liberal Party, in fact, there was a series of measures which had the effect of reducing the tax burden on corporations through accelerated depreciation and various other types of allowances which, among other things, led to an enormous piling up of deferred taxation on the part of the corporate sector, to an erosion of corporate tax revenues and to many of the injustices in corporate taxation which average Canadians have been so concerned about.

My hon. friend comes from a part of the country where that kind of thing really is not very tolerable because there are not many wealthy Canadians in his constituency. How is it that he was able at that time to let pass without comment the fact that the Liberals were reducing taxes on the wealthy just as the Tories are reducing taxes on the wealthy today, and that the Liberals were reducing taxes on corporations, just as the Tories are reducing taxes on corporations today? Perhaps the Hon. Member can tell us if there was any difference between the Liberal Party at that time and the Conservative Party today, because I cannot see very much difference.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, I can remember when the NDP—no, I cannot remember when the NDP formed the Government of Canada. It is very difficult to follow the hon. gentleman's logic. For the past four years, the hon. gentleman has been blaming the Conservative Government for drastically raising taxes on everyone, and he has been saying that prior to that the Liberals were drastically increasing taxes on everyone. The Hon. Member knows full well, however, that as far as federal income taxes are concerned, income taxes for ordinary Canadians took a fairly substantial drop in years prior. When I say "substantial", I mean that when a person filled out his income tax form at least he got a little more. I am talking

about the average Canadian, and by "average" I mean average in my riding.

What is average in my riding? Average in my riding is $8,000 or $9,000 a year. The Hon. Member does not know very many people who make $8,000 or $9,000 a year, I am sure. He does not represent fishermen. He does not represent the primary producers of Canada. He knows a lot about the corporate sector and what taxes it is paying.

I do not know anything about the corporate sector. All I know about is ordinary, producing Canadians. When the Liberal Government was in power, ordinary Canadians were the primary concern. I have seen incredible changes take place in the past four years since the Conservatives have been in government. Most of them have been to the detriment of these primary producers, these average Canadians who pay through the nose, day in and day out.

These average Canadians do not know, and I am afraid that I must claim some ignorance here and say that I do not know, what is the corporate tax structure. I have not got a clue. I do not know what happened under the Trudeau regime with corporate taxes. All I know is that ordinary Canadians benefited greatly under the Liberal administrations year after year. All I have seen in the last four years has been programs disappearing. All the assistance programs have disappeared. Look at all the insurance programs for fishermen; they were thrown out the window. All the assistance programs for boat building were thrown out the window. Why? Perhaps it was because they went against the wishes of the United States of America.

• (1650)

However, I can assure the Hon. Member of the NDP, the people who back in the mid-1970s supported the International Fund for Animal Welfare to get rid of the seal hunt, that under the Liberal Government the ordinary Canadians, the producers of Canada, are always looked out for first and foremost, not like under this present regime.

Mr. Horner: Oh, George, I don't believe you said that.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, while I have great respect for the Hon. Member, and while I know he speaks out for his constituents, there is a kind of blindness on the part of members of the Liberal Party, particularly when they are in government.

I have done a bit of research on this question. It does not affect Newfoundland directly, but it affects people with very modest incomes living in the east end of Montreal. I wanted to find out what was happening and who was speaking on their behalf between 1980 and 1984 when the Liberals were in power. I took the trouble to look at the legislative and parliamentary record of the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) who is well known here as a voice of the people, at least over the last two or three years. During the time that Montreal's economy was going down the drain, when basic industries were shutting down almost every day, the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie did not say a word. This man, who was such a defender of the rights of pensioners when the Conservative Government tried to deindex pensions in 1985, actually spoke up for deindexing public service pensions when the Liberal Party brought in the six and five program two or three years earlier. Yet there was not a peep, not a word was heard from him about Montreal.

It seems to me the problem with Liberal Members coming from poorer parts of Canada is that they walked on the other side of the street. They turned a blind eye when the Minister of Finance of the day cut tax rates on wealthy Canadians from over 60 per cent to the levels that prevailed before the Conservatives came to power. They turned a blind eye when the Government brought in accelerated depreciation schedules and other tax devices which made the whole tax fraternity and the corporate sector jump with joy.

The Hon. Member says he does not know anything about corporate taxes or accelerated depreciation. He had a responsibility to know about those things because during the time the Liberals were in power they were bleeding Canadians dry by putting so many tax breaks in the hands of wealthy Canadians and corporations. They did not take all the benefits away from average Canadians. What they did instead was run up the deficit in order to give those privileges to wealthy Canadians. That is a policy which tries to benefit everyone at the same time, but it led the country close to bankruptcy.

That is why I ask the Hon. Member why he and his colleagues were not vigorously on their feet to condemn the Government of the day in 1980 when its major priority for taxation seemed to be to cut taxes on the wealthy, just like the Conservatives today.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, I must say that accelerated depreciation is certainly not a major subject of importance in my riding. It certainly was not an election issue. Accelerated depreciation?

Mr. Angus: That sounds like growing old fast.

Mr. Baker: Yes. That is certainly not a subject of any great importance in my riding. However, I would certainly welcome the NDP running a campaign on it in Newfoundland. I would certainly welcome that kind of competition. Accelerated depreciation!

The Hon. Member is probably correct in one thing. That is, you will always be able to look back on what the Conservatives did and what the Liberals did, but you will never be able to look back on what the NDP did.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate. The Hon. Member for Burnaby.

Mr. Rossi: The people don't want the NDP.

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, the people will certainly be making a clear decision in the next election, and it is about time that we had a real change from the worn out and discredited policies of the Liberals of the past and those policies of the Conservatives of today. The people of Canada are going to vote for New Democrats and a Government led by the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent). That is what is going to happen in the next election, and we are looking forward to it.

Mr. Rossi: You are a bunch of bluffers.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to participate in the debate on what the Government calls tax reform but which is in fact nothing of the sort. Instead of reforming the tax system in a meaningful way, it shifts the burden to the poor and powerless from the wealthy and the corporate elite. That is the effect of Tory tax reform.

I want to make it very clear that in the next federal election, and we say the time for that is now, the people should have a right to speak out on the record of the Government and voice their concerns about the proposed trade deal. A central theme for New Democrats in that election will be the question of fairness. What area of government policy is more lacking in fairness than the tax system?

What we are seeing with Tory tax reform is a move by the Government away from a progressive tax system, to a system in which, rather than taxing people on income, it is going to be taxing people on consumption. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) says that is all right because people choose whether or not they want to buy goods or services. What kind of unreal attitude is that? Tell a poor family, a single parent family, that they can choose whether or not to buy shoes and clothes for their children, that they can choose whether or not to spend money on housing, that they can choose whether or not to buy essentials to provide for their family. Of course that is nonsense. By moving from taxation of income to taxation of consumption the Government is moving away from progressive principles in the tax system.

As New Democrats we have clearly identified a number of important areas in which the Government should be tightening loopholes and increasing the progressive nature of the system. I want to pay tribute to my colleague from Ottawa Centre and my colleague from Regina East who have done such an outstanding job in committee and across this country in drawing to the attention of Canadians the unfairness and inequities in our tax system. In the four years of Conservative rule the share of taxes paid by the corporate sector has gone down from approximately 20 per cent in 1984 to some 15 per cent this year. Who is paying more in taxes? Of course, it is low and middle-income earners. That is the nature of Tory tax reform.

The Minister of Finance boasts that 850,000 Canadians are going to be removed from the tax rolls. He neglects to mention that under four years of Tory rule over one million Canadians were added to the tax rolls. This kind of cynical shell game is obviously not going to wash with Canadians.

I have received extensive correspondence from my constituents in Burnaby on the unfairness of the Government's proposed tax reform. I want to share a couple of those letters with members of the House and those who are watching these proceedings across the country.

• (1700)

I received a letter, for example, from an 85-year-old constituent, Mr. Eric Button in North Burnaby. He wrote to me as follows:

> Dear Svend:
>
> Thank you for your latest Ottawa update. I enjoyed reading it.
>
> In the last paragraph on income tax you did not mention the great change in the 1986 schedule over that of 1985. It seems to me that a multitude of poor people will be paying income tax this year. This will be the first time in 20 years that I have paid a tax . . . We have always lived during our retirement time below the Government's poverty level.

He asked for an explanation. Why is it that for the first time in 20 years this elderly gentleman and his wife, who are struggling to survive on an income which is below the poverty line, are paying tax? He included copies of the schedules from the 1985 and 1986 tax tables. I examined them and, sure enough, under the Conservative Government taxes have in fact gone up substantially for the poorest in our society, including senior citizens.

I suppose we should not be surprised at that. After all, it was this same Government that attempted to deindex the pensions of senior citizens. It was only the angry outcry of seniors from right across this land that forced the Government to back down.

It is not surprising that a very respected national Seniors organization, the one voice: Canadian Seniors Network, in their response to the Government's White Paper on tax reform was severely critical of the proposals of the Government. They note that the fundamental principles of fairness, accountability, and stability are ignored when it comes to the proposals of the Government in the area of tax reform. We, as New Democrats, do not accept that.

We say that there is something very wrong with a tax system in which, in 1985, for example, 8,000 Canadians who made more than $50,000 paid not one penny in income tax. We say there is something wrong with that system. We say there is something wrong with a system in which, in 1984, over 1,400 people who had incomes in excess of $100,000 per year did not pay a penny in income tax.

We as New Democrats believe that the income tax system should be an important mechanism for the redistribution of income. We do not accept the philosophy of the Fraser Institute, for example, which suggests that we move to a flat rate system of taxation.

Under four years of Conservative Government we have seen an erosion of the fundamental principles of progressive income taxation and a very clear shift from income taxation to taxation on consumption. That shift is profoundly regressive and clearly attacks the poor in Canadian society.

The tax system should be used to redistribute income and wealth in our society. There is something fundamentally immoral about a society which is prepared to accept the fact that over one million of our children are poor while saying that some 8,000 individuals who make in excess of $50,000 a year have to pay no income tax whatsoever. There is something immoral about an economic system which condemns 700 children in the City of Vancouver and the municipality of Burnaby, which I have the honour to represent, to go to school hungry while the Government refuses to bring forward changes in the tax system which would ensure that such poverty is eliminated.

The same Government that refuses to tackle tax reform is prepared to spend in excess of $8 billion for nuclear submarines. What kind of madness is it that a Government is prepared to waste this kind of money? In fact, as my colleague from Winnipeg—Birds Hill points out, it is well in excess of $8 billion. In 1986 an estimated 102,000 Canadians were homeless. We want to spend $8 billion on nuclear submarines while people are homeless and hungry? As New Democrats we profoundly reject that.

What exactly does Tory tax reform mean and who does it benefit? Let us look at the figures. The most significant change under the tax proposals of the Minister of Finance is the reduction in the top tax rate on the highest income earners. In fact, the highest tax rate will drop from 34 per cent on incomes above $63,000 to 29 per cent on taxable incomes exceeding $55,000.

At the same time as the top tax rate is dropping the bottom rate is increasing. We are left with a situation, when provincial income tax is added in, in which the current top rate of 51 per cent is going to drop to 44 per cent but the bottom rate is going to increase from 9 per cent to 25 per cent. That is Tory tax reform—lower the marginal rates at the top and increase the marginal rates at the bottom. There is no sense of fairness or justice whatsoever.

It is interesting as well to consider the timing of these tax proposals. The tax reductions, of course, took effect on July 1 of this year. That meant a slight increase in the take-home pay of some employees. It is not entirely coincidental that this should be taking place on the eve of a federal election.

While there may be a slight decrease in taxes and a slight increase in take-home pay, the reality is that since 1984 a series of Conservative tax measures have increased sales and excise taxes substantially. The Government has taken literally hundreds of dollars out of the pockets of Canadians that it is now saying it is going to put back in the form of income tax reduction. We do not accept this. We do not accept so-called tax reform in which, as an example, a stockbroker who earns more than $200,000 a year is going to save $15,000 in tax while the Government continues to tax people who live below the poverty line. That kind of so-called tax reform is completely unfair.

We say as well that it is time the Government took a serious look at tax expenditures in Canada. We have called for an annual review, an accountability of these tax expenditures which add up to in excess of $30 billion. Imagine what we could do with that money for social programs, post-secondary education, housing, and the environment. However, the Government refuses to consider that.

We have said that it is time that this country looks seriously at the taxation of capital gains. Why is it that 50 per cent of capital gains are exempt from taxes? The Government is now saying that it will move to tax 75 per cent of capital gains, but why do we not recognize that capital gains should be taxed just as any other income is taxed?

As long ago as 1967 Carter said it well "a buck is a buck is a buck". For that reason we, as New Democrats, have said that capital gains, aside from small businesses and the family farm, should be taxed fairly, just as is the income of those who work on an hourly and monthly basis. Why should those who earn their income from speculation in land, for example, be taxed at a lower rate than those who are employed? For that reason we have called upon the Government to recognize that it should be taxing capital gains as other income is taxed with the exception, as I said, of small businesses and family farms.

• (1710)

According to the proposed tax reform, the share of corporate taxation has gone down. Let us consider some of the rationale for this proposal. Why has the Government refused to tackle this question of capital gains? In 1984, the 1 per cent of taxpayers with incomes in excess of $100,000 received 30 per cent of all capital gains. Why are they not taxed fairly? That would reduce the burden on low and middle-income earners. Yet the Government is not prepared to take that step even though the Reagan Government in the United States has moved to tax capital gains at full rates, just like ordinary income.

The Government huffed and puffed about corporate taxation and suggested that it would make significant moves to increase the level of corporate taxation. However, it has done nothing of the sort. Since it took office in 1984, corporate taxes have increased 8 per cent, income taxes have gone up by approximately 45 per cent, and sales taxes have increased in excess of 67 per cent. That shows where the Government's heart really is. It is looking after its friends in the corporate elite and continuing to hit hard on low and middle-income earners.

What are the rationales for this so-called tax reform? Why has the Government not taken serious action? The Government says that by reducing the number of tax rates from 10 to 3 it will reduce the complexity of the system. What nonsense. The number of steps in the tax schedule has no bearing whatsoever on simplification.

It goes without saying that New Democrats have called for a more easily understandable tax system. The reality is that by reducing the top level of taxation from 34 per cent to 29 per cent, the Government is simply reducing the amount it will be collecting from the wealthiest in our society. Why should a secretary at Bell Canada who earns $28,000 pay a marginal tax rate that is only 5 percentage points below the rate paid by the chairperson of Bell Canada, Jean de Grandpré, whose salary last year was $977,300. Is that fairness? Is that a fair, equitable and just tax system? Of course not.

We believe that instead of lowering the marginal rate for the wealthiest and most affluent in our society, that rate should be increased to enable us to pay for the social programs that we value in this country.

That brings me to another rationale of the Government in this so-called tax reform. It says that tax reform will make us more competitive with the United States. I must question that. The United States has an estate tax which Canada has not had since 1971. Furthermore, we as Canadians value what makes us a distinct society. We value safer streets. We value a publicly financed hospital and health care system. Indeed, it was the NDP and CCF, with J. S. Woodsworth and Tommy Douglas, that pioneered these health care programs. We value a greater public role in the area of financing of post-secondary education, in transportation, and in communications. Canadians are prepared to pay the cost if our tax system is fair.

The Government's argument that we must lower these rates to bring them more in line with American rates is part and parcel with its approach to Canadian society, which is best exemplified in the trade deal. That deal, if it is ultimately implemented, will result in Canada in many ways being transformed into something like a fifty-first state. It will erode our social programs and destroy our sovereignty, resulting in far greater levels of unemployment. We as New Democrats are pledged to fight that deal with every ounce of energy we have.

Another rationale of the Government is that the upper level of taxation should be reduced because no one pays at those upper levels in any event. If that is the case, surely those loopholes should be closed. Rather than lower the upper marginal rate, close the loopholes that allow people who are making in excess of $100,000 to pay no income tax whatsoever. That is a more sensible approach than simply lowering the upper level of taxation.

Another argument made by the Government is that higher tax rates breed inefficiency. Japan is often cited as one of the most productive economies in the world. It has a top tax rate of 80 per cent. Sweden, which has a very high growth economy, has a top rate of 88 per cent. Studies have shown that high tax rates have little effect on productivity.

In bringing this proposal forward, the Government still has not moved to implement a minimum tax on its friends in the corporate sector. Even Ronald Reagan has taken such steps in the United States, and in excess of $2 billion in revenue has been raised as a result of the minimum tax on the corporate sector there.

The New Democratic Party agrees that loopholes were opened by the Liberals during their term in office. We would have hoped that the Tories would have closed those loopholes and moved to a fair, just and equitable tax system. This tax reform is nothing of the sort. That is why in the next election Canadians will turn not to the Liberals, not to the Conservatives, but to New Democrats for a tax system which is fair and equitable.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Mailly: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member's heart is in the right place. He is right when he says there is something immoral about our society when we see Canadian children who come home at the end of the day and have to go to bed hungry and who get up in the morning and go to school hungry. These problems are caused by poverty, and it is true that they are a blot on this wealthy society of ours. However, the answer is not tax reform but a family policy that will help these children. These problems are caused by the lack of a comprehensive family policy that would include a housing policy, providing decent, affordable housing so that at the end of the month, parents would not be in a situation where they don't have enough money to make ends meet and give their children the food they need.

On the other hand, since the Hon. Member mentioned that the sales tax is a regressive tax, I would like to point out to him that we felt that a tax reform was necessary because we had reached the point where the only way we could get the money to upgrade programs to help the poor was to increase sales tax, because we could no longer increase personal income tax.

The tax burden on Canadians was undermining job creation, so a tax reform was necessary but we also had to make sure that we could get revenue from sources other than sales tax. These are the two aspects of the reform: income tax and sales tax.

As far as sales tax is concerned, we have introduced a credit to compensate people at the bottom of the financial ladder, a $50 credit for all Canadians. So an effort has been made, but the tax reform must be carried out. The Hon. Member may not agree on ideological issues or on the procedure, but our purpose, Mr. Speaker, is to provide some relief for Canadians who are overtaxed, and we want to do so by finding sources of revenue so that the Government can upgrade programs that deal with the problems of the poor, whether they are children, adults, or senior citizens. Sixty percent of the women over 65 in Canada are poor. So would he not agree that something had to be done and that we are taking this approach for a very good reason? And as far as capital gains are concerned, this also covers farmers, who are not wealthy people. I don't think he should blame tax reform for the problems caused by poverty which have been with us for quite some time.

• (1720)

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I find the Member's observation absolutely unbelievable. First of all, she does admit that the sales tax is regressive, does she not? So if it is a regressive tax, as the Member says, why have the Conservatives increased the level of that sales tax since 1984? Why, Mr. Speaker, have they increased the sales tax twice, if it is a regressive tax? The Members admits that, Mr. Speaker, and I find it unbelievable that she now says that there is no another way of obtaining the necessary money. There is another way, and it's quite plain to see. Why have they not taxed corporations, in the interest of fairness? Why, Mr. Speaker, have they not taxed corporations instead of increasing the sales tax every year? That is what I do not understand.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) has in fact removed $3.1 billion from the tax system. The 2 per cent of Canadians with the highest incomes will receive $379 million, but the 26 per cent who are among the poorest of Canadians will only receive $257 million. And there you have Conservative tax reform!

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Members ask me why we must use the tax system to reduce poverty. We New Democrats believe that the tax system can be used in a fair way to finance social programs, for instance, programs to help poor children, the homeless, and the elderly who are grappling with poverty. We think we can use the tax system and the money obtained by way of it to improve our social programs in a fair way. The Conservatives will not recognize that reality, and instead they help their friends in the corporate sector, in the corporate elite, and because of that the Canadian tax system remains unfair.

[*English*]

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, when I saw the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) rise in that beautiful red Liberal tie, I thought he was at least going to say some kind things about the Liberals. However, he began by indicating that the next Government would be a New Democratic Government. In the light of that, I think it is worth taking seriously the proposals he said would be part of New Democratic tax reform.

He indicated that capital gains would be taxed at full rates. This, of course, is tragic news for many senior citizens whose savings include Bell Canada stock which they have held for 20 and 30 years in some cases and will all be taxed in one year.

Mr. Cassidy: Conrad Black's parents?

Mr. Kaplan: I wanted to ask the Member about the small business and family farm exemption. Under the New Democratic tax system, he said, that although capital gains would be taxed fully the family farm, and small business and the family-owned business, would not be taxed at the regular capital gains rates which the NDP would impose. I think it is important, if those Members are proposing that a New Democratic Government be created in the next election, for us to know exactly what these exemptions are.

After all, the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) referred to his great friends, Conrad Black and family. Perhaps Argus Corporation is a family company in the definition of the New Democrats, or some of the largest farms in the country owned by one family. Are they to be totally exempt from capital gains tax under a New Democratic Government?

In a nutshell I am asking for more details about the exemption which will apply to family farms and to small family-owned businesses under New Democratic tax reform.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that a Liberal front-bencher should rise and be somewhat sensitive in the area of tax reform, particularly someone who has been around since 1968. It was the Liberal Government that was responsible for introducing loopholes into the tax system in this country that resulted in the loss of billions of dollars in tax revenue.

Some of us remember the scientific tax credit. Some of those Members will remember the research tax credit. Those great managers of the economy brought forward this boondoggle that resulted in the loss of literally billions of dollars. It is not surprising that the Member from one of the York constituencies would rise and raise concerns.

The reality is that when we look at the question of capital gains exemptions we must look at who in fact benefits most from these exemptions. I have made it very clear that the exemption for the family farm and for small businesses will continue, but let us look at who it is that benefits from capital gains. In 1984, the 1 per cent of taxpayers with incomes above $100,000 received 34 per cent of all capital gains. It is not surprising that the Liberals should be defending those people because in fact some of them, until a couple of years ago, used to be their principal source of funds, although the Liberals are now having some difficulty in collecting these funds.

I think it is interesting as well to note that on July 1 of this year the Chief Electoral Officer published the statement of the source of revenue of the three political Parties in Canada. As New Democrats, we are proud that we are a democratically financed Party, financed by the people of Canada. The Liberal Party and the Conservative Party receive thousands and thousands of dollars from the banks. The Liberal Party receives something like $50,000 a year from the banks. The Conservatives receive $50,000 a year from each of the major banks in the country.

• (1730)

It is not surprising that the Liberals are somewhat sensitive. They have a record of fiscal incompetence that is embarrassing. Canadians will never again allow them anywhere near the reins of power. They will go the way of the Liberal Party of the United Kingdom and the way of the dodo bird. They will be relics of the past.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, it is rich listening to the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) talking about the funding and financing of the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party and contrasting it to the democratic methods by which funds are raised by his Party. Yet the New Democratic Party is the only Party in the country which had a contributor go to the Federal Court of Canada to try to get his contribution back. He got it back, too. He did not want to contribute to the New Democratic Party. The banks which have made contributions to other Parties, as other companies have done, have at least done it voluntarily. New Democratic contributors want their money back. The court is ready to give it back to them. I do not think that the New Democratic Party should be telling Liberals and Conservatives anything about democratic fund-raising.

I have another question for the Hon. Member for Burnaby. It does not matter much that I do not get to ask it and have an answer from him, since I did not get an answer to the last question I asked. I asked him how he would define small business. He was unable but, more likely, he was unwilling to define small business for the purpose of the New Democratic capital gains tax exemption. I would be very interested to hear him—and I challenge him on some early occasion, or any other member of his Party—give the Canadian people more details about the exemptions that will be available from their Government in the unlikely opportunity, but the possibility, that they form the Government after the next election.

I have another question that I wanted to ask him, and since I did not get much of an answer to the last one, I think I will ask this one anyway as a hypothetical question. He indicated that following the next election in spite of the polls and in spite of what all of us who travel across the country meeting voters know if there is not a New Democratic Government, what his advice would be to people who are in the following situation. They cannot vote for the New Democratic Party. They might have been beguiled by what the Hon. Member had to say about tax reform, but they do not feel that they can support a political Party that wants to take Canada out of NATO. They do not feel that they can support a political Party that wants to nationalize at least one of the banks. They do not want to see the Government running a bank in addition to all the other things that Governments run and perhaps should not. Maybe they will say that they do not want to vote for a Party whose justice critic voted against the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Let us say that we were dealing with a voter who could not support with good reasons the New Democratic Party. Would he advise on the basis of taxation that that voter vote for the Liberals or the Conservatives? I do not know what the Hon. Member would have said if I had called on him, but I believe that he would have said, and that his advice to the Canadian people would be, to vote Liberal in a case like that. That is why I thought he was wearing a red tie.

There are some things that should be said about this tax reform package presented by the Government. I want to try to say some of them right now. The first thing that has to be said is that this is not tax reform. I remember during the last Parliament watching some very sincere activities by Members opposite, members of the Conservative Opposition in those days, directed toward improving the taxation system. I remember the efforts of the present Minister of National Defence (Mr. Beatty) to try to make the tax system simpler and less complicated. I think of how ironic it is that a political Party that in opposition developed a plan for making the taxation system simpler should have produced what it calls tax reform which is so much more complicated.

In my constituency office last Saturday afternoon I had a line-up of people who needed help with this long blue form that they had all received to enter into the simplified tax reform. It is not hard to do your twelfth, thirteenth or fourteenth form. But it is very complicated for the average individual to sit and look through and answer the complicated questions by which this so-called tax reform is being launched. It is not simpler. It is more complicated.

Also on the subject of tax reform, I remember in the last Parliament the efforts of the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) to try to deal frankly, openly, and honestly with taxation issues. I think he was very sincere when he was doing that. What I find to be the most astonishing feature of this so-called tax reform is the misrepresentations that it contains, the blatant efforts to pull the wool over the eyes of the Canadian people about what is happening in this so-called tax reform. I do not think Canadians will be fooled by this.

When the Hon. Member for Don Valley East (Mr. Attewell) stood up and said that four out of five Canadians would find their taxes reduced by tax reform, he knew the full story. What he meant by that statement was that four out of five Canadians would pay less tax under this tax reform than they did in the immediately preceding year, which was the third year of Conservative Government.

What he did not say and what he is hoping the Canadian people will not find out is that those four out of five taxpayers have had substantial tax increases under this Government, so much so that the reduction in this tax reform is no reduction at all. Each of those people, if they are in the same income level that they were when this Government took office, will be paying substantially more taxes as a result of a Conservative Government than they would have without any of these tax measures over the last four years.

I say that it is a misrepresentation to stand up and say that four out of five Canadians will pay less taxes this year than last. It is true, but when we look at the whole picture we see a Government that has engaged in what our Leader has called, and quite truly, the largest tax grab in the history of Canada.

I would like to say something very direct and blunt about tax increases because when the Hon. Member stood up, and I asked him a question about it, he said: "Oh yes, but we had a big deficit to pay off which we inherited from the former Government". It is true, there was a big deficit built up during the Liberal years of office. A great many good things were done with that money. In retrospect one can see that we should

have paid our way more as we went along. I concede that there was a big deficit. In years of prosperity something should be done to reduce the deficit. I am not arguing about that. I am not saying that taxes should never be increased. I am not saying that this Government should not have had to increase taxes. I am not saying that a Liberal Government, if there had been one in office, would not have increased taxes. I say something that I believe to the bottom of my heart: a Liberal Government would never increase taxes in a way which makes poor and middle-income people pay more while the richest people, the highest income earners in society, pay less. Their taxes go down while lower and middle-income Canadians have their taxes increased. I would like to think when Liberals have to increase taxes that they would be increased on a progressive basis, in order that those best able to pay would be the ones who would pay more, not those who are most able to pay would pay less. That is the formula followed by the Conservative Government.

• (1740)

The Minister of Finance had a cute phrase: "We want more wealthy people in Canada". That is an interesting idea. It is a good idea. If there are more wealthy people in the country, it is not a bad thing, but if people are made wealthy by having their taxes lowered while the deficit accumulated on the books is approached by making poor and middle income people pay more, that is fraud. It is not liberalism, and it is not tax reform. I hope the Canadian people will see through what this Government has done and call a spade a spade.

Another thing that astonishes me coming from the lips of the Minister of Finance, who was very sincere and dedicated while in opposition to have genuine tax reform, was the Government stating that tax reform has removed 850,000 lower income persons from having to pay income tax.

Mr. Horner: That's right.

Mr. Kaplan: "That's right", the Member opposite says. This year, without tax reform, 850,000 more people would have had to pay taxes than would have paid them without this so-called tax reform. Like the four out of five Canadians who are supposed to be better off, I would like to look at the situation of the 850,000 lower-income persons who have been removed from the tax rolls. Who are they? Did they suddenly get jobs and that is why they are having to pay taxes or not having to pay taxes? Those 850,000 people are the poorest Canadians who, in spite of their poverty and low incomes, were added to the tax rolls by measures the Conservative Government introduced since it came to office. There is no doubt about that.

The Fraser Institute has laid it out chapter and verse. In the first year of office the Government eliminated the inflation adjustment for taxes. The former Government had a policy that raised the floor in order that low-income Canadians were not brought into the tax rolls just because of inflation. That was introduced by the Leader of our Party when he was Minister of Finance. For a decade of Liberal Government every year the floor on income taxes increased so that poor people, who were not paying taxes the year before because of inflation, would not find that they were obliged to pay taxes because their inflated incomes brought them into the tax roll.

This hard-hearted, cruel, oriented to the rich, regressive Government removed that adjustment so that poor people, because of inflation and not because their real incomes went up, came into the tax roll year after year of Conservative Government. Over one million people became income taxpayers because of that change in income taxation. They became taxpayers not because they benefited from prosperity during a Conservative Government, which is what the Minister of Finance tried to say—

Mr. Horner: Maybe they got a job. Did you ever supply any?

Mr. Kaplan: I am not talking about those people. I am talking about people whose real incomes did not change. Some people did get jobs. Many jobs have been created during the last few years in Canada, in the United States, and in every industrialized country, but additional taxpayers appeared in Canada because of the callous policies of the Government introduced in its first years in office. According to the Fraser Institute over one million people became taxpayers because of inflation, although their real incomes did not change.

Now we get the great news that 850,000 of those one million people are being put back, as far as taxation is concerned, to where they were when the Liberals were in office. That is the Government's idea of tax reform. It might be the Government's idea of tax reform. When it says to those 850,000 people who would otherwise have had to pay taxes that under Tory taxation they will no longer do so, perhaps some people will think that a break is being given to lower-income Canadians, but the Government is not even restoring the situation that Canadians faced before the last election. There are still 150,000 people whose real incomes have not increased and who are paying taxes thanks to the Tories. During the election campaign we will see how grateful they are.

I am also concerned about child care. There is something in this wonderful tax reform package for mothers. What has been put on the table by the Government is so far from what is needed and so far from what it promised in the last election campaign that to call it tax reform and put it forward as a reason for voting Tory in the next election is the most bizarre proposition that has ever been put forward.

"We cannot afford it", the Hon. Member says, as he turns his back and marches out of the House. Canadians said the same thing about the old age pension. They said the same thing about medicare. They said the same thing about our massive support for post-secondary education, that we could not afford those things. Justice requires that Canada develop on an urgent basis an adequate child care program. Not only that, the economy demands it.

While we were bringing into place other major social reforms in this country, some of which I have just described, we were not focusing too much on child care. We lived with a reality, which has now become a myth, that there is a spouse at home looking after the children. When we needed to face up to old age pensions, and when we needed to face up to medicare and so on, child care was not competing because there was a spouse at home looking after the children and child care seemed like a frill.

All three political Parties officially recognize the reality; it was recognized in the last election campaign. There is no spouse at home dedicating herself or himself full time to looking after the house and children. She is at work, or she is looking for a job, or she has a job. She is not working for extra money to supplement the family income. In many cases—less than half, but perhaps in my riding more than most—such a woman is the sole income earner for a family with children. There is no adequate child care system.

The Government proposed a child care system. I did an analysis of it with the 200,000 additional day care spaces that were going to be created. One-tenth of the entire national production of this government program is needed in my riding. The City of North York in Metropolitan Toronto is 20,000 day care spaces short. There are more than 10 ridings in Canada; in fact there are nearly 300. We cannot say that we cannot afford it and return to that old rhetoric. We are talking about a program which is an economic reform and a way of taking a burden off the minds of mothers in my riding who need to work to support their families and cannot find a proper place for their children to be cared for during the day.

• (1750)

I do not like to hear men saying that a proper child care program is a frill, that it is not necessary, that it is too expensive, because unlike the other programs I mentioned child care is one where the injustice is borne by and large by women.

In this place where the majority of Members of Parliament are men, we have to be extra sensitive to a woman's point of view. I do not think Hon. Members are sensitive when they say that child care is a fringe or a frill that we cannot afford to have right now. We need to do justice to the mothers of this country by having an adequate child care program.

Some Hon. Members: Right on.

Mr. Kaplan: What is in the tax reform? The tax reform contains a couple of hundred dollars per child for each mother.

When Members opposite were asked about this program over the months that they were trying to bamboozle Canadians into considering their child care package to be worth while, they said: "Well, it is up to the mother. If she wants to spend it on her children, if she wants to establish child care, she has the money and she can do what she likes".

We on this side of the House know that that attitude will not create a national child care program in Canada. We do not want it totally in the public sector. We do not want to nationalize the kinds of child care facilities that there are across this country. Many of them are adequate. Many of them are economical. Many of them provide employment for mothers who take in four or five other children from their apartment building to look after them during the day. We do not want, as the New Democratic Party does, to see those types of day care facilities expropriated by the Government in favour of public child care. We have put forward a program. We want an honest, acceptable, comprehensive child care program that will give the women of this country justice. By the way, it will give the children of this country a good start in life, with a proper child care system containing great standards. This tax reform fails on every count. It should be rejected by us in this House, and it should be rejected by the Canadian people in the next election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On questions and comments, the Hon. Member for Windsor—Walkerville.

Mr. McCurdy: Mr. Speaker, I know that in a certain context the word "hypocrisy" is unparliamentary, but sometimes one has difficulty in this House understanding what is meant by that word. Perhaps the Hon. Member could help me with its definition. I wonder if this would correspond to an acceptable definition of hypocrisy: the notion that somehow it is illegitimate for a democratically elected union to determine democratically that contributions will be made to the New Democratic Party, being criticized for such but at the same time being perfectly acceptable for $80,000 in money from depositors and shareholders in banks to be contributed to the Liberal Party, even though individual depositors and individual shareholders may object to it. I wonder if seeing a difference between those two is not hypocrisy.

The Liberal Party criticizes the inadequacies of the Progressive Conservative Government with respect to tax reform which it could have brought about in the many years that it was in power. Is that not hypocrisy? I wonder if there is not a danger of hypocrisy in the notion proposed by a certain Leader of the Liberal Party that there would be no wage and price controls and subsequently introduce such wage and price controls, and whether that kind of hypocrisy does not hint at the kind of hypocrisy that one might expect in the same Party with respect to free trade. It is a Party that said that it will tear it up, but a Party that also had great difficulty, recently, in getting contributions from those same banks, large corporations, and corporate people in respect to their fund-raising. I do not know what hypocrisy is, but I wonder if the members of the Liberal Party could not give us a better definition of it, by virtue of experience, than anybody else in the House.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I think that when I am finished perhaps the Hon. Member will have a better understanding, because I want to put it precisely in the context of the questions that he asked. I criticized the New Democratic Party because it attacked our method of fund-raising to get contributions from banks, from virtually anyone who wants to contribute, while in the New Democratic Party I mentioned that someone went to the Federal Court of Canada to get his money back. They belonged to a union. As the Member said, they democratically decided that they were going to support the union and therefore every member, whether he liked it or not, had to contribute.

The Member asked me: "How is that different from a bank? Do the shareholders and the depositors get a say in whether the contribution is made?" As a matter of fact they do not. If an individual shareholder finds that the directors of the bank have decided to make a contribution to the Conservative Party and to the Liberal Party, and he may not like it, there is nothing he can do about it. If a depositor who is depositing in a bank learns that the bank is spending part of its money by making contributions to the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party, he cannot change the bank's policy. There is a very important difference in a contribution that the union makes and a contribution that a bank makes. If I do not want my bank to contribute to the Conservative Party or to the Liberal Party, I can move my money to another bank. If I am a depositor and I am not happy with the bank's investment policy, I can take my money out.

Mr. McCurdy: Which other bank?

Mr. Kaplan: If I am a shareholder and I find out that the Bank of Nova Scotia is contributing to the Liberal Party and I do not like it, I can sell my shares and buy shares in another bank. This unionist is forced to pay dues to the union, whether he likes it or not and whether he joins or not and he is forced to see part of his dues go to the New Democratic Party.

An Hon. Member: The shareholder in the bank has no choice at all.

An Hon. Member: The unionist can leave his job.

Mr. Kaplan: Yes, the unionist can leave his job and the shareholder of a bank can sell his stock. There is not much of a parallel in saying that you can sell your shares and invest in another bank that contributes to the political Party that you like. I suppose there are co-operative banks registered as such that make contributions to the New Democratic Party. If someone is unhappy with the way that they are handled as a depositor and with what happens with their money, they can change.

Do you know what you have to do to get relief if you are a member of a union or if you are paying dues to a union? There is no stock to sell. There are no deposits to transfer. You have to do what someone recently did; you have to go to court. He had to go to the Federal Court of Canada to get back the money that the union contributed out of his dues, against his will, to the New Democratic Party. What is hypocrisy? I think it is failing to recognize that.

I wanted to take some time to also talk about loopholes. The Liberal Government introduced a lot of loopholes, which were characterized as tax incentives and designed to produce certain results. I am not saying that they all worked. Why the Conservatives did not stop the science endeavour when they should have, why they let it run on and on for a billion dollars, I do not know, but tax loopholes created certain important industries in this country such as the movie industry. I do not think that we want to do without it. A loophole was meant to be an incentive. In many cases, they were incentives. If they were exceeded, as the Members opposite said, they should have changed them and stopped them when they first took office.

An Hon. Member: They shouldn't have even got in.

Mr. Kaplan: They should not have gotten in. I agree with that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hate to put an end to this debate, but it being six o'clock this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 o'clock, pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, July 21, 1988

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

TABLING OF ANNUAL REPORT

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I have the responsibility to table the Annual Report of the Farm Credit Corporation in two official languages, and I hope to make a statement in the House in a few moments.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to 10 petitions numbered as follows: 332-4995 to 332-5000 inclusive and 332-5003 to 332-5006 inclusive.

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

* * *

[*English*]

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

ANNUAL REPORT—STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I indicated only a few moments ago that I was intending to make a statement in the House with reference to the annual report of the Farm Credit Corporation. The document, upon study, really contains no surprises for those who have been following agricultural events over the last five or 10 years. The Farm Credit Corporation is reporting major losses again this year. It is important for Canadians to understand how the Farm Credit Corporation got into this situation in the first place and it is important as well to understand how this Government intends to bring the Farm Credit Corporation back onto sound financial footings.

In the 1970s, the so-called experts made a number of predictions that affected, and affected very seriously, many conventional or traditional lending institutions, and they also made some predictions that had a very severe impact especially on the Farm Credit Corporation. The so-called experts indicated and sent out messages to the effect that interest rates would remain stable. They said that energy costs would remain stable. They said that the inflation rate would remain stable. They said that we would be going through a time, now in the mid-eighties and beyond, of world shortages in food supply. They also said that we would be going through a period of time in our history when commodity prices would be reaching all-time high levels. Obviously, they were wrong on all accounts.

At that time, farmers were encouraged to borrow money to buy land and to expand their operations. By the mid-1970s, the Farm Credit Corporation could not supply credit to meet the demands. In 1975, the Farm Credit Corporation Act was revised to provide 100 per cent of the market value on security of the collateral for the loan.

Again, between 1972 and 1983, loan limits were increased five times to keep up with the inflation of the farm asset value. The lending decisions were made on market expectations that just did not materialize. The widely available credit resulted in heavy borrowing and the farm debt shot up from $4.6 billion in 1971 to $18.6 billion in 1981.

Then in the early 1980s, interest rates shot up. In fact, they increased by about 12 per cent to reach record highs of some 22 per cent or 23 per cent. For farmers, each percentage point represents an additional cost of about $150 million. That increase in interest rates of 12 per cent was a direct input cost to Canadian farmers of nearly $2 billion.

At the same time, commodity prices dropped, especially for grains. Incomes dropped and so did farm asset values drop by nearly $20 billion. Farmers with high debt loads were crippled and the Farm Credit Corporation became a lender of last resort. The Farm Credit Corporation found itself serving clients who owed more than the sale of their land could possibly recover.

• (1110)

Today we see the result of all those factors. Some 96 per cent of all FCC arrears today relate to those loans made prior to 1984. That was a direct result of the conditions during that period of time, and last year the FCC lost $511.8 million.

This Government has made it a priority to restore order to FCC policies and put the corporation back on its feet. These measures include a moratorium on foreclosures in 1984 and 1985; an $80 million interest rate reduction program in 1985; a shared risk mortgage introduced in 1985; farm debt review legislation was passed; farm debt review boards were established. As a matter of interest, a recent survey showed that 74 per cent of those who have used the boards are satisfied with the process. As well, we put in place the Canadian Rural Transition Program and also amended and enhanced the Farm Improvements Loans Act.

Last December, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) announced that this Government would provide $100 million to help cover FCC losses. More assistance was given to the corporation to allow it to participate fully in the farm debt review process. We put in new managers at the corporation and gave them the responsibility and the challenge of developing a recovery plan. Today, I am announcing that this Government will contribute another $400 million as part of that recovery plan. We will be injecting more money into FCC over the next three years.

The message we are sending out today on behalf of the Government is the fact that the FCC is here and here to stay. This Government stands firmly behind the corporation and is helping to solve its financial problems. This new money will ensure that FCC continues to serve farmers, and a healthier corporation means better service to farmers.

The corporation's role has also been clarified. Its primary job is to provide long-term mortgage credit to Canadian farmers on a break-even basis. It will be an alternative source of credit to average risk farmers, as well as those who represent a marginally higher risk but who have significant potential for commercial viability. These measures will ensure that our farmers have a reliable source of long-term credit when they need it, and that future FCC clients will not be penalized by past corporate losses. These measures also ensure that the corporation will be able to offer competitive interest rates.

Today's financial recovery plan is only the latest evidence of this Government's commitment to Canadian agriculture. In the last four years we undertook initiatives worth nearly $10 billion to our agri-food industry. We made record payments under the Special Canadian Grains Program, stabilization programs, drought assistance programs, and the list goes on. Our record on agriculture is second to none. We stand squarely behind Canadian farmers. We are determined to put the Farm Credit Corporation on a financially sound basis. We will ensure that it continues to provide long-term credit to Canadian farmers.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, it has been said before that never has so much been said about so little, the "so little" being of course the action of the Government in its assistance to agriculture.

The Government today prides itself on having bailed out the Farm Credit Corporation after it allowed it to go broke to start with. The Tories applaud the fact that the Government has, a year after the FCC was technically broke, bailed it out and put it back on the footing on which it should have been all along. We are supposed to be very grateful for this.

I was thinking this morning that the Government was going to come into this House and tell us about a massive program of assistance for farmers. I thought the announcement that the Minister was going to make on the FCC would include such things as that the corporation's current losses would be supported by the Government on a long-term basis. I thought the Government would say the FCC would play a brand new and innovative role in the development of financial services for farmers. I hoped to hear the Government would recognize the need for a policy role for the FCC and would commit itself to compensate the corporation for the losses it incurs while developing these policies. I was hoping to hear the Minister tell us today that the FCC would establish a brand new set of programs for beginning farmers and set standards for management skills of beginning farmers, that it would recycle FCC properties and recycle them for beginning farmers. Those are the kinds of things I was hoping to hear the Minister say this morning, but I did not hear any of them.

I was hoping to hear as well that the federal Government was finally going to bail out the FCC from the poor condition it allowed it to get into. Of course I was hoping that. That is the least the Government could do. As usual the Government did the very least it could have done.

I listened with great attention and read the Minister's speech, and I thank him for having the courtesy to provide me with a copy some minutes ago. I was wondering whether it would be delivered by the Minister. I will just refresh your memory on what the Minister just said. He said:

> This Government has made it a priority to restore order to FCC policies—

Order? It allowed the FCC to go broke! Is that what you call order? It has to be Tory order but it is not logical order and it is certainly not farm order. Farmers do not run their businesses that way.

The Government says it initiated a number of things such as a moratorium on farm foreclosures. The Government says it initiated farm debt review measures and so on. I am glad to see the Minister listened to some of the suggestions made by Ralph Ferguson and others in the past.

Mr. Wise: Ralph who?

Mr. Boudria: I am sure Ralph is proud of the fact that he suggested some of these things. However, when the Minister copies something like that he should put a note at the bottom and extend the proper courtesy to the people who made these suggestions in the past.

Mr. Wise: Ralph could not do it.

Mr. Boudria: If one does not do that, then it is plagiarism. We would not want to accuse the Minister of that.

One of the most important things I read in this statement today is this very short sentence:

FCC is here to stay.

That is an important statement. It is probably more important than anything else in the Minister's speech this morning. That statement is symbolically important for all farmers. It is my hope that the Government and the Minister mean what they say in that statement. It means the FCC has to exist as something other than a name. An organization which is broke now and has been broke for almost a year is not exactly something that looks as though it were here to stay.

I urge the Minister not only to provide the funding today which will satisfy the FCC for the short term because it has this huge backlog of cases to deal with but, more important, to make a commitment that the Government, and any future Government, will not allow the FCC to go broke as the Minister and his Government have done.

• (1120)

I know that the time afforded to us is very limited. That is unfortunate because I could go on and on talking about agriculture and the sad record of the Government in supporting agriculture. The Government has failed to convince its friend, the United States of America with whom it is trying to sign a trade deal, to stop this war on subsidies which has caused the prices of agricultural commodities to go down so much and which has caused so many of the problems we have today. The Government has failed miserably in that regard.

We must remember as well that the excess farm debt at the present in this country is $22 billion. There is $22 billion of excess debt which farmers will never be able to handle. As a matter of fact, the Standing Committee on Agriculture will be reporting on that issue and making a number of recommendations which I cannot reveal, obviously, because they have not yet been reported to the House and I, of course, would never leak the contents of a committee report.

The Minister said, "Our record on agriculture is second to none". What he should have said is, "Our record on agriculture is none to second".

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, it is amazing how an impending election can bring a tottering Government out of the doldrums and get it to make decisions, statements, announcements of funds which are suddenly available for a variety of reasons—which funds were probably going to be available anyway in some cases—or the re-announcement of funds that have already been announced and put in place.

Much of the Minister's statement dealt with the history of the Farm Credit Corporation. History is important to know and to learn from. However, it has little value to the credit-starved farmers looking for assistance. The deficit situation of the Farm Credit Corporation is a direct result of decisions made by the previous Government. That Government decided to find money on the market rather than use the money available through the Government.

The Minister indicated that he was going to announce a recovery plan, but failed to do so. The deficit of the Farm Credit Corporation was allowed to grow and the corporation almost reached the situation of being no longer viable. A bail-out was necessary. Last December, $100 million was announced and the $400 million announced today covers part of the deficit, but it does not put the Farm Credit Corporation into a position where it can return to the role for which it was originally established. That is something the Minister will have to do before the effect of this money will be felt by the farmers.

There are thousands of farmers in very difficult straits. This so-called recovery plan will give them no more hope of survival. There are a couple of things which this recovery plan could have done which it did not do. For instance, it made no attempt to shield the farmers from high interest rates. The Government has been supporting the increase in interest rates by a Bank of Canada policy which is already affecting the survival of farmers who require credit to continue operating. Interest rates are on the rise to such an extent that they are a factor in the elimination of more farmers each year. This so-called recovery plan contains no protection for farmers in that regard.

It failed to announce the quality or quantity of funds which would be available for lending to farmers in the future. The fact that there are thousands of farmers who need credit now and need a plan to keep them on the farms is not going to be affected by the putting into place of enough money to bring the Farm Credit Corporation out of a deficit position.

Third, as long as the Farm Credit Corporation operates as a bank it will continue to abandon the thousands of farmers who need action for their survival. As long as the Farm Credit Corporation continues to be just another bank it will not help those farmers.

In the past the Farm Credit Corporation has been a very important factor in agriculture, and it can be so again. It must be so again. However, the recovery plan which the Minister suggests he is putting in place, which I suppose could be called a non-recovery plan, will not do much toward establishing a comprehensive structure which would allow farmers to survive, farmers getting into agriculture, to have a source of funds without having to go to the banks and take the kinds of risks which were taken in the past, and to allow able farmers to continue in their present structure.

I am glad that the Farm Credit Corporation is going to be able to eliminate part of its deficit. However, we need answers about how the Farm Credit Corporation will operate relative to farmers in the future. Those are the kinds of answers the Minister did not give in his statement.

I hope the Minister will follow through on the position he has taken and give us, in the very near future, a comprehensive plan for the Farm Credit Corporation so that farmers will have some security about the availability of credit and the price they will have to pay for that credit.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

PRESENTATION OF SEVENTH AND EIGHTH REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, in my role as an urban farmer, being a member of the East York Garden Club, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture relating to Bill C-132, an Act to amend the Western Grain Stabilization Act.

In that same role, Mr. Speaker, I have the honour as well to present the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture relating to Bill C-112, an Act to amend the Canada Grains Act and other Acts in consequence thereof, also in both official languages which, of course, are the official languages of the East York Garden Club.

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

* * *

CANADIAN CENTRE ON SUBSTANCE ABUSE ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Doug Lewis (for the Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-143, an Act to establish the Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the Hon. Minister shall have leave to introduce the Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

[*Translation*]

• (1130)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Grisé: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. In today's Projected Order of Business, on page 6 under the heading Private Members' Business for Friday, July 22, we read:

Mr. Malépart—Motion—Passage of Bills without final Senate agreement

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart), since his leader, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner), decided yesterday that Bill C-130—since he asked the Senate not to accept Bill C-130, does the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie still intend to table his motion tomorrow during the time for Private Members' Business?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do not consider this to be a point of order, but if the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) wishes to add something . . .

Mr. Gauthier: What goes for the Parliamentary Secretary goes for the Member for Ottawa—Vanier. Besides, this is not a point of order at all, Mr. Speaker. But I would say that the Parliamentary Secretary has put his foot in his mouth. The debate will take place tomorrow at two o'clock. If he wants to know what we will do about it, let him attend the debate tomorrow and take part in it.

[*English*]

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a separate point of order. I believe that under Private Members' Business for today there has been an understanding among the Parties that while we will proceed with Motion No. 104 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson), we will spend a moment to deal with another Private Member's initiative as well. Perhaps we could get a clarification before we get too much further into today's business.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, if I understand the Hon. Member's point, I think the Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Mailly) has a Private Members' Bill in which she wants to change the name of her riding. She has consulted with me and I believe with the NDP. I do not know the Government's position, but we are ready to facilitate any passage of that Bill quickly tonight, if she so desires and wants to proceed with it.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, that is the offer we are prepared to make, with the understanding that it would not necessarily cut into the time allocated to the Hon. Member for Burnaby. However, to facilitate the request of the Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Mailly) to change the name of her constituency, the understanding is that we will take a moment to comment in order to facilitate her request. If that is the case, I would like not to see the clock so as at least to allow the one hour allowed for the Private Members' Motion of the Hon. Member for Burnaby.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I understand that those discussions have taken place and that there has been full and proper notice to all Members of the House that the Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Mailly) wishes to proceed at that time.

While I cannot speak for Members of the House as to what might take place, I can speak for the Government in saying that whatever takes place we will ensure that a full hour of debate is given to the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, this is a point of order or a question of privilege, you choose! In answer to my colleague, the Parliamentary Secretary and Hon. Member for Chambly (Mr. Grisé), I am open to any proposal to give the people an opportunity for a democratic debate and a chance to decide on the Mulroney-Reagan agreement, because I find it unfair that a small group of Conservatives in the House of Commons will force such an important Bill on the people of Canada without consulting them.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADA REFERENDUM AND PLEBISCITE ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mr. Patrick Boyer (Etobicoke—Lakeshore) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-311, an Act respecting Referendums and Plebiscites in Canada on Questions of Public Importance.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall the Hon. Member have leave to introduce the said Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Speaker, on a morning when there is controversy in Parliament and the country about whether a specific question such as free trade ought to be submitted to a general election or to the other place, the Senate, I am happy to be able to introduce for first reading a Bill that would point to a third way. The national referendum and plebiscite Act, or *La loi Canadienne sur les référendums et plébiscites*, is a complete code providing for the holding of referendums and plebiscites in Canada.

This Bill is certified in order, seconded by my colleague, the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway). It runs to some 363 pages and attempts to deal in every respect, whether with broadcasting, fairness of publicity, spending limits, and all of the issues that are important to fair and unsullied expression of direct public opinion.

In my view, it is high time that we had such a statute that would give that third option for direct expression of popular opinion. I am happy to bring this Bill before the House this morning for first reading.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

PETITIONS

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honour and privilege again to present a petition on behalf of a number of constituents who are of the opinion that the federal Government has no mandate from the people of Canada to conclude this trade deal with the United States.

They believe that Canada's sovereignty would be seriously compromised. They believe that this deal would undermine our ability as a country to build a society distinct from that of the United States.

They go on to outline all of the reasons why they think this is a bad deal for Canada. I wish the Government would listen to them, do the honourable thing, and call an election.

The petitioners are asking that Parliament dissolve now to allow the people of Canada to accept or reject the proposed trade deal during a national general election.

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Jim Jepson (London East): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour and pleasure to present a petition pursuant to Standing Order 106 from a number of Londoners who call upon the Government to pass legislation that will protect the life of the unborn child from conception and at all stages of development, with the exception of the extremely rare situation in which an abortion is performed in order to save the life of the mother.

PROSECUTION OF WAR CRIMINALS RESIDENT IN CANADA

Mr. Patrick Boyer (Etobicoke—Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by some 25 citizens from my constituency and elsewhere. It is certified pursuant to Standing Order 106 and pertains to the Memorandum of Understanding entered into between the Department of Justice and the Procurator General of the U.S.S.R. It relates to the prosecution of war criminals and seeks, through this petition, that the Government of Canada would broaden the terms of that Memorandum of Understanding to include not only Nazi war criminals but all war criminals who may be resident in Canada at this time.

NORTHERN TAX ALLOWANCES

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106 I have the honour and privilege to present a petition signed by a number of residents of the community of Atikokan. It is one of a series of petitions I have tabled in the House.

The petitioners are concerned that the community of Atikokan and the immediate area were not included in the northern residents' tax deduction. They call upon Parliament to take specific action.

I am pleased to indicate that on August 8, the task force set up by the federal Government will be in the community of Atikokan to hear representations from those citizens. Hopefully, René Brunelle and his crew will agree that they have been unfairly treated and will include them in the northern tax deduction.

OPPOSITION TO BILL C-33—PUBLIC SERVANTS' PENSIONS

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I have received petitions from constituents, mainly from the City of Thompson and the Town of The Pas. These people are concerned with the Government's attempt to pass Bill C-33 which they believe will deindex pensions of federal public servants who now have complete inflation protection through full indexation to the Consumer Price Index.

• (1140)

Whereas increasingly in the private sector, pension plan agreements have been negotiated by such unions as the Canadian Auto Workers, the Canadian Paper Workers, and the International Association of Machinists, and now include an indexing to the Consumer Price Index formula as the best means of protecting the members' pensions; and whereas the Ontario Government, which has responsibility for 70 per cent of all private pension plans in Canada has passed legislation calling for inflation protection for Ontario pension funds and has now received the recommendation from the Friedland task force that such protection take the form of linkage to the Consumer Price Index as the best possible method of achieving this; therefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to reject Bill C-33 as regressive, unfair, untimely and against the best interests of public servants and all Canadians, and that Parliament affirm full indexation to the Consumer Price Index as the model for inflation protection for all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to table pursuant to Standing Order 106, and they contain the names of people who are strongly opposed to the trade agreement concluded between Mr. Reagan and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney).

[*English*]

The petitioners humbly submit that the Mulroney Government has sold out Canada which has received nothing in return, that Canadian industries are still not protected from U.S. trade laws, that the United States obtained everything it wanted in all key sectors, especially agriculture, energy, auto trade, financial services and investment, that thousands of Canadian jobs are threatened and that the Conservative Government has not provided for any adjustment assistance for Canadian workers. Therefore, the undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to denounce the Government for signing the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement on October 4, 1987. This petition is signed by dozens of Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I also have petitions to table on behalf of people from all the regions of Canada, including Quebec, Ontario, Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver and the Maritimes. The petitioners unanimously oppose the agreement signed by the Canadian Government, the agreement that has been called "a horse, a rabbit". You know, Mr. Speaker, the Free Trade Agreement.

These people disagree with the Canadian Government, and are opposed to the passage of the agreement by the House of Commons. I am convinced that the petitioners would agree with the Liberal leader in demanding an election on such a fundamental issue.

* * *

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 325 could be made an order for return, that return would be tabled immediately.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that question No. 325 be deemed to have been made an order for return?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

EXPENDITURES IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Question No. 325—**Mr. Harris:**

1. For (*a*) 1986 (*b*) 1987, has there been any Government spending in Newfoundland and Labrador and, if so, in what amounts in each constituency by each (i) government department (ii) government agency (iii) Crown corporation involved?

2. For (*a*) 1986 (*b*) 1987, were government expenditures or contributions made in Newfoundland and Labrador under the various ERDA and ERDA sub-agreements and, if so, for each constituency, what amounts were spent and, by program and project, what is the (i) amount of the contribution of the Government (ii) amount, to the knowledge of the Government, of any contribution by the provincial Government (iii) name of each company involved (iv) amount invested by each company receiving financial assistance (v) number of jobs provided (vi) cost per job?

Return tabled.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grisé: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I wish to inform the House that because of the Minister's statement, Government Orders will be extended by 22 minutes beginning at 1:00 p.m. today.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

INCOME TAX ACT AND RELATED ACTS

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed, from Wednesday, July 20, consideration of the motion of Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) that Bill C-139, an Act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, 1977 and certain related Acts, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs; and the amendment of Mr. Garneau (p. 17724), and the subamendment of Mr. Boudria (p. 17770).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will resume debate on Bill C-139 with the Hon. Member for York—Scarborough (Mr. McCrossan).

Mr. W. Paul McCrossan (York-Scarborough): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to speak on the tax reform Bill today and to explain some of the benefits of the Government's tax reform legislation. All Canadians benefit from tax reform, either from having their own taxes lowered or through the increased economic activity that will flow from an improved, more efficient and more equitable tax system.

Previous speakers in this debate have examined various aspects of tax reform. As both a member of the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs and as Chairman of the government caucus Health and Welfare Committee, I would like to look at how our comprehensive tax reform package provides significant benefits to Canadian families. Most important, tax reform means that Canadians will pay lower taxes this year than they did in 1987. Tax reform will reduce personal income tax for eight out of 10 Canadian households and for almost nine out of 10 Canadians over the age of 65. In other words, about 9.7 million households will enjoy an average tax cut of almost $500.

As well, Canadians will generally find their provincial income taxes reduced in the nine provinces that have tax collection agreements with the federal Government. Quebec has also made a number of changes to allow residents of that province to benefit from our tax reform measures. I said that Canadians will "generally find their provincial income taxes reduced" because there is one province where the provincial Treasurer has taken some action to pre-empt the tax benefits that should be flowing to the residents of that province. I refer, of course, to the Finance Minister, Mr. Nixon, of Ontario, who introduced increases in taxes to take away the benefits that would flow to families in Ontario before they could be received.

Most individuals are already benefiting from higher take-home pay. As of July 1, most pay cheques are larger, reflecting the reduction in taxes as a result of tax reform. Further adjustments in taxes, of course, will occur at year end. Tax reform will also mean a fairer tax system. The key to improving the fairness of the system under tax reform is replacing a number of the old system's exemptions and deductions with tax credits.

Tax credits are fairer because they directly reduce tax payable. This means that a tax credit is worth the same to all Canadians regardless of their level of income. By contrast, under the old system, exemptions were of greater value to people with higher incomes because they reduced the amount of income subject to tax at the higher tax rates.

As a result of converting exemptions to credits, approximately 850,000 lower-income Canadians will have their federal personal income tax reduced to zero. Converting exemptions to credits will provide important financial benefits to Canadian families in a variety of ways. For instance, under tax reform, the married exemption will be converted to a credit. This will benefit many households where the second spouse has a modest income from part-time work or small investments. Currently, the married exemption is reduced by one dollar for every dollar of net income earned by a spouse above a threshold. As a result, a part of the earnings of the lower-income spouse are effectively taxed at the rate applicable to the higher-income spouse.

With tax reform, this inequity will no longer exist. The first $27,500 of income earned by the low-income spouse will be subject to tax at the federal rate of 17 per cent. The conversion of the married exemption to a tax credit thus removes the tax penalty that can now discourage a second income earner from entering the labour force. The new married or equivalent to married credit of $850 represents a significant increase over the old exemption. Indeed, for most Canadians, the new credit is equivalent to an exemption of $5,000 or $1,260 more than the old exemption would have been worth this year.

More than two million lower-income families will benefit from the higher refundable sales tax credit, the increase to $70 from $50 for adults and $35 from $25 for children. The family net income threshold at which the credit begins to be reduced has been raised by $1,000 to $16,000. These measures will protect lower-income Canadians from the impact of interim changes to the federal sales tax as part of the first stage of tax reform.

The refundable sales tax credit will be significantly enriched and extended to more Canadians in stage two of tax reform when the current federal sales tax will be replaced with a new sales tax. Many families, and single Canadians, will also benefit from the changed treatment of education expenses. The current education expense deduction will become a tax credit

of $10 per month. In addition, the deductions for tuition fees will be replaced by a tax credit of 17 per cent of post-secondary tuition fees. Quite importantly, the unused portion of the first $600 of these credits can be transferred to a supporting parent, spouse or grandparent. This is an important new feature. Before tax reform tuition fees could only be claimed by the student, even when the student did not have sufficient income to benefit from the use of the exemption.

• (1150)

Under tax reform the income level at which families start paying tax will rise. The increased value of personal tax credits raises the tax thresholds. That is the main reason that the 850,000 lower-income Canadians I mentioned earlier will have their income tax cut to zero.

For example, this year a couple with one earner and with two children will not pay any federal income tax until their income reaches $18,890. This compares with a threshold before tax reform of $16,770.

After presenting the original White Paper proposals the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) consulted with Canadians and gave the tax reform proposals to the Finance Committee which made a number of recommendations for improvements. Many of these improvements increased benefits for families with children.

For example, the refundable child tax credit was increased to $559 as of January 1 of this year. The dependent child credit, which replaces the old exemption, was set at $65 per child. However, for the third and subsequent children the tax credit was doubled to $130. The credits were also made available for the full year in which the child turns 18. A dependent child is now able to earn as much as $2,500 before the credit begins to be phased out.

While I have been dwelling this morning on benefits to families, it is fair to point out that a number of these increases were recommended by the Finance Committee and, indeed, the means to pay for them was also recommended by the Finance Committee in its report. The money has come from imposing effective taxes, alternative minimum taxes, for the first time on our large financial institutions. In this way banks, trust companies, life insurance companies, property and casualty insurance companies and real estate companies, which effectively for the large part have been paying no taxes whatsoever on their profits for the last 10 years, will indeed pay taxes under tax reform. By and large these taxes are being used to finance these family benefit tax credits to which I have been referring.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) also announced the Government's new national strategy on child care last December. By doubling the maximum child care expense deduction to $4,000 for each child who is six years old and under, and by introducing a supplement to the refundable child tax credit for those who do not have receipted child care expenses, we have increased substantially the level of tax assistance for parents.

Many families will also benefit from the improvements we have made to a number of the old deductions. The new medical expense credit will provide similar tax relief to all taxpayers with uninsured medical expenses. The charitable donations credit improves the tax incentive for the vast majority of Canadians to make larger donations. The improved disability credit not only is fairer to people at all income levels, it also increases tax assistance for the majority in the 17 per cent bracket. Greater fairness is being achieved by converting the deductions for the CPP/QPP contributions and UI premiums into credits of 17 per cent.

When one combines our tax reform measures with the improvements in tax assistance announced as part of the child care policy, it is clear that this Government is committed to improving the well-being of Canadian families.

If Members opposite share the Government's commitment to the Canadian family, they can show their support by voting in favour of this Bill to implement our tax reform proposals.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there questions or comments? The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask about fairness and therefore will ask a rather technical question of my friend who is also a member of the Finance Committee. I ask this question because I think it is a serious issue which is difficult to ventilate in the House of Commons.

In the House of Commons we have been talking about the unfairness of Conservative tax reform and the fact that while taxes on many families are down from last year, according to the tax reform, they are up from 1984. The only people who have tax cuts from 1984 under Tory tax reform are people earning over $100,000 per year.

Because of the fact that the Hon. Member and I worked together on this matter I would like to remind him of the report of the committee with respect to the issue of the proposed anti-avoidance rule. The Hon. Member for Scarborough will recall that the committee rejected the Government's proposed new anti-avoidance rules. It rejected them because of the feeling that we would be into a period of six, seven or eight years of turmoil before the courts began to define more precisely what the new anti-avoidance provisions meant. There was a feeling, which I believe the Hon. Member shared, that a large part of the problem was not the legislation but the lack of aggressiveness of the Department of National Revenue and, perhaps, the Ministry of Finance in actually pursuing avoidance transactions under the present law. We felt that the present law could be changed modestly in order to make it more effective.

I wonder if the Hon. Member can comment on the Government's determination to ignore the advice of the elected representatives, which came from all Parties, and which was offered not just by the New Democratic members or by the Liberal members of the committee but by the Progressive Conservative members as well. Can the Hon. Member comment on the failure of the Government to look seriously at the proposed anti-avoidance provision which the committee recommended and which was based, if I recall correctly, on submissions which we had from experts such as the Bar Association and chartered accountants?

The Hon. Member will recall the fact that, after the Ways and Means Motion which contained the draft legislation was made public in April, the joint committee of the bar and of the chartered accountants came back before the committee and once again told us categorically, and I think constructively, that it thought that the proposed legislation was wrong. It said that it would create enormous problems and that, far from stopping anti-avoidance devices and dodges being used by different companies, speculators and people in the stock market, in fact it would create more problems than it would solve.

I recognize that many of the people who are active in the tax committee of the bar and of the accounting profession are some of the people who are advising private plans on these avoidance schemes. However, in listening to the testimony I was convinced that they were, nonetheless, and regardless of a potential conflict of interest, not trying to leave Parliament and the Government boxed in but that they were speaking to loopholes and running room which had been created for them by a lack of aggressive action and enforcement.

Will the Hon. Member comment on how he can support this Bill when in this particular area which, in the end, is so offensive to average Canadians, the Government, in an excess of zeal, has created probably a weaker instrument than it could have had with the existing legislation had it been reinforced?

Mr. McCrossan: The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) has raised two points. The first point he raised had to do with the level of taxes paid under tax reform. The second point had to do not with anything I said but with matters we heard in the committee with respect to the anti-avoidance rules in the tax legislation. I will deal with both points separately.

With respect to the level of taxes which will be paid, I think that the Hon. Member has arrived at a false conclusion. His conclusion is false, and demonstrably false, as a result of the details which were provided to the Finance Committee. It is false in respect to two separate areas.

First, he indicates that in general taxpayers earning over $100,000 will pay less tax under the new system than under the old system. I categorically reject this. Indeed, all the evidence presented to the Finance Committee also rejects the same assertion. The Hon. Member rather conveniently ignores the large number of tax references which have been closed out which were largely utilized by these people making over $100,000. Indeed, the distribution of taxes provided with the tax reform package indicates that, of the 20 per cent of Canadians who will pay higher taxes, and as I recall it will average in excess of $500 a year more in taxes, it is concentrated largely with those earning $100,000 a year as a result of the much fairer and systematic elimination of loopholes and curtailment of tax preferences.

• (1200)

Second, the Hon. Member makes the sweeping assertion that Canadians will pay more taxes as a result of what I believe is a misinterpretation of figures. I certainly would not want to suggest it was a deliberate misinterpretation. However, one of the things I have noticed is that the Hon. Member has a tendency to look at the trend in personal income taxes. Since that trend has been going up over the four years, he has come to the conclusion that the level of taxes has gone up significantly over the four years including tax reform.

In his calculations the Hon. Member made the significant omission of looking at the increased number of people who are participating in the workplace as a result of the very large drop in the unemployment rate that has taken place under this Government.

Therefore, one cannot look at the trend in personal income tax collections and divide it by the population and state that the average taxpayer is paying more. One has to look at the number of people who are working and paying taxes rather than collecting unemployment insurance or welfare.

With respect to the second point of the Hon. Member, the general anti-avoidance rules in the legislation, in part I agree with the Hon. Member. Following the tabling of the draft legislation, I would agree with him that the Canadian Bar Association and the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants did appear before the committee and did indicate that they had serious reservations about—

Mr. Cassidy: In the strongest terms.

Mr. McCrossan: —the general anti-avoidance rules. It is fair to say that those reservations were in part shared by members of the committee from all Parties. Today we are looking at second reading of the Bill which is approval in principle. There is no principle involved in this Bill with which I have any problem. However, when the Bill gets to committee, which I would hope will be in the next day or two, I hope that once again we would call experts in the field of the anti-avoidance provision to see if we can come up with a better anti-avoidance provision which legitimately curtails tax avoidance schemes, but at the same time is not so arbitrary as to create such a large degree of uncertainty that business cannot effectively plan without seeking extensive tax rulings in advance of any major transaction in Canada.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the speech of my hon. colleague on tax reform. It was an interesting speech, but I think the Hon. Member missed the point on a number of occasions in describing exactly what has happened under the so-called tax reform of the Conservative Government. It is now well known that while the tax system has been changed rather than reformed, it has been somewhat deformed. If the tax system was unjust before the Conservatives examined it, it is now more unfair; if it was discriminatory against the poor, it is now more than ever discriminatory against the poor; if it advantaged the wealthy, it now more than ever advantages the wealthy; if it was a complicated system before, it is more complicated now.

The best reference that I have read relating to the Conservative Government's view of tax reform is "Robin Hood in reverse". Rather than take from the rich and give to the poor, tax reform for the Conservatives is take from the poor and give to the rich. Very clearly, the beneficiaries of the tax reform of the Conservative Government are those Canadians who are the wealthiest Canadians. Once again, the rest of Canadian society has been hammered and hosed through this tax reform package so that more than ever they are paying more taxes now than when the Conservative Government took office.

If one totalled all the tax increases that the average Canadian family has experienced under the Conservative Government, for example, income tax increases, gasoline tax increases, and sales tax increases of one type or another, it would be found that, compared to September, 1984, in September, 1988, the average Canadian family will be paying $1,000 more in federal taxes under the Mulroney Government. That is an absolute tragedy. In all the communities of Canada it means that that $1,000 per family is not circulating in the community from business to business and person to person to keep the local economy going.

There are tens of thousands of people in our country who need shelter or affordable homes. The only shelter the Conservative Government is involved with is sheltering taxes for the various wealthy Canadians. "Tax shelter", is what the Government means when it talks about "shelter". There are dozens of tax shelters technically designed to assist the Canadian economy, but in reality they result in a handful of rich people becoming richer.

Together with a number of my colleagues in the New Democratic caucus I have the privilege to work on Tax Probe 1986 which began in 1986. For two years we travelled the country and talked to tax experts on the East Coast, in central Canada, on the Prairies, on the West Coast, and up into the North. We talked to every conceivable person we could find who was interested in talking about how to reform the tax system. We asked the questions: "As a tax expert, what tax loophole is a good one?" "As Mr. and Mrs. Tax Expert, which tax loophole would you say that Canada is getting good value for?" "If it costs the taxpayers of Canada $500 million of lost taxes, how much do we gain from that in addition to the tax loss?" There was not one single tax accountant, tax lawyer, or tax adviser who was prepared to stand up and say that a certain tax loophole is good for Canada. Certain tax loopholes are good for some people or a handful of investors, but when asked if they were good for Canada, not a single expert was prepared to say they were.

I am not prepared to say that there is not a good tax loophole, but after two years of searching out the nooks and crannies of the country and examining page by page the complicated tax Act, we could not find a single tax loophole that made economic financial sense.

How can one summarize the Conservative view of tax reform? At the top of the list is this puzzling question that has been put to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) so many times that it has become a boring question. The question is: "Under your tax reform system, how is it that 60,000 profitable corporations do not pay a single penny in income tax?" Presumably the Minister of Finance is proud of what he has done to the tax system to improve it, but he allows 60,000 profitable companies to pay not a single penny in income tax. That is to say nothing of the thousands of companies that might pay $10 or $50 in income tax a year, but those 60,000 profitable corporations do not even pay five cents.

They are not small companies, or companies that we call the "Mom and Pop Shops" of Canada. In some years they are companies such as the Royal Bank of Canada. In other years it will be the Bank of Montreal, Cadillac-Fairview, General Motors, or Shell Oil. There are 60,000 corporations that do not pay anything.

• (1210)

We have said that it is time that that changes, that it is time that we start building some fairness into our tax system. If we are going to build fairness, it means that those corporations that are very profitable should be paying their fair share. They should not be paying more than their fair share but just their fair share. I noticed that in the United States, back in 1986, the President introduced a tax law that requires every profitable company in the United States to pay at least a minimum corporate tax of 20 per cent. That was accepted in the United States as fair and reasonable. That was accepted by large, small and medium-sized corporations as the decent thing to do, so that they would be able to pay their fair share. After all, their profits and so on were coming from a country and an economy where they obviously were benefiting, and they felt that 20 per cent minimum was a fair corporate tax.

Does our Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) do the same thing in Canada? Unfortunately not. He is not prepared even to touch that aspect of our tax system. I say that that is wrong, unjust, unfair and discriminatory, particularly against the people of Canada and against the small business sector of Canada.

As our well-known friend, John Bulloch, who heads the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, has indicated, our tax system is discriminatory against the small and medium-sized business in Canada. They pay their fair share and they pay what is a reasonable amount of tax, in some cases too much. They have to pay more than they should, because the large profitable corporation in some cases pays zero. We are saying that that is reflective of an unfair tax system.

Now, one can go on and speak on the personal side of the tax system. Under tax reform, the stockbroker in downtown Toronto who might make $200,000 a year will save $15,000 under Mr. Wilson's tax reform. He will save $15,000 because his rates have gone down, and yet, there are hundreds of thousands of people whose incomes rank below the poverty line who still pay income tax.

Young families struggling to get established, working hard, receiving a very modest income, pay income tax, pay $50, $100, and yet tax reform means that the stockbroker who makes $200,000 is going to save $15,000 this year on his or her income tax. That is the kind of unfairness that is perpetuated by this tax reform picture.

My dad is nearly 83 years old. He worked all of his life, saved modestly so that he could have a decent pension. He has to pay taxes on a small savings account. My dad, 83 years old, pays more income tax in some years than the Royal Bank of Canada. My dad pays more taxes in some years than Shell Oil. That is wrong. Who could sit here and say that this is a good system, that this is a fair system? My dad does not feel that way.

The tax returns that most of us have tried to fill out in the last few months, in that annual ritual where we sit awake late at night, night after night, with dictionaries and calculators and sheets of paper, trying to figure out what our tax bill should be that year, is an ordeal. I look forward to it in most years with some terror. I know that as simplistic as it seems to be, it inevitably ends up with weeks and weeks of agonizing. You finally sit down at your table and pull it all together and send it in, and it always comes back changed. They always change it. The tax minions look over your return and find that you have been a few cents out here and there, or you missed a space there, and you get a redone return mailed back.

Fifty-one per cent of Canadians cannot fill out their own tax returns; they have to pay somebody to do it. Fifty-one per cent of tax filers have to go to a third party to fill out their tax returns. Well, that is not right. It is not necessary. Under tax reform we have seen the system complicated even further.

Some members of the Finance Committee are here today. They will remember that the Finance Committee examined a simplified tax return. We studied this for some months. We looked at what other countries do, and we found that for the majority of Canadians a single-page tax return would be all that is necessary. About 10 lines, that is all that is required. With that, about 70 per cent of Canadians would not have to look forward to this annual tax return horror show every spring.

Did the Government introduce that? No, it did not. There are pages and pages of tax returns that have to be filled out now by the average Canadian. Well, you will look through the lists and lists and you will ask yourself what this tax reform has done to us. Is it Robin Hood in reverse? Is it tax shelters not for the homeless but for the wealthy? Is it tax reform not for the needy but for the greedy? Those people that have are going to get more. The average family in this country is paying an extra $1,000 in federal taxes.

Now, there are some changes. I would like to look through a list that we have compiled as to what we think should be done in terms of our tax system. At the top of the list would obviously be a tax system with a more simplified return so that Canadians would not have to agonize each spring while they fill out their tax return, with some exceptions. Obviously, if you have a complicated investment portfolio you will have to go to some pains to fill out that tax return. But for the average working Canadian man and woman, that is not necessary.

We would also like to see the structure of our tax rates examined and that a higher top rate be imposed. After all, is it not reasonable to expect that someone who makes a great deal of money should pay at a higher tax rate than someone who is making money that classifies him or her as living below the poverty line? In other words, the more you make the more you should contribute to the country where you make that money.

We are also concerned about what is taxed. I think a lot of people assume that wherever you make your money you pay the same tax. That is not the case. If you make your money speculating in property or in gold stocks or whatever, you do not pay the same tax as someone who is working in an office or a factory or a mine or a mill. We classify that kind of money differently. We say that you do not have to pay on all of that income. As a matter of fact, up to a certain level you do not have to pay any tax at all. So if you speculate on the Hong Kong Stock Exchange and you make good money on an annual basis, you do not have to pay any tax on that, no tax whatsoever. Why not? You have a capital gains allowance of up to $100,000. If you do, you only pay tax on half of the capital gains, not on a dollar.

What I am saying is that, depending on how you make your income, you pay different kinds of taxes. That is not fair. We say that capital gains ought to be exempt for people running small businesses or are family farmers, because that is the way that they provide for their retirements and so on, but not generally speaking. A buck should be a buck. That is going back to the Carter Commission many years ago. The suggestion at that time was that if we were going to have tax we should tax people on a buck being a buck, and not a buck being 50 cents for some people.

I think that all Members of Parliament would agree that the family farm has to be protected because that is the way people provide for their retirement years, and similarly the family business. I am not talking about General Motors in this case; I am talking about people you see as you walk up and down the main streets of Canada, running their independent businesses.

There are other changes that we have suggested. We are very concerned, in regard to the new tax being planned called the national federal sales tax, about the decision by the Government to impose now a sales tax on everything, every business transaction.

An Hon. Member: Even the haircuts.

Mr. Riis: When you get a haircut, as my hon. friend from Vanier reminds me, you will pay a new Mulroney sales tax. When you go out and buy a new shirt, when you have your laundry done, when you go to the movies, when you fill out your will, no matter what you do, every single business transaction in this country, large or small, will be taxed.

For the first time in history we are going to have a federal sales tax. It might be called something different, it might be called a value-added tax, it might be called a business transfer tax, it might be called a national sales tax, but whatever it is called it will be a national sales tax that will be imposed on every man, woman and child in this country.

My friend from Fraser Valley is asking what it will replace. I will tell you. We do not pay a national sales tax now when we go to the movies. We do not pay a national sales tax now when we have a will made. We do not pay a national sales tax now when we get a haircut, but we will be paying it. That is part of tax reform. I think that has been part of the tax reform that has been largely overlooked. I do not hear many Conservative Members talking about the new national sales tax that tax reform will impose on every Canadian citizen.

• (1220)

Mr. Gauthier: It is the second shoe.

Mr. Riis: It is the second shoe, clubbed by the first one and then we will be booted by the second one.

How do we derive our revenues? Not many years ago, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the amount of revenue which the federal Government collected from individuals and the amount collected from the corporate sector was about balanced, 50-50. Fifty per cent came from corporations and 50 per cent came from individuals. Over the years there has been some shifting as a result of successive Liberal and Conservative administrations.

If you look at those two sources of revenue now, 82 per cent comes from people and 18 per cent comes from corporations. That is the change. Who are the winners in this? The people of Canada have been taxed and taxed again. Under this Government, under every Budget it has imposed more taxes, more taxes and more taxes. There is a breaking limit, and for many Canadians we have reached that breaking limit now. People are saying that they are fed up and they will not pay any more income tax. They say they will find ways and means of avoiding the taxman or woman. So the underground economy begins to work. If you are a dentist, maybe you will fix some lawyer's teeth who will do some legal work for you and things will get done on a barter basis—

Mr. Horner: That is cheating.

Mr. Riis: —or on a cash basis with no receipts. Someone will come in and fix my plumbing for cash and there will be no record of that. Consequently, the price that work can be done for is much less than normal. We all know that. Someone goes out into the woods and cuts a load of wood for fireplaces. He brings it into town and wants to be paid in cash, not because he wants to go out and buy something necessarily at that moment but because there will be no record of the transaction, and no tax has to be paid. The most recent estimates today would say that our underground economy in Canada is worth about $30 billion a year easily. Maybe it is significantly more than that. But that is what happens when people start losing confidence in the tax system. I suspect that for increasing numbers of Canadians that is where we are today.

In February and March of each year when you look into the book shops of Canada, what are the most sought after publications? What are the best sellers? They are books entitled, "How to Avoid Tax", "How to Defer Taxes," and "How to Shelter Taxes". People realize that our system today is unfair. It is discriminatory and unjust. Therefore, people say, "Well, if he does not pay any tax at all and is able to avoid all income tax, why not me?" That is a fact.

I am pleased to say the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) had the courage to stand up the other day and say that there are hundreds and hundreds of wealthy people who pay nothing in income tax year after year, to say nothing of the 60,000 profitable corporations which pay no tax. When the small business person sees a large corporation like the Royal Bank of Canada paying not a penny in tax and a stock broker friend down the street paying no income tax year after year, people lose faith in the system. That is why we have called for at least a minimum tax on profitable corporations, not excessive, but a modest, minimum tax, so once again we can start building fairness and justice into our tax system. People will then not think of our tax as one designed for the greedy but one that is designed and composed for the needy.

Mr. Gagnon: Mr. Speaker, I found the discourse very interesting in the sense that the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) said that Canadians are being taxed, taxed and taxed. I agree. But I find it somewhat ironic that it is the New Democratic Party and his Party's policy to increase social spending. We brought out a child care program for $6.3 billion, yet his Party said that it was not enough, that more money was needed. The Member does not seem to understand the relationship between spending money and having to tax. Money does not grow on trees. It does not fall down like manna. You have to have taxes.

Mr. Cassidy: What about submarines?

Mr. Gagnon: Let us look at some numbers. Since 1961, which is a quarter of a century or 25 years ago, the cost of living has increased 313 per cent, whereas the tax bill for the average Canadian has increased over 1,000 per cent. We have escalating taxes because society, and the Hon. Member's Party in particular, is calling for more and more things out of the Government. Somewhere there has to be a breaking point.

Mr. Cassidy: The Liberals couldn't manage things.

Mr. Gagnon: The Hon. Member and his Party always want to talk about the class welfare system. Do it to the rich. The underprivileged are not being looked after. I would like to put a few things on the record, Mr. Speaker.

Let us look at who pays income tax. The bottom 50 per cent of taxpayers pay 5 per cent of the income tax and the top 10 per cent pay 50 per cent. People who are making money are paying a fair and a handsome share of the taxes. Some may argue maybe that they are paying too much, but we are trying to increase the taxes on the financial community which has not been paying its fair share to balance things out and have the poor pay even less. As I pointed out, the 50 per cent at the bottom are paying only 5 per cent.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the intervention by my hon. friend from Calgary. While I appreciate his intervention, I do not agree with any of it.

First, the Hon. Member for Calgary North (Mr. Gagnon) said that somehow the New Democrats have caused all of these programs. I want to remind him, much to my chagrin, that the New Democrats have not formed the Government of Canada yet. We plan to. But the Hon. Member is talking about successive Conservative and Liberal administrations—not New Democratic administrations. It has been his Party and the Liberals who have brought us the kind of tax system we have today. I am pleased at least that the Hon. Member thought somewhere along the line that the New Democrats had formed the Government of Canada, and I hope his wish is fulfilled in the next few weeks.

The Hon. Member asks where we are going to get the money to provide for important social programs like child care. I offer two suggestions. One, his Government says that it is imperative and absolutely necessary to spend $12 billion on nuclear hunter attack submarines.

Mr. Darling: Eight billion dollars.

Mr. Cassidy: Sixteen billion dollars, actually.

Mr. Riis: A colleague says $8 billion. Some people say $10 billion, some people say $12 billion and some even say the amount could go as high as $25 billion. Let us forget how many billions. That is what the Conservatives want, nuclear hunter attack submarines. That is the Government's decision, and it has a right to make that decision.

Some Hon. Members: Right.

Mr. Riis: I would rather see $2 billion or $3 billion additional going into child care. If the Conservatives want to say to the people that they want nuclear attack submarines—which even the Americans do not want us to get now, the Pentagon said it is stupid—that is fine, but we say, rather than nuclear attack submarines, let us have something for the children of this country so that every needy young child in this country is cared for properly. That is what we say should be a priority.

We differ, Mr. Speaker. That is fair enough. My hon. friend from Calgary asks, where else can we get the money? The Hon. Member did not mention the 60,000 profitable corporations like General Motors, the Royal Bank of Canada, the Bank of Montreal and the rest of those 60,000 that do not even pay a penny in income tax. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, what our revenue would be like if we were to ask those corporations to pay what Ronald Reagan has asked American corporations to pay, a 20 per cent minimum corporate tax? Imagine the hundreds of millions, the billions of dollars, that would be collected to pay for those programs about which the Hon. Member is concerned. There seems to be an easy solution to this dilemma. If we have a just and fair tax system, the revenues will be there for these much needed programs.

• (1230)

The Hon. Member's friend from Nanaimo whose *Householder* I released the other day said that he thought the notion of nuclear attack submarines was bizarre. He said he thought this was a silly way to spend taxpayers' money. I agree with him. I think he is a very sound Conservative Member.

I suspect that if the people around here were more honest and asked themselves if they actually thought we should spend billions and billions of dollars on nuclear hunter attack submarines, they would say no. However, they cannot say anything because they are back-benchers. They are caught with the peculiar notion of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Beatty), however, and they will have to justify that in the upcoming campaign.

I appreciate the intervention of my hon. friend from Calgary, as usual. It was a thoughtful intervention. I disagree with him, but at least I appreciate the opportunity to respond as well as I can to his questions.

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, like the Hon. Member for British Columbia, I want a fair tax system as well, and I share his concerns about the many corporations that are not paying taxes. I also agree with him that the Hon. Member from Nanaimo is a very sound Hon. Member.

I happen to have been born in Manitoba, and unfortunately, we saw that before the NDP Government of Manitoba was voted out of office, it increased taxes very, very substantially on people of average and lower than average incomes. Similarly, it raised the auto insurance premiums by about 35 per cent.

Does the Hon. Member plan to follow the leadership of his former colleagues in Manitoba? Does he plan to follow the leadership of the Mitterrand Government which raised taxes and nationalized banks, a number of things his own Party is calling for nationally? The result of that, as the Hon. Member well knows, is that the franc fell practically through the basement, unemployment went up and the Mitterrand Government had in effect to repeal itself within two or three years of taking office.

The rhetoric is fine, and I am sure many people agree with the rhetoric. It is the action that we on this side of the House are worried about, and I think Canadians generally are worried about that action, bearing on the experience of the Hon. Member's Party in Manitoba.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, actually I am delighted to have a chance to respond to the Hon. Member. My hon. friend from Edmonton reminds me of the auto insurance situation in Manitoba. I know that the Hon. Member is astute and is knowledgeable about the insurance business for a whole variety of reasons. As a result, he would know that virtually the lowest auto insurance rates in Canada are in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Kilgour: Saskatchewan.

Mr. Riis: I said virtually. Saskatchewan, of course, has had auto insurance for some time. Manitoba was following suit with what has to be described by any progressive-minded Canadian as the decent thing to do. Of course, auto insurance rates that are the lowest in Canada are in those provinces that have public auto insurance. This is because there is not a major profit motive involved in something that every Canadian citizen must have. Yes, I support that.

One can ask whether or not the rates charged ought to have jumped up by 40-some per cent on an insurance plan that is virtually one of the cheapest in Canada. I suppose that politically, that was not a particularly wise decision to take at that time. However, the decision was taken and for that reason I am concerned.

The Hon. Member referred to France and to the fact that France has a socialist Government. I suppose none of us in this room would be here if we did not believe in the fundamental principles of democracy. We would not be here if we did not believe that in the end, it is the collective wisdom of the people who decide who their Government ought to be. We in Canada are going to go through that exercise shortly, and in France they have just gone through that exercise.

After a number of years of Mitterrand's socialist Government, the Government went to the people and said that the people will now choose whether or not they want to give Mitterrand another seven-year mandate. The people of France spoke out at the voting booths. They said that yes, on balance, after looking at the policies of Mitterrand, policies similar to those that the New Democratic Party would consider for various sections of our own country, they agreed. Not surprisingly, the people of France re-elected President Mitterrand for another term.

That is the ultimate way of evaluating how effective a Government's programs and policies are. We will be doing that in our country soon. The people of Canada will evaluate the tax system that the Government has put into place, the tax system that I have described accurately, and I hope adequately, as being a system that is unjust and obviously biased and discriminatory and increasingly more complicated. The people will also have another choice. I indicated clearly in my presentation that there are a whole set of alternatives being suggested by the New Democrats. We are suggesting a tax system that would be fair and that would tax income in a fair, just and equitable way. Those are the choices that will be put rather simply to the people of Canada and they will have an opportunity to make those choices very soon, I hope.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate. The Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie.

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take part in a debate that is important because it affects all Canadian taxpayers, including middle and low-income earners, men and women, those working in industry, and so forth.

The purpose of the tax reform, and everyone in Canada agreed that changes were necessary, was first of all to reduce income tax and other taxes paid by taxpayers; second, to ensure that any citizen, whatever his income, or any corporation that receives services in Canada should pay his fair share, and third, to simplify the process. If we look at the legislation before the House, it has failed to meet these three objectives.

First of all, Conservative Members and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) want us to believe, as when they told senior citizens they would not touch old age pensions, that personal income tax and other taxes will go down. That is not true. And I intend to prove it isn't because the Government has done a bit of manoeuvring, and if we compare 1984 to 1988, in 1988 it is going to cost taxpayers $26.7 billion more in income tax and other taxes they will have to fork over to this Tory Government, which means 62 per cent, while it will cost corporations only $2.6 billion or 28 per cent. Is that the promised balance between personal income tax and corporate tax? Why are taxpayers paying more income tax in 1988 than they did in 1984? Simply because the Government de-indexed the tax tables, which means de-indexation of personal exemptions and personal income tax.

For a family, it meant that family allowance and the child tax credit were de-indexed. It meant that the ceiling below which middle-income families were eligible for the child tax credit was lowered, and it meant eliminating the tax exemptions that could have been converted into a tax credit for families with children between the ages of 16 and 18, when children continue their education.

The Tory Government wanted more than just a bite out of our weekly pay cheque. Every week or every two weeks when people get their pay cheque, another tax credit has been cut, which means that for every $3 we now have only $2 left just because the Conservative Government has taken that dollar out of our pay cheque.

• (1240)

But the Government didn't stop there. It took a different approach, more hypocritical and less open, reflecting the style of our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney). It used indirect taxes.

First we had three increases in sales tax on October 1, 1984, on January 1, 1986 and on April 1, 1986, from 9 per cent to 12 per cent. This means that every time consumers in Quebec and across Canada make a purchase, they are paying an additional Tory tax on all goods. This is a hidden tax. It doesn't show because the Government has already collected the tax from the manufacturer.

The Government didn't stop there. Gas was next, and what is more important than gas? Gas isn't just something you put in your tank to go on a holiday, to go for a drive. In Quebec, manufacturing is concentrated in the large urban centres, which means that essential products such as food, clothing and construction materials have to be shipped by truck. And trucks run on gas, which they need to deliver the goods to people in remote areas. And the same is true across Canada.

And the Tory Government, despite the fact that its gas expert promised to defend Canadian consumers in Ottawa, this Tory Government increased the price of gas by 23 cents a gallon. On September 3 1985, two cents a litre; on January 1, 1987, another cent; on February 19, 1987, another cent; and on April 1, 1988, one more cent. Mr. Speaker, all these increases in the tax on gas mean that when we open a bag of bread, drink a glass of milk or eat meat or fruit or vegetables, or when we buy curtains to decorate the house, the price increase doesn't go to the manufacturer or to the distributor. This is just another Tory ploy to increase the revenues of the Government. So much for the tax on gas.

But there is more. What about the tax on alcohol and tobacco, which has raised millions for the Government? But there are other examples, and I think the most shocking one, was the Prime Minister's failure to keep his promise to senior citizens. Last week, I had the honour and the pleasure of having lunch with Mrs. Solange Denis, the woman who said out loud on Parliament Hill what senior citizens were thinking, the woman who said: "Charlie Brown, you lied to us!". They remember. There is not one person in Canada, not one senior citizen who doesn't remember that the Prime Minister's word cannot be trusted. All senior citizens know perfectly well that the word of Tory Members cannot be trusted because they have already been cheated once, and it got to the point that senior citizens came to Parliament Hill and, as I said at the time, put down their playing cards and took up their placards to come and demonstrate to defend their rights.

However, the Government decided to increase the tax burden even more, reducing the purchasing power of Canadian taxpayers in the process. First of all, it put a sales tax that wasn't there before on soft drinks, snacks, manufactured construction materials and even on long-distance calls, Mr. Speaker.

In the areas outside Montreal, the telephone is essential. If a child has an accident and his parents have to make a long-distance call to reach a doctor, there is a Conservative tax on each long distance call. I am talking about people in remote areas of Quebec, where Conservative Members were elected, Members who did not stand up to defend the population on such an essential service.

There is a tax on wallpaper, but what really tops everything is the tax on drugs. The Prime Minister and the Conservative Government discovered that they could make money on the backs of the sick. When it discovered that drugs were not taxed, this Government decided to go ahead and tax them—just imagine, no one is safe . . . This medication isn't taken for the common cold, but by people suffering from cardiovascular diseases, respiratory illness, or diabetes.

Just as we did for the elderly, the Liberal team—smaller in number but a quality team nonetheless—had to band together with interest groups to force this inhuman and heartless Government to back down and withdraw the tax on drugs that are essential for survival. Unfortunately, the Government maintained its taxes on other drug products. This means that for the Conservative Government, a cold winter is a lucrative one—the more children with colds, the more children with the flu, the more money it makes, because it collects a 10 to 12 per cent tax on cold medications.

I have clearly demonstrated that there is no tax reduction for taxpayers and that their purchasing power is vastly diminished, because for each product they purchase they must pay the Conservative tax, either because of transport, or because of the sales tax on all the products that were not taxed previously and which the Conservative Government decided to tax.

I would now like to talk about the issue of fairness. In spite of the document we have before us today, there are still some 60 multinational corporations that will manage to benefit from advantages provided by the Federal Government and yet will not pay one cent of tax. And those businesses are not to be found in the Montreal—Sainte-Marie riding. These are not small family-run businesses where you have the father, the son and the wife all working hard—not the small car-repair shop or gas station—these are large multinational companies that are very close to the Prime Minister and whose representatives go to dinners at $5,000 and $10,000 a plate, and have managed to convince this Government to let them continue to abuse the system and continue to get off scot-free, without paying one cent of tax.

We saw figures again recently that showed that there are more than 5,000 people with incomes of $50,000 or more who do not pay tax, and others earning $100,000 or more who also pay no tax at all. Like middle and low-income earners, those people have the right to use health insurance and drug insurance programs; each one of us pays his share for those programs and we are forced to pay for the rich.

There you have proof that there is no fair treatment for everyone—corporations, the highest income earners, families and individuals with middle and low incomes—another failure. This reform has not achieved its objective.

As for simplifying the paper work, we expected, from what the Prime Minister gave us to understand, that people would find it much easier to fill out their tax returns. Mr. Speaker, here again, nothing has changed because the objective of simplifying paper work has not been met and tax forms have not been simplified, nor has the objective of eliminating tax loopholes for the rich; those loopholes still exist.

What should the Government have done? First of all, instead of granting a $500,000 exemption to the rich, while at the same time deindexing family allowances for low and middle-income families, rather than spending millions of dollars to bring in blue uniforms for the Armed Forces, it would have been preferable to continue helping our families.

But spending $16 or $17 billion for nuclear submarines is to my mind the greatest scandal of them all. Imagine that, Mr. Speaker—Canada decides that it could be under attack from two enemy countries! What countries are they? There are the Americans to the south and the Russians to the north. What weapons do those countries have? The Americans and the Russians do not just have two or three tanks. They do not have just one or two submarines, they have thousands. All of a sudden, our Canadian "Rambo", our new hero, decides to buy 16 submarines for a showdown with the Americans. He thinks that the American fleet will come here to Canada and want to get through. Then our "Rambo", our dear Brian, will jump into his submarine and say, "Hold on! If you shoot, I'll shoot!" Mr. Speaker, that is money wasted, poured down the drain!

We in the Liberal Party say no way will we have those 16 nuclear submarines. We won't do it. But what would we do with that money? With just one submarine, we can lower the pension age to 60 for all needy persons. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that your constituents in Duvernay, if asked, would rather lower the pension age to 60 than buy a single nuclear submarine. What would we do with the second submarine? We would put more money into day care and create more spaces. That takes care of two submarines and the money would help real people. What about the third and fourth nuclear submarines? What would we do with them? We would use the money to clean up the environment. We need it for the quality of life. That makes four submarines saved and many jobs for lots of people and better public services. What would we do with the fifth submarine? Our farmers in Quebec are penalized. Our farmers across the country need assistance, research and other such things.

So we would use the money from the fifth submarine for our farmers throughout Canada. There are still many submarines left for which the money could be spent in other ways. We could use the sixth and seventh submarines to establish a real family policy. Canada's number one problem is the low birth rate. What do Canadian families need? What do young couples need? Well, the sixth and seventh submarines could be used to fully index family allowances, to increase the child tax credit for middle- and low-income families, to follow the example of a good Liberal Government in Quebec and give $3,000 for the first, second or third child to help couples.

Mr. Speaker, don't you think that the voters in your riding would prefer a family assistance and support policy to two nuclear submarines that will waste their time in the Arctic?

What would we do with the money from the eighth and ninth and additional submarines? First of all, we could use the money from two of them right away to reduce the deficit and stop the fussing inside the Government. But we also have our seniors, the elderly of today and tomorrow. What do our seniors most need, in addition to an income? What does every Member of Parliament hear from seniors? They do not want to go and live in an old age home. Seniors, even at 80 or 82, are in good physical condition and want to live at home, but they need help. Mr. Speaker, at 82, you cannot wash the ceiling and the walls. So we Liberals would use the money for the seventh submarine to set up a nice national program with the provincial Governments for home support, medical assistance, things people need, not submarines!

Young people, Mr. Speaker! We had programs that helped young people and we could take the money from the eighth submarine to help youth. What do our young people leaving high school, college or university need? They need work experience, because when they apply for a job, companies ask them if they have experience. Without it, they do not get work! So they go back to studying. Well, we could have a program like the one lawyers have; a lawyer works in the field for a year before taking the bar exam. We could take the money from a nuclear submarine to give every student a year of practical work experience with companies across Canada, whatever the occupation, be it engineer, architect, lawyer, notary, machinist, construction worker or docker, Mr. Speaker.

Another important aspect is the problem these days of people 30 to 55. Today, 40-year-olds who have a specific training see their working world upset by technological change. They see that they do not have an indexed pension plan; they do not even have a private pension plan. Well, we could take the money from two submarines to give these people with work experience phased-in retirement, Mr. Speaker.

How many 50-year-olds say to themselves, "My children are grown, my house is paid for, but I cannot stop working five days a week. But I could work three days a week and I would train a young person." That is what I was just talking about.

This is an overall policy for quality of life. That is what the Liberals will be fighting for in the next election campaign, a quality of life program. Quality of life begins at home. You want quality of life in your home, on your job, in your environment, around your house, in the air you breathe.

I conclude with that and I would hope that the Conservative Members will answer my questions. Why would the Hon. Member for Duvernay (Mr. Della Noce) rather have the

Government waste $16 billion on nuclear submarines than use that money to lower the pension age to 60 for all seniors or for a home support program for seniors or to help young people or families? Why does the Hon. Member for Duvernay not want to defend the interests of these people? Why has the Hon. Member for Duvernay, unlike the time when he was head of the gas station owners in Quebec, allowed his Government to use gasoline as a way to get more tax from drivers or not tried to stop it, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I conclude and I would hope that some Conservative Members will wake up as the election approaches; otherwise, their time in Parliament will be short.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Duvernay (Mr. Della Noce) on a question or comment.

• (1250)

Mr. Della Noce: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for this opportunity to respond since the Hon. Member was so kind as to refer to me several times. What he said, however, was highly inaccurate, and I must say the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie likes to hear himself talk. And in fact he talks a blue streak, as they say. And that is because when his Party was in power, the Hon. Member, the very same, was not only not talking, he was absolutely struck dumb on the subject of Quebec's problem with gas prices.

And speaking of gasoline, I will give the Hon. Member a short course on gas, off the cuff. He said we increased taxes. And so we did. We had to reduce the deficit. Yes, we raised the price by five cents a litre. But let me tell you, that even if the Conservative Party increased taxes on gas, consumers are paying less than they were paying when you were in power. Back then they were paying 60 cents per litre, and today they are paying 52 cents. Today, every time consumers go to get gas in Quebec, they think of me. And they save $9.

Another thing the Hon. Member didn't mention was heating oil. It was 40 cents when his Party was in power. Today, heating oil is 20 cents per litre. We all have homes. And everybody needs a home. We don't need children—

Mr. Gauthier: It's not the Government's fault!

Mr. Della Noce: The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) says it's not the Government's fault. Mr. Speaker, it was the Liberal Party that introduced the National Energy Program.

I hope the Hon. Member is going to listen, because he might learn something. I did my calculations yesterday. If the Liberal Party were in power today and if we had maintained the Liberal Party's National Energy Program, oil would be $66 a barrel and gas would be 77 cents at the pump.

Talk about inaccurate, look at the Hon. Member who talked about $16 billion for the submarines when they will cost only $8 billion over a period of 25 years, which boils down to less than $300 million annually.

To answer the Hon. Member's question, $300 million per year, $8 billion for the submarines will cost less than repairing the scrap they left us. And the same applies to gas and the tax on gas. The Hon. Member conveniently forgot to mention this. He forgot to say that we abolished the Petro-Canada tax, the 7/10ths of a cent tax his Government introduced to build gas stations to compete with independent retailers like myself, using taxpayers' money. And what did Petro-Canada do for Canadians, Mr. Speaker? Did it give them a better price? No. Did it give them better service? No, they all have self-service operations. Did it create jobs? No, but it gave independent retailers ulcers. That is what your policy did for Canadians.

Mr. Malépart: Did you sell?

Mr. Della Noce: No, because I outlasted Petro-Canada. I am stronger than Petro-Canada. In my area, Petro-Canada didn't last.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, what did the Liberals do for Petromont in the Hon. Member's riding? They buried it. That is what the Liberals did. It took a Conservative Party to invest millions in the area. They should be ashamed to talk about energy. They should be ashamed to talk about energy when I am in the House, because of what they did. They killed the industry, and today if it were not for this Government, Canadians would be paying 77 cents per litre, gasoline would be $66—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart), who I imagine will wish to reply.

• (1300)

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, I see I have just woken up the former chief gas pump attendant from Quebec! But the erstwhile chief pump attendant from Quebec just admitted his failure. He just admitted that he fought Petro-Canada, but that Petro-Canada has increasing control under the Conservative Government. He just admitted that if it were not for the Conservative Government, if it had had more backbone, consumers would only be paying 47 cents a litre for their gas, because there was a five cent a litre tax increase under the Conservatives. Mr. Speaker, he just admitted his personal failure, because his main reason for getting into politics was to make Petro-Canada toe the line. Petro-Canada has become stronger and stronger throughout Canada. He wanted to ensure that the Conservative Government would stop taking small retailers hostage, Mr. Speaker. It is even worse under the Conservative Government than it was under the Liberal regime. Within four years, this Government has slipped an additional 23 cents' tax on a gallon of gas, and the chief pump jockey has been silenced as thoroughly as a car with a brand-new muffler.

Mr. Speaker, that is what has been happening and the population will remember. When I travel through Quebec, people say to me: Where is the head pump attendant who was fighting Petro-Canada and going to trials? We never hear from him anymore, Mr. Speaker! Well, I can tell you, the population . . . I know a foxy old politician, Mr. Maurice Bellemare, who is not a Liberal. He always used to say to me: Jean-Claude, the first election is easy to win, because you can promise anything, you can say anything you like. But the second one is more difficult to carry off, because people are going to say to you: Why didn't you do what you said you were going to do?

I think there are certain Members . . . he seemed nervous this morning and I think that what I said made him jump. I don't think it was the oil keg he's been sitting on, but what the people of Duvernay have been saying, Mr. Speaker. This has allowed me—

Mr. Della Noce: Pétromont!

Mr. Malépart: I did not think that the Member for Duvernay (Mr. Della Noce) approved. I thought that at least on this issue he would not agree with his Government's plan to waste money on nuclear submarines. I would never have thought that the Member for Duvernay would have stood up in the House to say: I'd rather spend money on nuclear submarines than on the plight of the elderly.

Mr. Della Noce: Point of Order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Duvernay (Mr. Della Noce) on a point of order.

Mr. Della Noce: I would like to point out to my Hon. colleague that aside from blathering on he is exaggerating again as I am not necessarily in agreement with any expenditure, but I do agree that $8 billion—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order! That is not a point of order.

Questions and comments. The Hon. Member for Ottawa-Centre (Mr. Cassidy) has the floor.

Mr. Cassidy: I had some comments I would like to make for the benefit of the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart). Although I welcome his support for positions taken by the New Democratic Party, I get the impression that the Liberals who are now in the Opposition acted like Conservatives when they were in power. And I would like to ask the Hon. Member of Montreal—Sainte-Marie why, when he was a back-bencher on the government side, he remained silent? I agree that he made up for his silence to a certain extent in the four years from 1980 to 1984. But I did some research, and I was astonished when I realized that during that time, the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie did not speak more than 15 times in four years. Today, it's 15 times a week in the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker!

He said nothing about the recession in Montreal's east end during that four-year period. He said nothing about the impact of rising interest rates, up to 22 per cent, on his constituents. He said nothing about the shipyards that were closing down because of a lack of contracts. He said nothing against the refinery shutdown which occurred under the Liberals when they were in power. He said nothing about the problems of workers over 40 during that time. Nothing was said by the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie about unemployment that was soaring between 1980 and 1984.

Mr. Speaker, about taxation, when the then Minister of Finance, Mr. MacEachen, proposed cuts in taxes on the rich, did the Hon. Member have anything to say? No, he said nothing! Not a word to defend the interests of the average taxpayer in his riding who would have to pay to make up for these cuts. Not a word in the House to object to the fact that tax shelters would be maintained and expanded under the Liberal Minister of Finance.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I remember how he campaigned with the NDP against the deindexing of old age pensions. However, when he was a Liberal back-bencher , what did the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie do about the deindexing of Public Service pensions? Did he object to the six and five Program or to the cuts in old age pensions like the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier)? Certainly not! The Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie rose in the House to support the deindexing of old age pensions for retired public servants.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member acted like a silent Conservative when his Party was in power, although he acts like a New Democrat now that he is in the Opposition?

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, it is depressing to listen to the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy). He reminds me of the Hon. Member for Duvernay (Mr. Della Noce), who as far as intellectual honesty is concerned . . . There are some doubts about that.

Remember the frigates, when the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre deceived the people of Quebec. He told them that an NDP government would renegotiate the frigate contract and bring it back to Quebec. His Leader contradicted him!

Mr. Cassidy: I made a mistake, and I admitted it in the House and outside the House.

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, in politics, if you are intellectually honest, you don't tell voters what they want to hear. I think the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre, as far as the space agency and the frigates were concerned, was playing his game the Conservative way, a little like the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), like a snake. And I don't think he is going to win any votes that way. He doesn't know the difference between a Member on the Government side and a Member in the Opposition. To win a case . . .

Mr. Cassidy: In power, the Hon. Member is silent!

Mr. Malépart: —no, because in Manitoba, when the NDP Government raised automobile insurance premiums, the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre didn't say a word.

I realize the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre is upset about my success in fighting the deindexing of old age pensions. I understand why the Hon. Member for the NDP, who is used to playing political games in Quebec, is not getting a foothold there. I understand why the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre is disappointed that I won the battle for 46,000 older workers, at a time when his Party was getting ready to throw in the towel. I understand why the NDP are disapppointed that they don't count in Quebec, and while the Liberal team is there, ready to defend the workers, the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre runs around telling those workers: I'll ask a question. I'll make a statement under S.O. 21, and I'll send you a copy. I took part in a candidates' debate, and my NDP opponent said he wanted to defend the banks. A former vice-president of a national bank says that his main task is not to defend the interests of Laurier—Sainte-Marie but to persuade the NDP that banks are good the way they are and not to nationalize them.

The NDP's hypocrisy explains why it is always in the Opposition.

• (1310)

[*English*]

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate why the Conservatives are not speaking on this Bill. There is nothing to defend. I can understand their unwillingness to participate and defend this Bill which is supposed to reform taxation. I can understand their shame and why they cringe and why they will not speak on this particular Bill.

It seems to me that any tax system must have three aspects to it. The tax system must be fair. The tax system must be progressive. The tax system must redistribute. Ordinary Canadians look at this so-called tax reform and they have to ask themselves certain questions. The first question has to be, is this tax system fair? There is a cynicism which exists with respect to what has happened since the Conservatives came to power in 1984, with all the hopes Canadians had that we would have effective tax reform. After all, that was one of their commitments during the election campaign. But what happened in the first three years in Government? The Conservatives taxed and taxed and taxed. They did exactly the sorts of things that the Liberals used to do.

In the year in which an election is expected, we get this much-touted so-called tax reform. Having taken out of the pockets of the average Canadian family over $1,000 over the last four years, the Conservatives decided to return it to them in their pay-packets. The Government says it is taking less from these taxpayers. This is all scheduled to happen, of course, on July 1, 1988, the eve of an election.

That is the first cynical aspect. Second, this Government has protected its options for an election next spring. Because of the so-called tax cuts in the spring of 1989, Canadians will get back a refund cheque. The amount that was collected in the first six months of 1988 will be calculated with a higher tax deduction. That is cynicism. All of these so-called loopholes the Government says it has closed, none of that comes into effect until 1991. That is the other aspect of the cynicism. That is well beyond the next election. Canadians who are perhaps more cynical than myself would look at that and realize the opportunism of this Government when it comes to tax reform.

The Government is not really interested in reforming the tax system. It is a shell game. There is a pea under the shell and the Government moves the shells around. That is the old game that is played at fairs right across this country. That is a shame because I think it really destroys the whole political process. In fact, the political process is really the arena to make moral changes. It is a place at which Canadians should be able to look and see hope for a better system, for an improved system. But when we look at this tax reform package which is embodied in this Bill we find it sadly lacking. For example, the average Canadian will look at this tax reform package and discover that three out of four Canadian families earning over $100,000 a year, who have already benefited from past Budgets, will receive yet another tax cut of $4,363 per year.

The ordinary Canadian has to ask why, after this much-touted tax reform, the rich will again benefit. Average Canadians will wonder why a family earning under $15,000 a year will receive a cut of only $100 a year. Ordinary Canadians will ask why. Why this unfairness in the way this Government deals with the wealthy as opposed to the poor? Why is it that we have to take from the poor to give to the greedy? I suspect that is part and parcel of the Progressive Conservative ideology. It is part of that ideology that believes in acquisition. This is an age of acquisition. If one cannot go out and get it, there is something wrong. It is there for personal gain. As long as I can get my share, I do not care about any one else. That is the mentality that is reflected in this so-called tax reform.

Ordinary Canadians will remember the promise of a minimum tax. They will ask themselves why there is not a minimum tax on corporations. Why are the wealthiest corporations in this country treated with velvet gloves? Small businesses, in fact create most of the employment, 80 per cent of the jobs in this country. All of those who work very hard in their small enterprises, and individual Canadians who work very hard at their jobs, will ask why this Conservative Government treats the large corporations so generously and treats them with such severity in terms of taxation. That is a good question.

Why is it that after the so-called tax reform package, 60,000 very profitable corporations will still continue to pay not a penny of tax? That is a question Canadians will ask. After all, if those 60,000 very wealthy corporations do not pay their share to keep this country—a country which allows those corporations to make their handsome profits—someone else has to pay. That someone else will be the ordinary Canadian and the small enterprise. Canadians will ask why. Why does this Government do that?

Ordinary Canadians will take a look at the statistics which show that in 1984, when this Progressive Conservative Government came to power, the percentage of taxes collected from the corporate sector was 20.3 per cent of all revenues collected by the Government. The latest figures in 1987 show that it is down to 15.5 per cent. So corporate taxes have been reduced in terms of total contribution to the upkeep of this country, and the percentage of revenues the Government has taken from ordinary Canadians in income taxes and sales taxes has gone up considerably. So ordinary Canadians and small enterprises are paying more percentage-wise to support the country while the large corporations' percentage continues to decrease. The Government boasts that after these tax reform measures that figure will rise to 17.2 per cent by 1991. Big deal. That is still about three percentage points lower than they contributed when the Government came to power in 1984.

• (1320)

Ordinary Canadians will read that statistic and say: "Why? Is that fair? Is any of it fair? Is fairness reflected in this Bill regarding income tax reform?"

I see that it is time for lunch.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being 1.22 p.m., I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m.

At 1.22 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, the Canada-U.S. trade deal threatens the Canada that we know and love and as we have built it for more than 100 years. This deal will limit Canada's ability to take action in regional development, social policy, health policy, industrial and resource development, environmental protection, and culture.

Such a fundamental change was not discussed in the 1984 election, and consequently the Government has no mandate to proceed. This deal threatens our independence, sovereignty, and identity. It puts us into a massive alliance with the United States in which the United States will dominate.

If the Government is serious about the agreement, let it call an election and seek the approval of the people of Canada. The people have the right to decide.

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

INCREASED FEDERAL FUNDING

Mr. Elliott Hardey (Kent): Mr. Speaker, today the Government once again demonstrated its commitment to Canadian agriculture. I am referring to the Minister of Agriculture's (Mr. Wise) announcement of $400 million to support the Farm Credit Corporation.

Farmers have learned that this federal Government will always walk that extra mile to ensure that producers get a fair deal. Support for agriculture has gone up by 400 per cent in the last four years. The Government has announced initiatives worth more than $9 billion in that period of time.

The Special Canadian Grains Program is the largest federal initiative in Canadian history. It has put $2.1 billion into the grain and oilseed farmers' pockets. There has been a record stabilization payment, and timely drought assistance.

The Government has ensured that Canadian farming is here for the long haul. Today's announcement will mean that the Farm Credit Corporation is here to stay, too.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House of Commons, we have a duty to respect the rights of all Canadians, and to give full consideration to major issues which confront our country and, in particular, to those issues which would profoundly change the nature of our nation.

The right of all Canadians to share in democratic debates has been consistently denied by the Conservative Government in its rush to push the trade deal through the House of Commons in order to meet the mandate of the United States Government.

Hundreds of groups have requested that the committee travel and give them the opportunity to put forward their views on the trade deal that is before us. These people have all been denied their democratic rights by the Government.

The Government has ignored requests from groups such as the National Federation of Nurses, the National Council of Playwrights, the Canadian Teachers Federation, the Saskatchewan Tenants Association, the Toronto Workers Health and Safety Legal Clinic, the Catholic Family Services Bureau in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, the Conference Program Staff of the United Church of Saskatchewan, the B.C. and Yukon Women's Centre Association, the Co-op Atlantic, the Northwest Territories Federation of Labour, the Archdiocese of Regina and its Social Action Committee, the Federation of Women Teachers Associations of Canada, and the Toronto Theatre Alliance.

The Canadian people did not elect the Conservative Government to deny the history, traditions, and interests of Canadians, or to sell out to the United States. Specifically, the Canadian people did not give the Government a mandate to deny democratic rights. We need an election now on this issue in order that Canadians can be heard.

* * *

THE SENATE

POSITION OF LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mrs. Mary Collins (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, as a Member from British Columbia I am often accused of being from Fantasyland. Well, these days in Ottawa I feel more like Alice in Wonderland.

Here we have the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Turner) abandoning the fundamental democratic tradition that it is the elected Members of Parliament who determine the public policies and programs of this country. He would, instead, hand this prerogative over to a group of Senators appointed by his predecessors and demand that they smother government Bills and force an election.

As *The Globe and Mail* so aptly editorialized this morning: "Surely the Senate lacks that right in this democracy and surely Mr. Turner should not have put the question on the table".

Surely even we from Fantasyland know a Mad Hatter when we hear one, and send regrets to his invitation to participate in this blatantly bizarre tea party.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—POSITION OF LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the government Members are doing their best to blame the Senate for future holding up of the trade deal. They do not want to admit that they are afraid to go to the country and have Canadians pass judgment on the trade deal with President Reagan. There is nothing more democratic than to go to the people of Canada and to let all Canadians vote on the future of their country.

That is what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) did yesterday; he asked the Senate to step aside and let all Canadians have a chance to pass judgment on the Canada-U.S. trade deal.

It is not a free trade deal because Canadians will not have free access to American markets. It is not a free trade deal because when there is a dispute on any item or circumstance the agreement states that American trade law will be supreme, and Canadians will have to accept second best.

The Prime Minister knows full well, as do all Canadians, that the elected Leader of the Liberal Party has asked the Senate to allow Canadians to decide on this bad deal. The only person who is blocking the democratic rights of every Canadian is the Prime Minister of Canada, because he is afraid to call an election on the issue.

Even while in opposition the Liberal Party is standing up for the rights of Canadians to decide on the bad trade issue that even the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) said during the last election was an unthinkable thing to propose, and then they turned around and did the very opposite and did what they said they would not do.

* * *

THE SENATE

POSITION OF LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. W. Paul McCrossan (York-Scarborough): Mr. Speaker, as Member of Parliament for York—Scarborough I represent almost 300,000 people. How many constituents are represented by Senator MacEachen or Senator Kirby? It appears they represent exactly one person—the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Turner), the Party that appointed them to the Senate in 1984.

Over the past two years Liberal Senators have been delaying vital legislation adopted by this House. The Leader of the Opposition has told the House that he could not be blamed since he could not control Liberal Senators. Today the truth is out. He had an option then to protect the elected representative Government. He failed.

He has the option of protecting our elected House today, and he is failing again. The sad fact is that each time he has an option, he fails.

Today he asserts the divine right of Liberal Senators to rule over elected Members by ordering the body of "sober second thought" to refuse to think. It is tragic to see a long-serving Member of this House subvert its authority merely to prop himself up for a few months longer.

S. O. 21

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House of Commons we have a duty to respect the rights of all Canadians and give full democratic consideration to major issues which confront our country, in particular to those issues which would profoundly change our country.

The right of all Canadians to share in democratic debates has been consistently denied by the Conservative Government in its rush to push the trade deal with the U.S. through the House. In spite of its massive majority, the Government has no mandate from the people of Canada to force this project through the House. Hundreds of groups have requested an opportunity to put forward their views on the trade deal presently before us. Many people have been denied their democratic rights by the Conservative Government.

The Government has ignored requests from groups such as the Diocese of Victoria Social Justice Commission in Victoria, B.C., Oxfam Canada, the Association of Canadian Publishers, the United Church of Canada, the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, the Executive Secretary of the United Church in Winnipeg, and the Health Coalition of Cape Breton.

The Canadian people did not elect the Conservative Government to deny the history, traditions, and interests of Canadians, or to sell out to the United States. Specifically, the Canadian people did not give the Government a mandate to deny their democratic rights. We need an election on this issue in order that Canadians can be heard, and we need it now.

* * *

[*Translation*]

LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

CHOICE OF STRATEGIES

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Quebec-Est): Mr. Speaker, I would be surprised if the senators were to do as they are told by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) because he has no authority within his caucus, within his Party and, particularly, within the Canadian Senate. He never did control anything. You can give orders to your caucus, to the Liberal senators, to Mr. Robert, nobody listens to you anyway. You lack credibility, just as does your Party. You are panicking. You are losing your cool. You have to be in a very desperate predicament to behave like this.

You are asking the senators—these experienced men and women—to follow you. I happen to know that serious Liberal Senators will not buy this conniving approach. The legislative agenda and the date of the elections will be set by the Party in office. In our Party, the Leader, the Right Hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), faces up to his responsibilities and Canadians are quite aware of that, but in your Party the discussion is still raging on as to who will be the leader during the next election campaign. In due time Canadians will have an opportunity to say where they stand with respect to this historic trade agreement.

Is the Leader of the Opposition justified to raise objections because Canadians have made peace with themselves and with their neighbour? Canadians have lost faith in you and in your Party. If you are unable to assume your responsibilities as an elected Member of the House, go!

* * *

• (1410)

MEMBER FOR QUÉBEC-EST

DEFENCE OF ELECTORS' INTERESTS

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, we have just heard the Hon. Member for Quebec-Est (Mr. Tremblay). His act was a total failure and his S.O. 21 motion was a disaster, Mr. Speaker. Instead the Hon. Member for Quebec-Est should look after the people of his riding who had their unemployment insurance benefits cut off, older workers who are told every week that the Quebec caucus will solve that problem.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, older workers from the Province of Quebec attempted to march into the office of the Minister of State for Employment and Immigration (Mrs. Vézina) at the employment and immigration office to seek justice.

Mr. Speaker, when I saw the Hon. Member for Quebec-Est rising and failing to stand up for his constituents, I did not suggest that he ought to go because I know that the people will get rid of him.

* * *

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—POSITION OF LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. Jim Jepson (London East): Mr. Speaker, I am still in a bit of shock, like most Canadians, over the unbelievable statement made by the Leader of the Liberal Opposition (Mr. Turner) yesterday, requesting the Liberal-dominated, unelected Senate to block the free trade Bill when passed by the democratically elected Members representing the people, namely, the House of Commons.

I cannot believe, after four years, the arrogance of Mr. Trudeau's and Mr. Turner's appointees to the Senate, who honestly believe that the Conservative Government has in some undemocratic fashion usurped their divine right to govern Canada.

What we heard and saw yesterday from the Leader of the Liberal Opposition was not leadership but the sounds of the death rattle of an opposition Leader and in a Liberal Party making one last desperate grab for political power in Canada. What a sad way to end a Leader in the Party's life in Canadian politics.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DEMOCRACY

OBLIGATION TO GO TO THE PEOPLE ON ISSUES THAT CAN PROFOUNDLY CHANGE CANADA

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa-Centre): Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House of Commons, we have a duty to respect the rights of all Canadians and to give full democratic considerations to major issues which confront our country and in particular to those issues which would profoundly change our country. The right of all Canadians to share democratic debates has been consistently denied by this Conservative Government in its rush to push the trade deal with the U.S. through this House.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of its massive majority, this Government has no mandate from the people of Canada to force this project through the House. Hundreds of groups have requested the opportunity to put their views before the House of Commons, but this Government has refused them. The Government has ignored the request from such groups as the National Federation of Nurses, the Canadian Federation of Teachers, the Pro Canada Network of Saskatchewan, the Commission on Social Justice, the DSS of Victoria, Oxfam Canada, the United Church of Canada, the Toronto Council of Social Planning, the Jesuit Centre, etc.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian people did not elect the Conservative Government to deny the history, but to protect the interests of Canadians, and not to sell us out to the U.S. They specifically did not give this Government a mandate to deny their democratic rights. We need an election on this issue so that Canadians can decide, and we need it now.

* * *

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, there is a huge hue and cry and the sound of fury emanating from benches opposite, from Members who are aghast at a revolutionary new and startling idea in Canadian political life. Someone has dared to stand up to suggest that after years of having the politicians, the pundits, the power brokers making the decisions, the people of Canada should decide, and that concept frightens the Tory Party.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we have entered a stage. The debate has begun. The election has begun, and it is not going to be the politicians, it is not going to be the pundits, it is not going to be the power brokers, it is not going to be the elite, it is going to be the people of Canada who decide the future of this country.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: If that idea be radical, if that idea be revolutionary, let the battle begin. Issue the writ and call the election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

[*Translation*]

LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

RESPONSIBILITY FOR CHOICE OF STATEGIES

Mr. Gabriel Fontaine (Lévis): Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Leader, a former Prime Minister of Canada, officially renounced the ability of the House of Commons to legislate. He told the non-elected Senators of the Liberal caucus to oppose the free trade Bill.

Often, when weak people have exhausted all human and intellectual resources, they surrender.

Never again will Canadians want as Prime Minister a Member of the House of Commons who has decided to abdicate the powers of this House. They will not want to have anything to do with a captain who has scuttled the ship of State. Come election time, they will surely not elect a Prime Minister who would get his orders from a Senate godfather, even if it were MacEachen.

* * *

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House of Commons we have a duty to respect the rights of all Canadians and to give full democratic consideration to major issues which confront our country and in particular to those issues which would profoundly change our country. The right of all Canadians to share in democratic debates has been consistently denied by this Conservative Government in its rush to push the trade deal with the U.S. through this House. In spite of its massive majority, the Government has no mandate from the people of Canada to force this project through the House. Hundreds of groups have requested the opportunity to put their views before the House of Commons. This Government has refused them.

The Government has ignored requests from the Catholic Family Services Bureau in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, the Conference Program Staff of the United Church of Saskatchewan, the B.C. and Yukon Women's Centre Association, the Co-op Atlantic, the Northwest Territories Federation of Labour, the Archdiocese of Regina and its Social Action Committee.

The Canadian people did not elect the Conservative Government to deny the history and traditions and interests of Canadians, or to sell us out to the U.S. They specifically did not give this Government a mandate to deny their democratic rights. We need an election on this issue so that Canadians can decide, and we need it now.

* * *

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

PROVISION OF LONG-TERM MORTGAGE CREDIT

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) today gave a clear indication of the continuing role of the Farm Credit Corporation. The primary job of the FCC is to provide long-term mortgage credit to Canadian farmers on a cost-recovery basis.

The corporation is an alternative source of mortgage credit to average risk farmers. It is also a credit source for those farmers whose risk is marginally above that of average. The FCC is not about to reduce its level of service, but it will pay more attention to its bottom line. By monitoring and handling risks more effectively, the corporation will be better able to serve Canadian agriculture, now and for many years to come.

It is a telling fact that 96 per cent of the present farm accounts that are in arrears occurred in accounts that were started prior to the last election in 1984.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ELECTIONS

DIFFERENCE IN VIEWS

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, as a Canadian, I must say that I was somewhat distressed by yesterday's event. The Leader of the Opposition and of the Liberal Party (Mr. Turner) was, as usual, somewhat inconsistent in his positions and decided to have the Senate, the Liberal-dominated Upper Chamber, block the free trade Bill. At the same time he is asking us to call an election to have the population elect a Government. We have a majority Government.

Mr. Speaker, this really makes me wonder about our democratic federal system. In my opinion, we are deceiving Canadian citizens when we ask them to vote for us.

• (1420)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—REQUEST FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question or two for the Prime Minister, but since he is perhaps on his way to Rideau Hall I will put them to the Deputy Prime Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): The Prime Minister has now had 24 hours to reflect—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): —upon the proposition I put to him. He now understands that his contemplated trade deal with the United States will not happen until the people of Canada have had a chance to pronounce on it.

I say to the Prime Minister through you, Mr. Speaker, and through the Deputy Prime Minister, that there will be no trade deal with the United States until the people of Canada have had a chance to review the issue.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): There are those who approve of my decision yesterday and there are those who disapprove of that decision.

Mr. McDermid: I haven't had one phone call yet.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): I will say to the Hon. Member for Brampton that he should not be here; he should be back protecting his backside in the constituency of Brampton.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): He ought to reach back into the locker room and get Billy Davis out there to protect him. He will need him every minute.

The real debate has finally begun. I stand ready to abide by the people's decision. Is the Leader of the Government, the Prime Minister of Canada, ready to stand by the decision of the people and, if so, will he call the election now and let the people decide?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that when the Prime Minister considers the date of the next election he will also be considering the comments that have been made responding to the unprecedented actions of the Leader of the Opposition which, in newspapers, were described as follows: blatant, wretched, hypocrisy, strange, desperate, sleazy, arrogant, squalid, and cynical. That is how the Leader of the Opposition's actions have been described, and I am sure that that will be taken into consideration when the request is made, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Kaplan: The media don't decide elections, the people do.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, let the people decide whether that vocabulary is accurate or not. I am ready to stand by the judgment of the people.

Ms. Copps: Let's go, let's go!

[*Translation*]

RIGHT OF PEOPLE TO DECIDE

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this agreement with the United States harms our farmers and they have the right to be heard. This agreement harms our textile workers and they also have the right to speak out. This agreement is bad for our business people and they have the right to speak out. This arrangement with the United States is bad for Canadians and all Canadians have the right to say so.

And so I put the question to the Deputy Prime Minister once again: Why not let Canadians decide?

[*English*]

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, what is happening is that a piece of trade legislation is going through Parliament in its normal process. It was the subject of a Royal Commission, a $23 million Royal Commission paid for by the taxpayers of Canada, chaired by a former colleague.

An Hon. Member: Donald Macdonald.

Mr. Mazankowski: The trade initiative is supported by eight out of 10 provinces, eight out of 10 Premiers. It is supported literally by every think tank and objective policy based bureau that study these things. It is supported by a majority of the House of Commons. It is going through the committee stage.

I find it incomprehensible that the Leader of the Opposition who has traditionally been a staunch defender of the House of Commons—and he is on record for that—would now subvert and circumvent the role of the House of Commons. He talks about being a great friend and a champion of the Right Hon. John George Diefenbaker. I can tell the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition that Mr. Diefenbaker would not be very proud of him today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): I want to say one thing about Mr. Diefenbaker, Mr. Speaker. He was never afraid of facing the people of Canada. Nor am I.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): There is one thing about the late John George Diefenbaker, he would never have sold out this country the way the current Prime Minister is doing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER'S POSITION

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): The real issue is the future of Canada. Our senior citizens have been hit by this trade deal. They have the right to decide. Our young people have been hit by this trade deal. They have the right to decide. Our grandchildren will be affected by this deal and their parents have the right to decide. Every Canadian is affected by this deal and they have the right to decide.

Ms. Copps: Let's go!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): I ask the Deputy Prime Minister of Canada why doesn't he let the people decide?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Diefenbaker always defended the rights of the House of Commons first and foremost.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: He believed, as I believe, that the House of Commons has the right to pass legislation. The House of Commons has the right to bring forth legislation. No subsequent Parliament is tied to legislation that is passed by a previous Parliament. That is a pretty fundamental part of our democracy, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nunziata: Brian is a wimp. He is more of a wimp than Joe.

Mr. Mazankowski: I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Diefenbaker would have never sold his soul to the Senate, particularly to that bunch over there.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: I find his position somewhat hypocritical because in 1961 the right hon. gentleman, in calling it a political conundrum said:

> The Senate, in terms of current facts, no longer plays a useful part in the government of Canada. Its historical purposes have been lost. It no longer operates (albeit through forces beyond the control of its own members) as a restraining influence on legislation. Its initial historical function, that of representing and protecting the rights and interests of provinces, was never discharged; and it is scarcely equipped with the necessary mandate for that role today. Consequently the argument for its abolition is difficult to resist.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DEMOCRACY

IMPORTANCE FOR CITIZENS TO MAKE POLITICAL CHOICE PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montréal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister, I would like to put my question to the Deputy Prime Minister.

What we are talking about today is not John Diefenbaker's future, but the future of the Canadian men and women of today.

The Deputy Prime Minister may not be aware of this, but this week all the workers' representatives in Quebec are against the Mulroney-Reagan trade deal, because they think it does not provide sufficient job protection.

Can the Deputy Prime Minister tell us why the Prime Minister and the Conservative Government are denying workers the right to decide their future in a general election? Why is this right being denied to the men and women who work in the textile industry in the riding of Drummond, and to the men and women who work in the footwear industry in Montreal? Why not let these men and women speak out in a general election, rather than passing this agreement and forcing them to accept the result after the fact? Why are you afraid to let them vote first?

• (1430)

[*English*]

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I find that absolutely incredible. The person who purports to represent all these workers in Canada showed up at committee this morning, made a statement indicating that she would not present one bit of evidence and then walked out, walked out of the committee. She did not give evidence at all. She grandstanded in front of everyone.

The labour movement is not interested in listening to the facts on this. It is supporting its socialist friends over there, that's all.

[*Translation*]

DEMAND FOR APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, if the representative of big finance wants to know whether the workers are interested in free trade, let him call an election and you will see how the workers vote! You have representatives of Quebec farmers here. They too are against this agreement. Can the Deputy Prime Minister tell us why does the Government not have the courage to let these farmers decide in an election before this project is accepted? Have you ever seen a collective agreement accepted over the workers' heads? Why do you not have the courage to have it accepted before, in an election campaign, right away?

[*English*]

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there has been no Government in the history of Canada that has responded to the needs of the farmers as ably, capably, responsibly, and responsively as this Government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: Since the hon. gentleman has joined with his Leader in a strange abdication of responsibility to the Senate, I would like to know from the Hon. Member what he will do with his Private Member's Motion that is currently standing on the Order Paper, which reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider amending the Standing Orders so that a bill passed by the House, returned to the House by the Senate, with amendments, and sent back to the Senate with further amendments, shall be deemed to have been adopted by the Senate on the sixtieth day after receipt thereof, unless previously disposed of by the Senate.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: We are seeing across the way not only the final act of desperation but the champions of hypocrisy.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—WATER RESOURCES

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Deputy Prime Minister, but I would like to say that it is more than a little amusing for Canadians to hear Liberals and Conservatives fighting with each other to see who can be most critical of the Senate. I have never known either a Liberal or a Conservative to turn down an appointment to the Senate. It would be interesting to see that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice says that there is one Conservative. No doubt he has subsequently died, but there was one.

Two days ago, Mr. Mel Clark, former Deputy Chief Negotiator for Canada at the Tokyo Round of the GATT discussions, in very serious testimony before a House committee pointed out that in his view there is no doubt whatsoever that in the negotiated agreement between Canada and the United States on the matter of trade, water is indeed included. He has urged in the strongest possible terms that the agreement be amended to exclude the possibility of the exportation of water. Today a Gallup poll has come out showing 69 per cent of Canadians in total agreement with that position.

The Minister has indicated the possibility of accepting an amendment down the road. If government Members want to fulfil their commitment, and they have publicly said that they are not interested in having the exportation of water to the United States, will they listen to one of the most learned people on this subject in the country, our Deputy Chief Negotiator? Will they respond to the people of Canada who want it excluded and announce now their intention to bring in an amendment to this agreement?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, in response to the preamble of the Leader of the New Democratic Party, might I just add in observation that it is interesting to see the NDP and the Liberals jockeying for last place in the public opinion polls as a result of the latest fiasco that has been going on.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: As long as the Leader of the NDP wants to quote experts, perhaps he might be interested in the expert testimony of Mr. Frank Stone, speaking on behalf of the Institute for Research on Public Policy, a pretty well established and credible organization. He said:

> Water diversions have never been discussed in the GATT, and any suggestion that GATT covers water diversions or inter-basin transfers would be hooted down in Geneva by the GATT member countries.

He said as well:

> But the Free Trade Agreement, whatever its merits and flaws, has nothing at all to do with the diversion or inter-basin transfer of water.

That has been enunciated time and time again in the House of Commons and outside the House of Commons. It is true that the Minister for International Trade, while clearly stating the fact that water is not a part of the free trade agreement nor was it ever intended to be nor was it discussed, in the interests of clarity said that if it is so deemed necessary or fit, or if a recommendation comes from the committee to incorporate a clarification, he would certainly look at it.

This Bill is being discussed in the committee. If, in the wisdom of the committee, it so sees fit to make these kinds of clarifications, they will certainly be considered.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, the Minister knows that the majority of members on that committee are Conservative members, the same majority who denied the right of that committee to travel from Newfoundland to British Columbia to listen to Canadians.

The Government says it is concerned about the serious matter of substance, of protecting our water from a future decision that could be made, according to our Deputy Chief Negotiator at the GATT who ought to know more about these matters than either the Deputy Prime Minister or I because he was there and knows the technical material. He says it is included. We want some government leadership, not to wait for a committee, on a commitment to change the agreement to protect Canadian water. That is the issue.

Considering that I have a list of some 450 groups of Canadians, including farmers from the Minister's province, lawyers from Alberta, fishermen from the Atlantic provinces and trade unionists—

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the Hon. Member to put his question.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, these groups have indicated that they believe that this Accord profoundly affects the future of Canada and they want the opportunity to present testimony, not simply in Ottawa but where they live. Will the House Leader talk to the Conservative members of that committee and urge them to reconsider their decision not to have hearings, and go out and listen to the people of Canada on this matter?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party was represented on the committee that brought about recommendations for parliamentary reform, and it brought forth a recommendation to establish legislative committees. As a part of that recommendation, it was clearly outlined that legislative committees would not travel.

If the Hon. Leader of the New Democratic Party is suggesting a change in the recommendation, then he should have made that recommendation to his representative on the committee because that has been the established practice. It is rather late in the day to be making those kinds of representations.

In so far as clarification of the water issue and providing leadership are concerned, the Minister for International Trade has clearly made the point that if there is a requirement for clarification with respect to the water issue, he would certainly consider such an amendment. I hope that the wisdom of the committee will prevail.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, the Minister knows that if it were the case that a Standing Committee could not travel—

Mr. Mazankowski: It's not a Standing Committee.

Mr. Broadbent: A legislative committee, calm down. He says that a legislative committee could not travel. I am told that the Atlantic committee which was a Standing Committee did in fact travel—

Mr. Mazankowski: Standing.

Mr. Broadbent: —so there is precedent for it. It could happen, as the Minister knows, by unanimous agreement. He would have that agreement on this side of the House. If he wanted to do the democratic thing, he could have all Canadians give testimony on this Bill, and that is what the Government should do.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1440)

REQUEST THAT GENERAL ELECTION BE HELD

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, the Government will not make a commitment to change the agreement on the important matter of water. It will not allow the committee to travel to the people of Canada to hear what they have to say. Will it at least give us a commitment that before we recess the Prime Minister will come into the House, dissolve Parliament, and go to the people?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Leader of the NDP wants to get involved in a procedural battle he had better let his House Leader do it because he is a little more conversant with the rules.

So far as committee travel is concerned, there have been other important issues before the House where the committees concerned have not travelled. There was no travel in the study of the Meech Lake Accord. There was no travel by the Constitution committee in 1980. It is rather strange that at this late hour the Hon. Leader of the NDP wants the committee to travel.

With regard to water, the Minister of International Trade made our position quite clear. If the Leader of the NDP wants an election, he will get an election, when it is appropriate.

Mr. Broadbent: When is that?

Mr. Mazankowski: I would suggest he go back—

Some Hon. Members: Now!

Mr. Mazankowski: Maybe the Hon. Leader of the NDP should go back to his cottage and rest up a little more. He is going to need it.

GOVERNMENT POSITION ON WATER RESOURCES

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Acting Prime Minister. As we heard, it was reported yesterday that 69 per cent of Canadians oppose the export of any fresh water to the U.S. Some 40 per cent, the greatest number in the poll, say that water is our most important resource. Experts have said that water is covered by the agreement.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Allmand: Engineers, scientists and lawyers have said it is covered by the agreement. Whether the Government meant it or not, it is clear that water is covered under the agreement.

How can the Government proceed with this agreement without a mandate from the Canadian people? How can it sell out our most important resource without the consent of the Canadian people?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the answer remains the same. As was indicated in the House, if it is necessary to clarify that particular issue in the legislation, it will be done. May I also remind the Hon. Member that the water policy announced in November of 1987 is pretty specific. It clearly says that federal legislation to the extent necessary to implement fully this policy, which prohibits the inter-basin transfer of water, will be brought before the House.

I can tell the Hon. Member that legislation will be brought before the House in a very short time. It is in its final drafting stage. That will clarify the issue. If it needs further clarification with regard to Bill C-130 itself, that will be done as well.

TERMS OF AGREEMENT

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, the Government is contemplating an amendment to the Bill but that cannot correct the problem. It is the agreement that is defective.

Mr. Masse: How do you know that?

Mr. Allmand: Once again, how can the Government proceed with an agreement that sells out our most important resource, fresh water, without the consent of the Canadian people?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, once again, the free trade agreement does not cover the large scale export of water. Water is covered by the FTA as a tariff item under beverages, spirits and vinegar. Bottled water is covered. The bottom line is that Canadian water is fully protected. It will be even more absolutely and fully protected when the new legislation is introduced by the Minister of the Environment. If any clarification is required with respect to the definition in the trade Bill, that will be done.

REQUEST THAT AGREEMENT BE AMENDED

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, the day before Mr. Clark gave his very powerful testimony to the legislative committee looking at this issue, the head of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture expressed in very clear terms his concern about the potential for large-scale exports of water and what they would do to agriculture in this country.

The Deputy Prime Minister just said that if necessary there will be a clarification. I want the Government to show some leadership for a change, and stop trying to play—

Mr. Valcourt: Is that a question?

Mr. Speaker: I would ask Hon. Members, given the very lengthy time it has taken to go through only a few questioners, to be as precise as possible in putting their questions.

Mr. Langdon: The Deputy Prime Minister says he is willing to clarify this issue. Is he willing at this stage to make a definite commitment that the Government will change this trade agreement so that water is excluded? Will he show that leadership?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I think the Deputy Prime Minister made it very clear in his answers today that the inter-basin transfer of water is outside the free trade agreement.

I have been sitting on the committee with the Hon. Member and we have heard some excellent testimony, including that of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, and the evidence of Mr. Clark. We also have the evidence filed by Mr. Stone. We had all kinds of evidence. I think the Hon. Member will admit that what we as members of that committee should do is hear the evidence, which we will hear through until next Thursday night. At that time amendments will be presented by all Parties to the committee for consideration clause by clause. Let us let the committee do its work.

GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, we have a situation in which we are getting clearly conflicting advice from those people who are acting as experts. With that sort of uncertainty I ask the Government to clear it up, make a commitment to Canada now, and tell Canadians that large-scale exports of water will be prevented in the future.

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, we have already said that very clearly in our policy statement last November. My colleague, the Minister of the Environment, made a very clear statement about the water policy of the Government.

The Hon. Member says we are getting conflicting advice. We are. Our responsibility is to separate what is factual from what is not, and make a decision. We have been getting conflicting advice from the NDP for years and we know what the Canadian people think of that.

[*Translation*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

CONSTRUCTION OF AIRPORT AT UMIUJAQ—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Further to the agreement signed on September 27, 1983 by Transport Quebec and the federal Government to give northern Abitibi a system of airport facilities meeting the specific needs of this large region, in accordance with the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, Mayor Noah Inukpuk and the people of the Village of Umiujaq have been demanding an airport for several months.

Can the Minister tell us today whether Transport Canada and Transport Quebec have reached an agreement to include in their construction programs building an airport in Umiujaq for the welfare of the people in their construction programs, in accordance with the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism) and Minister of State (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)): Mr. Speaker, further to the implementation of the James Bay Agreement, the Government of Canada did agree to build an airport at Umiujaq. Indeed, Transport Canada is now negotiating with the Province of Quebec and hammering out the details of the construction that is to be done shortly.

* * *

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—CABLE TELEVISION

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, in the free trade hearing this morning we learned from the Canadian Cable Television Association a shocking new fact, another secret story about the Prime Minister's trade deal. It will annually grab $70 million, through monthly cable charges, from the pockets of the millions of Canadians who watch their favourite TV programs. Further, we learned that most of that $70 million will flow through to the American programmers.

• (1450)

My question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. Why does the Prime Minister not let Canadians decide whether they want their monthly cable bills to increase dramatically and their money to flow to the United States? Why will the Prime Minister not call an election and let the people decide?

Mr. Rossi: Here comes the butler.

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, a personal insult is the final proof of an empty mind.

I was at the committee this morning too, Mr. Speaker, and I did not hear quite the same evidence as that to which the Hon. Member alluded. She is talking about $70 million in transfers of copyright to American broadcasters. That is not exactly what was said this morning. They said there could be potential for it.

They made certain recommendations today. They agreed that they have to pay copyright, under certain conditions, to those who produce the programs. We were discussing those certain conditions this morning.

It was an excellent presentation, and the Hon. Member will admit that. As the committee examines this legislation it will consider those very good recommendations.

Mrs. Finestone: Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that if there is any selective hearing going on around here it is that of the Government and particularly the Members sitting around the free trade table.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

REQUEST FOR ELECTION

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, the Government trade deal amends the Copyright Act, as the Hon. Member heard this morning. It also sanctions the right of political interference, particularly by the American movie mogul, Jack Valenti, who, with these changes, can now dictate Canadian cable retransmission policy to the Canadian Cabinet.

Will the Prime Minister let the people decide whether they want their television tampered with along with their water? Will he call an election now?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the Hon. Member of one thing. In 1985 an all-Party subcommittee examining retransmission rights made a recommendation regarding the rights, and that is exactly what we were discussing today. It was an all-Party unanimous recommendation. We have exactly the same thing in the free trade agreement. Talking about selective hearing, I find this absolutely amazing from my hon. friend.

As far as an election is concerned, the Hon. Member's Party is going to rip up the trade deal, and the New Democratic Party is going to cancel it after six months. It will be an issue in the election, and I can hardly wait.

Mr. Rossi: Well call it then.

ACCESS TO INFORMATION

MILITARY EXPORTS

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. He will likely recall that in the 1984 election campaign the Prime Minister said, "Secrecy and stonewalling have become a habit with the Government and we will never break that habit until we change the Government". And the Government was changed.

In a letter made public today, Bruce Mann, the Assistant Information Commissioner, has stated that in his view the Department of External Affairs has been "effectively coaxing" military contractors into keeping records of their military exports secret.

In light of the comments made by the Prime Minister during the last election campaign, does the Deputy Prime Minister think it is appropriate for a government Department to be advising and coaxing private companies to keep their export records secret? Would he now admit that the real reason for this interference by the Department of External Affairs is that it wants to keep Canadians in the dark about our exports of military equipment to countries like Chile which obviously abuse human rights?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member was really serious about getting an answer to his question he might have thought about sending the letter over in order that we would have a chance to look at the context within which he brings it up.

If the hon. gentleman wants to talk about access to information, I remind him that this Government is the first Government which has operated under the access to information regime. We have strengthened and are continuing to evolve the most effective access to information regime in the country.

There is no socialist Government in the country now, but he should have talked to the former Governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan. They never had access to information regimes worth a darn.

DEPARTMENTAL LETTER

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mann cites a letter from the Department which reads in part:

> The political sensitivities of some of the export destinations for the goods being exported has changed and it would not be correct to disclose documents today on the basis of approval . . . over two years ago.

It is a most serious situation when a Department of the Government is asking private military contractors to conceal from the public details of their contracts and exports.

As a result of this very serious situation, would the Deputy Prime Minister be prepared to launch an immediate investigation into this blatant political interference by the Department of External Affairs? Is it not time that Canadians had the full story on which countries are receiving military equipment from Canada, what kind of military equipment they are receiving, and to what extent?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, while in no way acknowledging the premise of the question, I know that the Hon. Member has had a number of exchanges with the Secretary of State for External Affairs on this very important issue. I think the Minister has been very forthcoming and has told the Hon. Member that if he has any specific information or any specific suggestions he should bring them to his attention and he will look into them.

I can refer to *Hansard* and read back the exchanges which have taken place. There have been private discussions as well of which I am aware. I will certainly raise this with the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I assure the Hon. Member that it will be looked into.

* * *

CORPORATE AFFAIRS

READY-MIXED CONCRETE COMPANIES—PRICE FIXING ALLEGATIONS

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs I will direct my question to the Deputy Prime Minister. It involves the allegations reported today of price fixing in the ready mixed concrete industry in the Metropolitan Toronto area. As a result of that price fixing, apparently the cost of a new house in the Metropolitan Toronto area has been increased by at least $1,000.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister advise the House what action the Government intends to take to put a stop to this?

The industry was taken to court in 1972 and it pleaded guilty and was convicted of price fixing at that time. The court made a prohibition order against further price fixing on the part of the industry. Therefore, why has it been allowed to get away with it again?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the Hon. Member knows, it is the usual practice neither to confirm nor deny the existence of any investigation that may or may not be taking place. It is also the practice not to comment on such an inquiry if it is in progress.

I can only assure the Hon. Member that the director of investigation will obviously be interested in the press comments. I am sure that that will trigger some action on their part.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—REQUEST FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. The unassailable fact is that there will be no trade deal in this country until there is a national general election and a decision taken by the people of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: As of yesterday and the statement by the Leader of the Opposition, that unassailable fact cannot be changed by debate in the House of Commons, cannot be changed by questions and answers, and cannot be changed by editorial comments which either celebrate or condemn this new reality.

• (1500)

It is an unassailable fact. Given that certain reality, why is the Government afraid to allow the people of Canada to be heard, to speak, and to decide on this nation's future, by calling an election campaign?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member can support his Leader and the Liberal Party's total abdication of responsibility—

Ms. Copps: Power to the people.

Mr. Mazankowski: —and tacit recognition that the real Leader of the Opposition is not in this House but in the other place in the name of Senator MacEachen. If they want to play that sort of game, they certainly can. But let me tell you, I have just had handed to me a letter sent to the Member for Burlington from IPSCO Incorporated, a steel company in western Canada. I would like to put this on the record—

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Table that letter.

Mr. Mazankowski: You are darn right I will table it. It says:

Dear Bill:

I note with dismay that the Liberal Party of Canada has decided to put partisan politics ahead of the future well being of Canada with their threat today to block the free trade agreement in the Senate of Canada. I assume this threat will not stop your current committee hearing, and the purpose of this letter is to volunteer to assist your committee in pushing for an early positive result. If there is anything I can do to help please let me know.

Yours truly,
IPSCO Incorporated.

I would be glad to table it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Copps: Why do you not talk to the United Steelworkers, Don?

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Humber—Port-au-Port—St. Barbe.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, it never fails that whenever one asks a Tory what the people of Canada think, he quotes the head of a corporation. They know what the steel corporation thinks but they do not want to hear the steelworkers and workers right across the country, and they deny them a right to speak.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: During the last election campaign the Prime Minister said: "Give me four years". Four years are up. He said: "Give me a sacred trust". The people of Canada have denied that trust. They now want their say and they are going to have it—

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member will put his question.

Some Hon. Members: We want George! We want George!

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, let me put forward the revolutionary proposition, rejected by the Tory Party, that the people of Canada have every right to be heard, as much as any steel corporation or any corporate boardroom.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre.

* * *

AIR CANADA

ACQUISITION OF AIRBUS FLEET—INDUSTRIAL OFFSETS

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. The Air Canada Airbus contract for $1.8 billion involves thousands of jobs. The Government failed to get assurances of Canadian content and therefore threw away thousands of jobs.

Why did it not assert the traditional Canadian position, which is that we have a right to ask for industrial offsets under GATT? Is it because the American trade office disagrees with our position with regard to the negotiation of industrial offsets? Why is he throwing away these jobs?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the tradition has been that when Air Canada undertakes to acquire new airplanes to modernize its fleet, it is a decision taken by Air Canada. The decision is based upon the criteria that are set down by the corporation to fulfil a certain mission it has for that particular aircraft. The issue of efficiency, price, and all of those conditions are taken into account. The matter of offsets has never been a part of those criteria. It has not in the past and it is not today.

This Government and previous Governments have never interfered with the decision-making process in terms of the acquisition of which aircraft is the best to suit the needs of a particular mission. That is the case in this particular acquisition.

Mr. Speaker: There will be a supplementary question by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre. Then I regret that we are out of time.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, does the Deputy Prime Minister realize that this new ideology of giving no direction to Crown corporations means that Canada has failed to assert its right under GATT for industrial offsets for Canadian jobs, and has failed to give opportunities for Canadian workers to have good jobs, while spending Canadian taxpayers' money?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member is so interested in jobs why is he opposed to the free trade agreement?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Riis: Because of the jobs.

Mr. Mazankowski: It will create jobs, jobs, jobs.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask either the Government House Leader or the Deputy Government House Leader to give us the customary Thursday statement of government business.

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, our agenda is as follows: The House will deal with Bill C-139, the income tax reform Bill, at second reading; Bill C-136, the broadcasting legislation, at second reading; Bill C-82, Lobbyists Registration Act, at third reading.

We will then commence the abortion debate. We will stay with that debate until it is resolved.

When we have completed these items our plan would be to take a short recess until August 10, 1988, when we will return to deal with the free trade and the child care legislation, and other important legislative initiatives. The motion will be ready to be tabled at the appropriate time tomorrow.

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Government House Leader what steps the Government is taking with respect to people who work in this place and around this place? I have checked with the relevant authorities and found out that persons in the parliamentary program, that is *Hansard* reporters, interpreters, those who keep records here and have to keep this place going, have had all of their leave cancelled for the entire summer. They have been working extended hours; there have been 10 hours a day in sittings. They have been working since last August 18, without any significant break.

I have also found out that generally leave has been cancelled for the cafeteria workers, the messengers, the security clerks, and the cleaners who work here in the House of Commons. In the cafeterias, the normal short hours of the summer have been extended. Does the Government have any sympathy for the people who work here and provide services for Members of Parliament?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, the New Democratic Party House Leader will know, the Board of Internal Economy enters into contracts and agreements with all of the organizations to which my hon. friend refers. All of the people employed in those organizations realize that the House of Commons can sit 365 days a year to do business. There are normal breaks. That is one of the reasons why we are taking a break after we finish the abortion motion.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, will the Deputy Government House Leader clarify part of his statement? He said that after the debate on certain Bills is completed the Government will call a debate on abortion. Will he make it exactly clear for the House and the public what it is we will be debating? The Government has a resolution that is still on the Order Paper. It was tabled last May. We thought last week the Government was going to call that motion for debate, but because of the Government's own decision, that debate did not proceed. The Government in effect cancelled the debate. I would like to know from the Deputy Government House Leader if the Government is going to call the motion it put down last May, or is it going to present another separate motion or Bill?

• (1510)

Mr. Lewis: No, Mr. Speaker, the Government will present a motion to take a sense of the House. It will be a normal motion, debated under all of the normal Standing Orders, requiring the abrogation of no Standing Orders. We believe the debate should commence without any procedural concerns at all.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, further to what was raised by the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy), the Chair will know that approximately—

Mr. Lewis: Come on!

Some Hon. Members: Sit down!

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I interrupted the Government House Leader when he spoke. Surely the same courtesy should be extended to Members, even if they happen to sit on the opposition side of the House, temporarily.

Mr. Rossi: You are not a dictator, Lewis.

Mr. Boudria: I was just speaking further to what was stated by the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre. Some time ago I raised with the Chair in this House the situation involving the employees of Parliament Hill, particularly through the summer months. I brought to the attention of the Chair at that time that at least some accommodation should be made to allow a number of employees throughout the summer to have some time off because, I believe, notwithstanding the fact the House sat through most of the summer, many of us took some time off.

In conclusion, I want to draw to the attention of the Chair, in particular, the treatment of the Parliamentary Restaurant employees who traditionally work eight hours a day during session and six hours a day during the month of August. This has been changed. They are now working eight hours a day during August and are not being paid overtime even though they work two hours a day extra. That decision was taken by the management, as I understand it. I would like the Chair to look into the matter to see whether or not that is fair in that particular case, as well as the other cases I have brought to the attention of the Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Matters relating to the working conditions of House of Commons employees are not points of order. Nevertheless, I note the representations made by the Hon. Member and if the Hon. Member has further representations to make to the Speaker, he is welcome to do so.

[*English*]

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I would like to seek some clarification from the Deputy House Leader. He indicated that the order of business would be Bill C-139, and second reading of Bill C-136 and Bill C-82 and then we would begin the debate on the abortion motion. Did he say that the motion we would be debating would be the motion that is currently on the Order Paper or does he plan to bring in a new motion? And would he be tabling that new motion tomorrow?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will be tabling a new motion tomorrow afternoon for debate. I should also point out that if we can rearrange those Bills in order to facilitate spokespersons from either Party, we will be pleased to do so in an effort to make as much progress as soon as possible.

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Deputy House Leader. Can he explain to the House and to the people of Canada why he is bringing forward a motion to deal with abortion rather than showing some leadership and courage and bringing forward legislation? Can he explain why this House will not be debating legislation prior to the next election campaign?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair believes that this is a question more appropriately put during Question Period.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

INCOME TAX ACT AND RELATED ACTS

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) that Bill C-139, an Act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, 1977 and certain related Acts, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs; and the amendment of Mr. Garneau (p. 17724), and the subamendment of Mr. Boudria (p. 17770).

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, prior to the lunch break I was commenting on the fact that there are three fundamental factors which affect every tax system. One of these factors is fairness, the other is the re-distributive nature of the system. The third factor is progressivity. I was talking about the fairness of the tax system. The Government in its proposal has scrapped the 10 rates and we are now moving to three rates. The top rate is somewhere in the vicinity of 44 per cent. Under the proposed so-called reforms in this legislation, all incomes above $55,000 will be taxed at a rate of 44 per cent. Any income above $55,000 will be taxed at a rate of 44 per cent. This means that families which earn just above $55,000 will face the same rate of taxation as a person who earns $1 million. The most striking aspect is that many Canadians with incomes of less than $30,000 will face a marginal tax rate of 39 per cent. Is that fair?

That is the question average Canadians are going to ask. Should a secretary at Bell Canada who earns $28,000 a year face a marginal tax rate of only 5 percentage points below the rate faced by the chairperson, Mr. de Grandpré, who earns some $900,000 a year? A secretary at Bell Canada will be paying the same rate of tax. Is this the Conservative view of fairness?

I also mentioned the fact that the tax system should be progressive. This Government, since it has come into power, has increased taxes. It certainly has increased the sales taxes and it is even talking now about going to a national sales tax or what might be called a value-added tax or a business transfer tax. It is now going to proceed to one of the most regressive ways of raising taxes. Everything will now be taxed. If you go to see a lawyer to get your will drawn up, you will pay a tax. The Government is going to collect.

There are those who see a devious plot in all of this. In fact, when the free trade deal comes into effect, the Government is going to be giving up some $1 billion in revenue as a result of the tariffs it is going to forgo when products come across our border. That is $1 billion the Government cannot give up without getting it from somewhere else. So the Government has come up with this system of a business transfer tax to really recoup from the consumers of Canada what it will lose with respect to the free trade deal.

All of this talk about free trade being a bonanza for consumers is not correct. I hope Canadians are not thinking that somehow or other they will be able to get all these things a lot cheaper because there is no tariff duty on, for example, television sets coming in from the United States. I trust Canadians are not thinking that way because this Government is going to grab it all with this business transfer tax.

In the long run, the Government will be taking in spades more than it has given in tax reform. The most regressive form of taxation is sales taxes. If the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) goes to the store and buys bread, he pays the same price as a poor person. The tax does not respect wealth and it is not sensitive to poverty. It is a tax that is applied and everyone pays it. It does not recognize that some person might be on a fixed income of perhaps $15,000 or $16,000 a year. Just because they are on a fixed income does not mean the tax will be waived. It does not apply. The tax is regressive because it does not respect incomes. It is regressive and not progressive.

• (1520)

We New Democrats studied this whole question of taxation. It was one of our concerns. It was an issue for us in the 1984 election campaign, and it remains an issue for us today. The New Democratic Party caucus studied the tax system. We participated in the Finance Committee when it looked at tax reform, which has resulted in this Bill. Our members on the committee on behalf of the caucus tabled a minority report in which we made recommendations. I want to put those recommendations on the record.

First, we recommended that the structure of tax rates should be further examined and that a higher tax rate should be imposed on high-income Canadians. People such as Mr. de Grandpré should not be paying 44 per cent; they should be in a higher tax rate, those who have received so much from our country. They should be prepared to contribute much more to the upkeep of it.

Second, we have recommended that the personal income tax system should be indexed fully to inflation. We agree with moving from exemptions to tax credits. We agree that that is fair. But it is not going to be fair if we do not ensure that those tax credits are fully indexed to the cost of living. In fact, what the Government has tried to establish with tax credits is to redistribute wealth to those who need it. Unless provision is made for indexation to the cost of living, the value of the tax credit will be eaten up by inflation.

Third, we recommended that capital gains income, except for that of farmers and small business, be fully taxable, and the lifetime exemption be eliminated. The Government continues to allow capital gains up to $100,000 with a lifetime exemption.

That is a tax loophole that ordinary Canadians cannot take advantage of. They are not in the speculation business. They are in the living business. They have to live from day to day. They are not the ones who buy condominiums in Florida. They are not the ones who are in the flips of property in Toronto where the market is so heated. We are saying in this recommendation, as was said in the Carter Commission report on taxation, a dollar is a dollar is a dollar and it has to be taxed.

Fourth, we recommended that other personal tax measures which largely favour the wealthy such as the deduction for RRSP contributions for upper income earners, special treatment of dividend income and full deduction for interest costs in excess of investment income be further reduced. In 1984, 187 wealthy Canadians with incomes of more than $250,000 paid no income tax whatsoever. Many more paid tax at well below the average rates. By and large, this tax reform proposal of the Government does not change much. It still allows the wealthy to take advantage of loopholes in the tax system.

We believe there ought to be no sales tax on food whatsoever. We recommended that the reform of the federal sales tax should not involve taxation of food, and should reduce the reliance of the federal Government on indirect taxes.

We also recommended that special treatment for capital gains relative to other corporate profits should be eliminated. Tax measures which favour large profitable corporations such as the seven-year carry-forward and the two-year carry-back loss provisions and the deductibility of interest costs incurred in corporate takeovers should be reviewed.

Finally, we recommended that a corporate minimum tax be implemented. That was one of the promises we elicited from the Prime Minister during the 1984 campaign.

We say to the Government that these are the kinds of recommendations that would make tax reform tax fairness. That is what we are interested in, not this phoney approach to tax reform but rather tax fairness as outlined by the recommendations which this caucus put on the record in the Finance Committee as its minority report.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there questions or comments? The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain.

Ms. Dewar: My question is with respect to the Hon. Member's point of view with regard to the regressive tax system and where we are going with tax credits. For a long time we have advocated an increase in tax credits. However, some of the tax credits we are dealing with here are tax credits which fall into non-indexed areas which the Government has now identified. The tax expenditures at the upper end have been closed off but do not come into effect until 1991. What will the effect on the revenues of the Canadian Government be in trying to finance the Government with this type of conflict?

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, Canadians who are more cynical than I recognize that it is very convenient that the so-called elimination of tax exemptions and the closing of loopholes are scheduled to come into effect in 1991, a time which is well beyond the next federal election. I want to say to the Hon. Member who posed the question that there is a certain cynicism involved here. I must admit that there are times when I slip into that cynicism. I also see the cynicism of tax cuts which appear on people's pay-cheques as of July 1, 1988. Just to protect the possibility of a spring election people will get tax refunds in the spring based on the first six months of 1988 when tax is collected at the higher rate.

It seems to me we have to look at this in the context of a cynical Government which is in fact trying to pick the right time to call an election. It has protected itself in terms of calling it in the spring, summer and winter of next year.

With respect to the question of tax credits, of course tax credits are more fair than exemptions. Tax credits can be focused and be used for the redistribution of funds. One of the factors in a tax system is its redistributivity. The ideal of using the tax system to redistribute money to poor people is much more easily achieved with the tax credit system than with exemptions.

However, it is no good to have a tax credit system unless one is prepared to index it fully. If it is not indexed fully it will become eroded. In this way the poor get poorer and relatively their position does not become improved. We in the New Democratic Party have proposed full indexation. The Government has not responded positively to that proposal.

The Hon. Member has pointed out that the elimination of these proposals concerning tax exemptions will not take effect until 1991. I suppose what the Government is looking at to recoup any of those losses in the future is to move to a national tax system. I cannot think of anything more regressive than that. The average Canadian family will be paying $1,000 more after tax reform comes into effect than they were paying when the Government came to power in 1984. Even with the few pennies of their own money that Canadians got back, it did not take too long for the Liberals down at Queen's Park to rush in and grab it from Ontario taxpayers. The Liberals moved right in and grabbed it, after using the bonanza or surplus to win an election by spreading the largesse. Now they find they do not have the money, so whatever few shekels Ontario taxpayers will get back, the Liberals at Queen's Park will take.

• (1530)

I say to the Hon. Member that the two old Parties, the Liberals and the Conservatives, are tweedle-dum and tweedle-dumber. Their view of taxation is "Robbing Hood". They take from the poor to give to the rich. That view will not change as long as the Liberals or Conservatives sit on the government benches. We need an NDP Government that believes in tax fairness, and none of this phoney tax reform approach that is being foisted off on Canadians.

Mr. Kilgour: The Hon. Member doth protest a bit too much. Unlike himself, many of us have seen what the New Democratic Party does as a Government. It is one thing to talk, and another to see what people actually do when in office. Until recently, Manitoba was the only province in Canada that has seen fit to elect an NDP Government, other than British Columbia and Saskatchewan. That Government raised taxes substantially for all tax-paying Manitobans, so much so that in the recent election all but 20 per cent of Manitobans voted against the NDP.

If the day ever came that the NDP was elected to office, which I pray is not the case, how do we know that the NDP would not do what their colleagues have done in Manitoba, and in a fiscal sense put the boots to the men and women of low income throughout the province?

Mr. Rodriguez: When the Hon. Member mentions that British Columbia, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba have in the past elected NDP Governments, I also wish to point out to him that the territorial Government of the Yukon is a New Democratic Government lead by Tony Penikett. I want to point that out to the Hon. Member because he seems to have avoided that. The economy of the Yukon was in a shambles. Today the Yukon is in a far better economic position than it was when led by Conservatives not so long ago.

It is important to look at the style of a Government when it taxes. One has to look at the quality of life of the people within the borders of that community. For example, when the New Democrats were in power, a young man or woman driving a car in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, or British Columbia had a lot more money in his or her pocket to maintain that car than a young man or woman in Ontario where there is no government-run auto insurance. That is a saving right off the bat, particularly to poor people. Rich people tend to put the cost of vehicles into their corporations and the corporations write off the insurance. Therefore, one has to keep that in mind, and look at the quality of life.

When the NDP was in power in Manitoba, day care was light years ahead, compared to when Conservatives are in power in the provinces. That is a benefit and redistributing tax dollars in areas that affect the quality of life of poor people, which is extremely important.

In the area of employment, it is no good to receive a tax cut if a person does not earn any money. What good is a tax cut to that person? First, what is important is to have jobs, jobs, jobs. When Manitoba was led by the New Democrats, it had one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country, as did Saskatchewan. In fact, the Government in Saskatchewan had a balanced budget. When Allan Blakeney was defeated in the Province of Saskatchewan, there was a surplus. Within six short months of the great Devine coming to power the surplus was lost. That Government is now in a deficit position. These fiscally irresponsible Tories have run up a deficit. Who will pay for that? The taxpayers of Saskatchewan have to pay the interest on that deficit. They have to pay not only the year to year deficit, but also the accumulated deficit. That must deduct from the quality of life of the people of Saskatchewan.

What can I say about British Columbia with Premier Vander Zalm. To see what is going on one needs a numerologist to find out who the players are in British Columbia. If anyone wants to stand up and tell me that the people enjoy a better quality of life in British Columbia under Vander Zalm, then that person is dreaming in Technicolor.

We need a Government to put people first and recognize that there are people whom the tax system must serve and who do not serve the tax system. The tax system under the Tories and the Liberals serves the wealthy corporations and the wealthy people in this nation. The Tories will never understand that because they are not sensitive to people. They are only sensitive to making a quick buck. The thinking of the Tories is: "I am all right, Mack, and I do not give a hoot about you. You look after yourself, and pull yourself up by the bootstraps". The Tories believe in privatizing, deregulating, every man for himself, and the devil take the hindmost. That is Tory philosophy, Buster, and you are in the wrong park because we are not in there with you.

Mr. Norman Warner (Stormont—Dundas): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this important debate. I heard a few familiar words a little while ago from the Hon. Member who just spoke, although it was in different terms to what was said four years ago. I heard the ring: "Jobs, jobs, jobs". At one time it was said with disrespect, and now it is with respect. Obviously, times change.

When the Government initiated certain reforms in the House and indicated where it thought it would be leading the country, and it is fine to stand up today and report that the Government did create the jobs, very few people in Opposition thought it would. Jobs have been created throughout Canada and unemployment is at a much lower rate throughout the country. Although the Government has not achieved its goals in all areas, it has been very successful. To go along with the economic renewal program, tax reform has been initiated. This will give confidence to business, individuals, and investors.

I have heard a lot of rhetoric from the NDP and previous speakers about loopholes. The Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) was talking about dozens and dozens of loopholes, which apparently were studied in Tax Probe '86. The Finance Committee also looked at various initiatives that the Government has taken historically, and some that it may consider. The committee found there was some value in many of these; it included capable representatives from the opposition Parties. I am quite surprised that the Hon. Member would rise and say that there was absolutely no initiative there of any great economic consequence.

Besides the reforms initiated by this Bill, the record is quite clear as to what the Government has done in previous tax reform. A minimum tax has been initiated which was implemented to ensure that upper-income Canadians pay their fair share of tax. Tax shelters based on investments in yachts, recreational vehicles, and similar properties have been eliminated; income splitting through interest-free loans between family members has been halted; the so-called carve-out transactions in the oil and gas sector have been stopped; trusts are now unable to distribute investment income tax free; the use of partnerships and corporate takeovers to increase tax deductions has been eliminated; new at-risk rules for limited partnerships have been introduced; and corporations are being prevented from distributing profits as capital gains rather than dividends.

• (1540)

These are all initiatives that our Government has brought forward and these were so-called loopholes in the past. We have looked at various other initiatives that we have in place, and it is difficult to make major changes. Other than what we are bringing in now, I believe that what we are bringing in with this Bill certainly is fair and equitable. I am quite surprised that the opposition Members would argue against the initiatives of this Bill.

I would like to point out particularly one of the key elements in the tax reform package, which is the conversion of personal exemptions and some deductions to tax credits. For more than 20 years, Canadians who have studied our tax system have increasingly recommended that tax credits should replace exemptions and deductions to make the system fairer.

The reason why tax credits are fairer is straightforward: An exemption or deduction is subtracted from income in determining taxable income. It is therefore of greater value to higher-income earners because it reduces income that would otherwise be taxed at a higher marginal tax rate. A tax credit, on the other hand, is subtracted from tax owed, and therefore provides the same reduction in tax to all taxpayers regardless of their income level.

Let me illustrate in dollar terms. A $1,000 exemption reduces the federal taxes of a taxpayer in the old 6 per cent tax bracket by $60. But for a taxpayer in the highest tax bracket, federal taxes are reduced by $340—almost six times as high. When the provincial portion is calculated, the higher income earner comes out even further ahead.

Under tax reform, this $1,000 exemption is converted to a tax credit equal to 17 per cent of income, which is $170 for a $1,000 amount of money. This amount will be the same for taxpayers in every tax bracket, whether low or high-income earners.

The new tax credits will replace the personal exemption, the married exemption, the equivalent-to-married exemption, the dependants' exemptions, and the age exemption. Credits will also replace a number of deductions: The disability deduction, the pension income deduction, the medical expense deduction, the tuition fee and education deductions and the charitable donations deductions. The most commonly used credits have been set at levels that will make them worth more on tax savings for the majority of taxpayers than the old exemptions would have been worth.

Lower-income taxpayers, in particular, come out ahead. Indeed, the increased value of personal credits is the main reason why 850,000 lower-income Canadians will have their income tax reduced to zero.

Let us look at a few of the commonly used credits to see why they are better for 66 per cent of taxpayers in the 17 per cent tax bracket. The new basic personal credit directly reduces federal tax payable by $1,020. This year, the basic personal exemption would have been $4,270, reducing the federal tax by only $725; therefore, it is clear that most taxpayers come out further ahead.

The married or equivalent-to-married credit is set at $850. The old exemption would only have been worth $635. The age credit is $550, significantly higher than the $455 value of the exemption. The $65 credit for a dependent child is the same as the old exemption; however, for the third and subsequent child the credit is doubled.

Many deductions will also be converted into tax credits at 17 per cent of their present value. That is, taxpayers will be able to subtract from tax 17 per cent of the amount that they can now subtract from income. In effect, this simply means that the new credits are worth the same to those taxpayers in the 17 per cent bracket as the old exemptions. The conversion to tax credits directs more money to those in need and reduces the after-tax value of benefits going to higher-income Canadians.

Tax credits respond to the view, expressed to the Government by Canadians from one end of the country to the other, that the tax system should be fairer and give a better break to those most in need.

Tax credits also work to eliminate a number of inequities under the old system. A perfect example of this is the new married or equivalent credit. Dependent spouses will be able to earn $500 before their earnings begin to reduce the married credit. Above that amount, the credit will be reduced at the rate of 17 per cent of earnings. Under the old system, those earnings directly reduced the married exemption, which in turn increased the amount of income taxed at the highest tax rate of the higher-income spouse.

The credit system ensures that the initial earnings of a second income earner are effectively taxed only at the lowest rate in the system. This removes the disincentive under the old system for many spouses to enter or return to the workforce.

Tax reform also recognizes the importance of tax credits as an integral part of the Government's over-all social policy. The refundable child tax credit has become a vital measure aimed at assuring families of adequate income support for the care of children. The credit is being increased to $559 this year, up from $489 last year. It is now available for children in the year that they turn 18.

Combined with other tax reform measures and with the Government's child care proposals, the improved credit will significantly increase tax assistance for most families with children and make the system more progressive.

Similarly, the sales tax credit, which has increased under tax reform, serves a vital function in offsetting the effect of sales tax on those with medium or low incomes.

I might add that we have made clear that the sales tax credit will be enriched considerably and extended in the second stage of tax reform when a new, broad-based sales tax is introduced. The new two-tier credit for charitable giving will encourage charitable support by starting at 17 per cent for donations up to $250, and then rising to 29 per cent for donations above that level. The new credit means that tax assistance will now be based on the size of the donation, not the size of the donor's wallet.

No longer will we have an unfair system where the donation of a wealthy person is rewarded more than the donation of someone less well off.

Since provincial taxes, except in Quebec, are calculated as a percentage of federal tax, all the new credits will also have the effect of reducing provincial taxes in the provinces. For example, the charitable donations credit would actually be 25.5 per cent for the first $250 and 43.5 per cent for donations in excess of $250, in a province which levies a tax of 50 per cent of basic federal tax.

I am pleased that Quebec made a number of changes in its last Budget, to ensure that Quebecers can take advantage of some of the tax savings from federal tax reform.

With all of the advantages offered by tax credits in terms of fairness, social progress and flexible application, Canadians will agree that the time has indeed come to adopt them into the system as part of tax reform. I urge all Members of the House to support the Bill before us.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments. On debate.

• (1550)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Tardif (Richmond—Wolfe): Mr. Speaker, I also welcome this opportunity to take part in this important debate on the Bill now before the House, and I do so for a number of reasons.

First of all, I believe this Bill accurately reflects what the Conservatives are and what they have been since they came to power in September 1984. We have seen a Government that during the four years it has been in power increased taxes in a way that was both shocking and shameless, table tax reform proposals apparently aimed at restoring a measure of fairness and equity to the system so that the needy in our society could hope for a fair deal.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill also gives us a very clear picture of what is so typical of this Government, and I am referring to the fact that its decisions were always made for the benefit of the wealthy, the elite, and more often than not to the disadvantage of those at the very bottom of the scale, in other words, the poor.

We have also seen this Government hide the thrust of its tax reform, using various measures as a smoke screen. A few months ago, for instance, we had some incredible tax increases, and now we have a Bill which admittedly introduces a number of tax cuts.

My colleague, the Hon. Member for Laval gave an example which very aptly illustrates the situation. The example he gave was this: It's like a thief who steals an old lady's purse, opens it, removes $150, leaves $50 and gives the purse back to the old lady with the remark: I didn't rob you because I gave you back your purse. So I think that illustrates the Government's attitude in the Bill now before the House.

With previous measures the Government put an incredible tax burden on Canadians, and now it proposes a series of tax cuts.

More specifically, Mr. Speaker, over a four-year period there will be a reduction of $11.1 billion in personal income tax, an increase of $4.1 billion in corporate tax and finally, an increase of $5.4 billion in revenues raised by sales and excise tax. On the face of it, this may seem very attractive, but we must realize that considering the present situation, these proposals smack of electioneering, to my mind.

In recent weeks, we have seen what seemed to be a series of tax cuts, marginal though they may be. And there is also the fact that as a result of these measures, taxpayers will be entitled to a refund when they file their returns in April 1989. So all this is being planned to cover two eventualities. If an election is imminent, the Government could say: Look we cut taxes. If they decide not to call an election now or in the weeks to come, they can say next spring: Look at your tax refund. There's proof positive that we managed your tax money and this country both wisely and well.

I think this shows how little respect this Government has for the Canadian people, if it thinks it can make Canadians forget what happened in the past four years. We saw this not long ago in a by-election, when the Conservatives promised incredible amounts of money in order to win votes.

The proposals before the House are altogether unacceptable for any number of reasons.

When we talk about tax reform, I think we should aim for improvement, but this improvement should be tangible and reflect a better distribution of the tax burden, away from those at the bottom of the financial scale to those who are better off.

The main criticisms are of course the fact that the new rate structure and tax brackets are not progressive enough and I think that the best way of illustrating that reality is through the following example: Take the case of a family with an income of $30,000; their effective tax rate would be 31 per cent, which is higher than the rate for a family earning $100,000. The family earning $100,000 would only be taxed at the rate of 29 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, consider also the following fact, which is just as indecent, just as unacceptable and just as unreasonable: Tax reform will allow 60,000 profitable businesses to continue to operate and do business in Canada, without paying one red cent of income tax.

According to the document we were given on tax reform, the number of profit-making companies that do not pay income tax has in fact been reduced from 110,000 to 60,000. Before reform, there were 110,000 compagnies that did not pay tax. With tax reform, there will be 60,000 businesses that turn a profit, that are lucrative, and that certainly contribute to the economy in their region, but they will pay no tax whatsoever. That's the truth, and even if it were the only factor, the only criticism levelled at the bill, I think we should vigorously oppose it.

Of these 60,000 businesses, 35,000 will not be subject to tax because of the deferral of loss provisions, and 25,000 will not pay tax because of their low profits and the various tax incentives still present in the system.

I don't think it is going too far to ask all businesses to put their shoulder to the wheel and take on their share of the tax burden in Canada. The fact that there are 60,000 businesses out there that are profitable, that are going concerns, and that pay no tax seems unacceptable and certainly very inappropriate to me.

Also, Mr. Speaker, with tax reform the Government has brought in a minimum tax. This Government said: It is totally unacceptable and unfair that some Canadian taxpayers manage to pay no tax whatsoever. So what is known as a minimum tax was brought in. And yet in 1986 there were 5,220 taxpayers with incomes of more than $50,000 who did not pay one red cent in income tax. Of these 5,220 taxpayers, 40 earned $250,000 or more, and the Government seems content to have brought about a simple improvement in the matter, since in 1985, there were 7,947 taxpayers with incomes of more than $50,000 who also paid no tax. To my way of thinking that sort of thing is totally unacceptable in our tax system.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) claims that tax reform will improve the situation, and that 850,000 low-income individuals will be totally tax-exempt. We must understand, Mr. Speaker, that it is possible that 850,000 people will find that they no longer have to pay tax. But we should also understand that over the past four years, the Government has taxed these people unabashedly, and today turns around and says: We are fixing things so that you will no longer have to pay tax.

That dovetails quite neatly with the example my colleague the Member for Laval (Mr. Ricard) gave: We stole from you for quite a while. We'll give you back your purse with a penny in it. That's the proof that we didn't steal from you. That proves that we are generous. But I think that Canadian men and women will not forget what they paid out during the past four years and that they will be able to assess the situation quite accurately.

People have criticized the Bill on another account, and that complaint seems quite well-founded to me. For instance, if we compare the total amounts paid by the taxpayers in 1984 and in 1988, after the tax reform, we see that only households with incomes in excess of $117,000, I could tell you that although there are more than 80,000 people in my riding, those who earn $117,000 a year are few and far between. Well, people who do earn $117,000 a year will pay less tax in 1988 than they did in 1984. These households account for 1 per cent of the Canadian population. So we have families earning $117,000 in 1988 and they will end up paying less tax than they did in 1984. Need I say more? I think this is just one more very obvious and telling example showing that with all such measures this Government has done everything it could to make the rich even richer, to the detriment of poorer families.

• (1600)

Another fact, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government, ever mindful of the upcoming election, said that taxes would be reduced as of July 1. A good many Canadians will notice a marginal decrease, I agree, smaller tax deductions on their pay cheques. But, Mr. Speaker, let us bear in mind that they have been paying too much since January 1988, so much so that if an election is called for next spring these people will again notice that their tax refunds are bigger. As I pointed out earlier, the Government will then be able to say that it has reduced the tax load. That is nothing but hogwash! As it is, the deductions made since January 1988 amount to a grand total of $1 billion which the Conservative Government took right out of the pockets of Canadians, wrongfully because it had no right to collect that money which will have to be refunded when people file their tax returns next year, and of course the Government will not pay any interest on that money.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Canadians will indeed be able to see for themselves that the over-all impact of the four Conservative budgets and the tax reform will translate into a sharp drop in family benefits. The best example I can give you is that the tax load of individual Canadians has grown a lot heavier than the corporate tax load. Here are some interesting facts and figures: between 1984 and 1985, and 1988 and 1989, the tax burden has been shifting towards individual Canadians. Sure enough, the individual tax load, that is personal income tax plus sales and excise taxes, went up by $26.7 billion during these four years, a staggering increase of 62 per cent, compared with a corporate increase of $2.6 billion, or 28 per cent more. Between 1984 and 1987 therefore, the corporate tax load increased by 28 per cent while personal income taxes went up by 62 per cent.

In addition, for a number of years now the percentage of corporate taxes with respect to total budget revenues has been declining steadily. For example, 20-odd years ago, in 1961-62, corporate taxes accounted for 20.1 per cent of budget revenues. By 1984-85 the figure had dropped to only 13.2 per cent; in 1984-85, only 13.2 per cent of all revenues came from what we might call the corporate sector. This trend has been even more obvious since our Conservative friends took office: this year, barely 11.6 per cent of revenues come from corporations whereas, from 1984 to 1985, the take was 13.2 per cent, $11.6 billion this year. Of course, they could take credit, and quite wrongly, for the fact that a number of jobs were created and that subsequently taxes paid by those new employees fattened government tax revenues. I would like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that if this is so, then corporations also became more profitable, their profits increased and so their contribution to tax revenues should have gone up likewise.

I think, Mr. Speaker that those few comments show how this Government intends to make people forget those four years in which the administration indulged in an absolutely unbelievable tax grab on the backs of Canadians, and in order to more clearly illustrate, let me give specific figures in specific areas. In the area of indirect taxes, the sales tax was increased from 9 to 10 per cent on October 1st, 1984, not to forget of course that Conservatives came to power in September. On October 1st, 1984, they increased the sales tax from 9 to 10 per cent; as if this were not enough, on January 1st, 1986, they raised it from 10 to 11 per cent; and because this was still not enough, four months later, they increased the tax from 11 to 12 per cent. And on each occasion this brought in $1 billion here, $1 billion there, and another $1 billion. Who is paying the sales tax? I have no hesitation in recognizing that the rich, the less affluent and the poor pay it. But it must be understood that the sales tax is much harder, much more cruel to people near the poverty line. The Government got $3 billion through that sales tax hike. There were also tax increases on soft drinks, as everyone will recall, on dental apparatus, candies and sweets.

Those two increases that came in July 1985 and in July 1987 brought in $460 million. There again, everyone must recognize that people who eat those kinds of snacks, people who use that type of product, people who eat that kind of food are mainly the general population, in other words people who do not have the ability to pay what this Government asked from them.

On the other hand, a tax increase that was perhaps much more directly targetted to those who have the ability to pay, as I believe everyone will agree, is the progressive increase on air travel. Air travellers—and this may not mean everyone but in the main I think we can say as a rule that they have greater ability to pay than the majority of the people who never boarded an airplane. However that tax only brought in $55 million. Fifty five million from a tax that at the outset was aimed at a much richer, much more affluent category of taxpayers out of which the Government could have gotten much more than $55 million.

Also then increased from 8 to 12 per cent was the tax on paint, wallpaper and toys. There again, this brought in $60 million. We also got a whole series of increases on the tax on gas—2 cents, 1 cent, 1 cent, 1 cent, so much so that over-all this brought upwards of $2 billion—$2 billion in tax increases. And finally, we were also hit by a number, more specifically by four increases on spirits and tobacco, which brought in nearly $1 billion.

There was a whole series of such increases that all together brought in billions and billions of dollars, and now that an election is in sight the Government suggests: We are going to lower taxes somewhat in order to hopefully, although this is in no way certain, try and get the support of Canadians. I believe that if the Government has the courage to listen to our urgings and call an election, I think it will have the true answer to its legislation, its tax reform.

• (1610)

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, I find it rather strange that the Liberal Party representative should deal with the tax reform issue in the House, because we are in the process of reforming the system which his Government and party had created over the years. Some 20 years ago, for instance, the income tax paid by individual Canadians accounted for nearly 25 per cent of federal revenues, while the income tax paid by corporations accounted for nearly 75 per cent. When the Liberal Party was in power, and that includes the period under their current leader (Mr. Turner) at least for now, they completely reversed the situation to the point that in 1984, personal income tax accounted for 75 per cent of federal revenues, while corporate income tax accounted for 25 per cent. If the statement I have just made is true, and I suggest it is, how can his Party, if it wants to keep some credibility, now defend and debate in the House this most important issue for Canadians?

M. Tardif: Mr. Speaker, the answer is quite simple: my Party has always been concerned first and foremost with the need to protect the underprivileged, the low-income people. It is a fact that over the years, changes must be made to ensure a proper balance between the two main classes of taxpayers.

Changes must be made, and I suggest it is the responsibility of any government to make them and take steps to remedy an unfair situation.

It should be understood that when our friends opposite took over the Government in 1984, they made a whole series of promises, insisting that they would re-establish the balance as the U.S. Administration had done, as the provincial governments had done or were planning to do, so that those with the ability to pay would carry a heavier load than those who have lost part of their purchasing power.

I must repeat that whenever the Liberal Party introduced measures, it always took into account the need to protect the underprivileged, and I think my hon. friend will recognize that almost all our social legislation was introduced in Canada under a Liberal administration.

We should also realize that these taxes are imposed on Canadian men and women who just cannot afford these wild increases. On the other hand, we can see that the federal government is systematically getting out of regional development. Its many deregulation initiatives will cause irreparable damage and make things worse for the underprivileged while benefiting the rich fat corporations. I suggest this is the most distinctive feature of this Government.

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Hon. Member's answer, but we do know what policies the Liberal Party is against. Let us talk now for instance about the sales tax? Could he tell us whether the Liberal Party, besides being in favour of the Senate, for we all know that the Liberal Party is definitely in favour of unlimited rights for the Senate, could he tell us what the Liberal Party thinks of the sales tax? Should the Government increase or reduce the sales taxes? Could he tell us what his Party's position is on this issue?

Mr. Tardif: Mr. Speaker, it is clear on our side that we are soundly against any measure to tax food, to impose a tax on people who do not have the capacity to pay. We must recognize that in some cases, a certain number of problems arise with taxation and with the tax base, and that, in effect, actions taken in the pursuit of some objectives have an unintended impact on some people.

So I think that in such cases, which are relatively easy to pinpoint, and which can be numerous in some instances, something can be done to restore equity.

Tax credits are one example. Other measures can also be taken to correct an initiative which may initially be intended to bring about a certain balance, a certain degree of equity, but which needs to be tempered by indirect measures.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, there is also the fact that Canadian men and women . . . with regard to taxes, I can take as an example something that comes up when we canvass our ridings during an election campaign, and I must say that I look forward to being in such a position soon. It is the case of the minimum wage earner with two, three or four children who reminds his Member that he pays the same price as he does for butter and that when he can afford to buy steak he also pays the same price. I think that the message is quite clear and that it shows how cruel indirect taxes are, how wicked they can be for people who just don't have the capacity to face that kind of expenditure.

[*English*]

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to enter this debate primarily because the issue is fundamental to the direction of government. It also, of course, interests the average Canadian. There is no question that with the exception of employment, there is no issue of more vital importance to the people who live in my riding of Winnipeg North Centre than the issue of taxation. Therefore, I want to make quite clear where my Party and I stand on this issue and how I see the Government's approach to taxes.

What I hear from people is that they want and need justice in the tax system. They want tax justice rather than tax burdens. They want tax fairness rather than tax politics. I have concluded, and I am sure other ordinary Canadians have done the same, that the Government is playing politics with the tax system. When the Conservatives were elected they raised taxes in Budget after Budget after Budget. They raised taxes to the extent of $1,500 for the average family. Now that we are approaching a federal election, now that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) is searching for the courage to call the election, now that he is peeking around the corners testing the winds to see whether or not it is all right to have an election, the Conservative Government has changed its direction on taxes and is going to give a few dollars to Canadians. After taking thousands of dollars out of the pockets of ordinary Canadians the Tories are going to give a few back.

The Tories hope Canadians will have very short memories. They hope the average Canadian will look at his or her pay cheque today and see that in comparison with the month before their take-home pay has gone up because federal taxes have dropped. The Government is hoping they will see that and say: "We have a good Government, we have a Government for the people". That is what the Government hopes. If Canadians have short-term memories and difficulty remembering as far as a few years back, in all likelihood they would come to that conclusion. However, that would be a very short-term perspective. I am sure it will not be the perspective of most Canadians because the average Canadian family knows that it has less disposable income today than it had four years ago and that it is worse off with regard to the tax burden than it was four years ago.

• (1620)

Those Canadians who voted for the Prime Minister, the Conservative Party, and change in 1984, voted for tax fairness. They were promised tax fairness and tax justice. They will remember that the same Government took the disposable income out of their pockets. It picked Canadians' pockets of the cash they had to buy the things they need for their families. This Government has raised taxes for the average Canadian family by $1,500 in a series of Budgets over the last four years.

Canadians have good memories and will know who to hold accountable. If the Government thinks Canadians will suddenly forget who took the money out of their pockets, just because they are being given a few coins back today, it is underestimating Canadians. Canadians will know that they are being toyed with and being underestimated. They will see through the cynical gestures of the Government and will measure the Government accordingly. They will know that the Government is playing politics with taxes in an attempt to win the next election rather than being committed to justice in economics and taxation for the ordinary family.

Canadians must remember to take the long look if they want just government and just taxes. I believe they will do that. I know that the families who live in my riding are fed up with constantly increasing taxes and having to carry the burden of the tax system while others are getting away scot-free. They know that others are being given gifts by the Government.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a different approach to the issue. This Government is now trying to make Canadians forget the fact that it increased taxes, but who else would be responsible for such an increase? Is there an alternative for Canadians? The Liberal Member who spoke before me promised tax justice. Is the Liberal Party an alternative? Is it offering the possibility of tax justice?

While on the subject, I hope Canadians will remember the Liberals' actions when they were in power. It was a Liberal Government which introduced that system, reduced taxes for corporations and increased them for individuals.

It was a Liberal Government which increased taxes for ordinary families while reducing them for wealthy Canadians. It is not an alternative, Mr. Speaker, since the Liberal Party actually established a "Conservative" economic policy in tax matters. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, despite the wonderful promises made by Liberals when they were in the Opposition, once in power, they did not offer an alternative nor a true change of direction to ordinary people. They certainly make big promises, just like Brian Mulroney, the current Conservative Prime Minister, did! Both the Conservatives and the Liberals made big promises that they did not keep after being elected.

Mr. Speaker, people should remember that it was Mr. Turner, current Leader of the Liberal Party who, as Minister of Finance in a Liberal Government, introduced the policy of giving out tax exemptions to large corporations. Under that policy, corporations that make hundreds of millions of dollars in profit pay no taxes at all. That situation is the result of a policy put forward by a former Liberal Minister of Finance, who is now Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party, which is now pretending to be in favor of tax justice—

[*English*]

I want to take a look at the issue of justice in the tax system from another perspective, from the perspective of who benefits from and who is hurt by the tax system. Clearly the rich and powerful and the largest corporations in the country do quite well by the tax regime which both Liberal and Conservative Governments have put in place.

We know that many individuals who earn over $100,000 a year pay not one cent of tax. We know that large and powerful corporations which make hundreds of millions of dollars in profit pay not one cent in tax. I am not talking about taxing corporations which are struggling to survive and to provide employment. I am talking about powerful, wealthy, lucrative, profit making corporations which are making hundreds of millions in profits and are paying no taxes.

We ask why, not only from the perspective of justice in the tax system but from the perspective of what we give up by giving up these revenues. What opportunities do we lose by giving up the revenues which could be collected from very wealthy Canadians who earn over $100,000 a year and large profit-making corporations? What could we be doing with those revenues? What could we be doing to introduce a greater measure of justice in Canadian society?

I would like people, including Members of this House and in particular members of the Government, to ask themselves that question. What could be done with the millions of dollars of revenue that is forgone when wealthy individuals and profitable corporations are allowed to get away with paying no taxes?

• (1630)

The Auditor General is an objective, independent officer of the House. He has identified some $40 billion of tax write-offs whose success in achieving their stated economic benefits are questionable. For example, it is questionable whether some of these write-offs achieved their objective of creating employment or enhancing research and development to provide a stronger economy.

While we ought to retain those tax incentives that achieve their objectives and produce the required results, tax incentives such as those the Auditor General pointed to, which do not achieve the public objective for which they were implemented and only benefit the interest of corporations and the wealthy who use them, ought to be closed. The revenues saved from closing those loopholes should be used to introduce a measure of economic and social justice in this country. I want Canadians to think about how they would use those revenues.

Many people in my riding complain about the heavy burden of taxation. While they had disposable income to spend as they wished some four or five years ago, all their money is used today on the necessities of life. Those people would like some tax relief.

I spoke to a man in my riding who some four or five years ago was earning the minimum wage of $5 an hour and supporting a family. Now his wage is about $11 an hour, but he finds that his income has not gone up because of the taxes coming from his pocket. The Government has continued to increase the burden of tax so that he has received no benefit from the increase in wages.

I have also talked to people in my riding who are known as yuppies. A married couple earning $40,000 a year each are discovering that rather than being able to afford the luxuries of life, their salaries are actually dropping as their taxes continue to rise.

At least some portion gained from the closure of these loopholes should be used for tax relief. The tax relief gained by requiring individuals earning over $100,000 a year and powerful corporations to pay tax would introduce a greater measure of economic justice and social justice in our society.

What about the homeless? While we have been drawing attention to the fact that the average Canadian in a city like Toronto and many other cities can hardly afford a house, we forget that there are many individuals, as well as families who have no house. These people deserve a roof over their head. Those children deserve a roof over their head. I suggest that some of the revenues gained from closing unproductive tax incentives should be used to provide that kind of accommodation.

Why not use those revenues to provide for the hungry in our society, or to give training to the functionally illiterate in our society?

We need an alternative under tax reform that will not be satisfied by the political games that the Conservatives are playing with the tax system. The Conservatives increased the burden of taxation when they were elected. Now they are giving back a few pennies as an election approaches. Canadians will not be satisfied with the promises of the Liberal Party that started us down that road.

Canadians must be made aware of the unjust tax system that increases the burden on ordinary families while it allows the rich and the powerful to go tax-free. We need a citizenry that will demand tax reform, with a Party that will take up the fight with them in order to bring about real justice in a tax system so that everyone will pay their fair share. Such an approach will mean a greater measure of economic and social justice so that no family will have to go without a roof over its head and no child in this society will have to live on the streets. I call for a serious approach to tax justice so that those who have pay and those who do not have receive the help they need.

The Conservatives have only increased the tax burden on ordinary people. As we approach an election, they provide a little relief in the hope that people will forget who increased their taxes originally. The Liberal Party only gives big promises when in opposition but acts like Conservatives when in government.

Let us debate this legislation thoroughly so that Canadians will be aware of the nature of the tax system today. When they realize that large and powerful corporations earning millions of dollars in profit pay no taxes, they will demand change. When Canadians become aware that people earning over $100,000 a year pay no tax, they will demand justice.

Canadians know that they are paying more taxes today than they were four years ago when the Conservatives were first elected. They know they have less disposable income than they had four years ago. The election is the opportunity for them to hold the Government accountable for the fact that they have less to meet their needs than they had four years ago.

• (1640)

I call upon the people of Canada to wake this Government up and let it know that Canadians are interested in tax relief, not politics played with the tax system. Canadians are interested in tax fairness, not political stratagems. They are interested in fairness, not increased tax burdens. They want the Government to collect its just, fair revenues so that it can use them to bring about greater social justice in Canadian society, so that no one will have to go without a roof over his head or hungry, so that people can be trained to use their full capacity. We need tax justice and social justice in this country. We need a NDP Government.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill C-75, an Act to implement an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Nova Scotia on offshore petroleum resource management and revenue sharing and to make related and consequential amendments.

And a message has also been received from the Senate informing the House:

1. That the Senate does not insist on its amendments to Bill C-55, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976 and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof and agrees to the amendments made by that House to the Bill; and

2. That the Senate does not insist on its amendments to Bill C-84, an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976 and the Criminal Code in consequence thereof, and agrees to the amendements made by that House to the Bill.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

Rideau Hall

July 21, 1988

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable A. Lamer, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 21st day of July 1988, at 5:00 p.m., for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain Bills.

Yours sincerely,
Jean M. Sévigny
Deputy Secretary, Operations

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

INCOME TAX ACT AND RELATED ACTS

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) that Bill C-139, an Act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, 1977 and certain related Acts, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs; and the amendment of Mr. Garneau (p. 17724), and the subamendment of Mr. Boudria (p. 17770).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On questions and comments, the Hon. Member for Crowfoot.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Keeper) played on one of the simplest of emotions that could ever be portrayed before a citizen of any democratic country. He said essentially that citizens do not like paying taxes. That is quite understandable. No citizen likes to pay taxes if he or she thinks there is some legitimate way of not doing so.

The Member also played on the emotion that the hungry, the indigent, those who live in the streets, ought to have some significant assistance and help. I want to say to the Hon. Member that no Member of Parliament, no matter to what political Party they aspire or work for, believe that these grossly wrong social injustices are appropriate in any society.

Having said that, let me also remind the Hon. Member that when our Government came to office in 1984, and it is still a fact today, one out of every three tax dollars did nothing other than service the accumulative debt of this country.

The Hon. Member cannot have it both ways. Let us pretend for the moment that there was no debt. In that case, Canadians could pay one-third less taxes or, alternatively, pay for one-third more services. I would be greatly interested to know if the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre believes it is appropriate that one out of every three dollars that every citizen pays in taxes to the Government of Canada should be used for nothing other than to pay interest on debt? Is that good value for Canadians? Is that why we should pay our taxes? If the answer to that is no, if the Member says, "no, that is not good value", then how is he going to bring that debt down?

Canadians should be told that it is a burden placed there by a Government past because of its wild spending habits in the years from 1972 to 1984, and that it was supported by the NDP. The NDP endorsed the Government's National Energy Program. It was those kinds of expenditures that drove the debt, year after year, higher and higher. I would like to hear the Hon. Member's response.

Mr. Keeper: Let me respond then.

Mr. Malone: He knows that the coming into office of the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) is what brought about the trend, to where almost 1.5 million more Canadians are employed. They are now in a position to pay taxes, to help spread the burden, and to bring down the debt.

I ask the Hon. Member: Is a major significant debt good for Canada? If the answer to that is no, then what other option is there to pay that debt other than what we have already succeeded in doing, that is, increasing employment in this country and making sure that all Canadians together shoulder the burden to get rid of the albatross that takes one out of three of our tax dollars?

Mr. Keeper: I really want to thank the Member for posing that question. I think it is an important one. I want to answer it by pointing to the behaviour of two Governments. The first Government was the Government of Tommy Douglas. When Tommy Douglas was elected during the Great Depression, the Province of Saskatchewan was deeply in debt. Tommy Douglas was a man, a leader who was concerned about social economic justice. He managed over the years to bring down that debt. At the same time, he increased social services and social justice in the Province of Saskatchewan.

To pose the false dichotomy of bringing down debt and increasing social justice is simply a rhetorical trick the Member seeks to play. I want to point to the behaviour of his own Government. How can this Member stand and point the finger at the New Democratic Party, saying that we are responsible for the debt when his Party has just gone through the process of buying a by-election? It was a "buy-election" in Lac-Saint-Jean. It cost hundreds of millions of dollars. That Party is now in the process of attempting to apply that very same strategy, that "buy-election" strategy, to the whole of Canada. That Party is seeking to buy the Canadian voters with their own money.

I would like the Hon. Member to explain how the Government can keep down the deficit when it seeks to buy elections. The Government is going to bankrupt the country without any measurable change in its social make-up. The only thing the Government is spending its money on is seeking to get back into office. If it would invest that money properly in people, we would not have the hungry, the homeless, and the functionally illiterate.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to ask the Member of the New Democratic Party a question. In the course of the debate, the NDP made certain comments about the tax policies of previous Liberal Governments, as well as those of the current Government.

• (1650)

I would like to ask the Hon. Member what the NDP thinks of the decision by the socialist Government of New Zealand to impose a tax on food. What can we expect if members of his Party are elected to government?

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is seeking to deflect the criticism which justly belongs to the Conservative Party and the Conservative Government onto her political competitors. She knows she has nothing to worry about in terms of political competition from the Conservative Party. What she has to worry about is the increase in support in the country for the New Democratic Party. She is simply trying to pass on the sins of Tories on to the backs of New Democrats. That will not wash. People know that we in this Party fought against the Government's proposal to tax food. We are glad that public pressure caused the Government to retreat from the odious idea of taxing food.

It will not wash to try to corner New Democrats because the Hon. Member feels that she is threatened in her political career and her political neighbourhood by the increasing public support for New Democrats and by the fact that people know that this Party is seeking real economic justice. They know that this Party is seeking real economic reform. They know that this Party wants the rich and powerful, as well as the corporations, which make profits in this country, to pay taxes so that we can have some tax relief for the ordinary Canadian family. In this way we could have the types of programs that would bring about better social justice.

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, I know that the Hon. Member is quite sincere. He has been around to talk to his constituents. They are concerned about rising taxes. He and I have discussed that.

Given the fact that the Schreyer NDP Government in Manitoba drove many Manitobans to Alberta because of its anti-taxation and anti-business policies; given the fact that the Barrett Government in British Columbia did the same thing to many British Columbians, again to the advantage of Alberta; and given the fact that his own Government, the Pawley Government in Manitoba, raised taxes significantly for all people of all incomes in Manitoba, including my mother who pays taxes, why does he think that Canadians would be so foolish to elect a radical democratic socialist Government that would only do for all of Canada what NDP Governments have done in three of the provinces in western Canada?

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Hon. Member's question I want to start out by admitting that, yes, the Government in Manitoba raised taxes too much. That is a point of view I share with my constituents. In fact, the leadership of the Party going into the last election realized that. They sought to change direction. It is unfortunate but the Party went down to defeat. Yes, the NDP is capable of making mistakes. We are also capable of recognizing them. I wish that this Government would recognize when it has made mistakes.

The Hon. Member said that the Schreyer Government turned people away from Manitoba to Alberta. That is wrong. The Government from which Manitobans fled was the Sterling Lyon Tory Government. That was when the population of Manitoba decreased. It was only when Howard Pawley was re-elected that the population of Manitoba started to increase once again.

Let me point out to the Hon. Member, if he is seeking to attack in a false way Mr. Schreyer, who was a former Premier of Manitoba, that many families in Manitoba still have hanging on their walls a photo of the former Premier. I have seen no family homes in which the picture of Sterling Lyon hangs on the wall, or pictures of Brian Mulroney for that matter. If one attacks Schreyer, one attacks the very heart of Manitoba. I ask the Hon. Member to keep that in mind.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate with the Hon. Member for Hamilton East.

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the previous spokesman did not respond to my question about the socialist Government's decision to impose a tax on food. I think a great many questions that Canadians legitimately ask themselves begin with: "What would you do in the place of the Government?" I was most disturbed when the Hon. Member brought this on himself by suggesting that when the Liberals were in power we had somehow imposed this kind of tax burden on middle-income and lower-income Canadians and that in fact we were like the Conservatives. I suggest to the Hon. Member that if we look at the legacy of the Liberal Party, beginning with the introduction of national medicare, as well as with the decision to increase tax credits for those who are at the lowest end of the income scale in relation to child benefits, yes, they were supported by the NDP—

Mr. Cassidy: Proposed by the NDP.

Ms. Copps: —but they were Liberal programs introduced by a Liberal Government in a national—

Mr. Cassidy: Medicare came first from the NDP, let us get it straight.

Ms. Copps: As a matter of fact, the first Bill to deal with equal pay for work of equal value was brought forward by the Hon. Margaret Campbell who was a Member of the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Cassidy: Let's talk about medicare.

Ms. Copps: Talking about medicare, what Party introduced medicare?

Mr. Cassidy: Medicare came from the NDP in Saskatchewan.

Ms. Copps: I can understand why the NDP is a little bit nervous about the positions and programs of the Liberal Party. It is because, hopefully, Canadians are looking at the Liberal Party as an alternative Government. People have the right to examine policies of the Liberal Party.

However, I would like to speak for a moment about the hypocrisy of the NDP. I refer to the issue of flow-through shares. Some Hon. Members may remember the hypocrisy of the NDP when it came to the issue of flow-through shares. It is important that the public pay attention to this because it was the same Member, the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy), who day after day stood in the House and said: "We have to eliminate all corporate tax breaks. We have to get rid of the corporate tax rip-off. Put the tax burden on the corporations and take it away from the individual". He in fact did an absolute flip-flop on flow-through shares.

The flow-through shares measure was introduced by a Liberal Government. It was a policy introduced to try to stimulate the creation of development in northern Canada, in particular in northern Ontario and northern Quebec. It permitted small Canadian mining companies to be able to get an up-front tax adjustment or, in fact, tax abeyance if they were investing the money in looking for Canadian mineral production. It was very successful. It was a program that created jobs for northern Canadians. It was so successful that one of the first things the Conservative Government wanted to do with this so-called tax reform was to cut it out. On the one hand members of the NDP, day after day, week after week, and month after month, have stood in the House and said: "No corporate tax deductions. No loopholes". Yet on the other hand it took one meeting with the Canadian Mining Association for the NDP to change its position completely. One day members of that Party were against flow-through shares and the next they were in favour of them. They were in favour of them because they saw that in certain circumstances the judicious use of tax incentives can encourage Canadian companies to remain competitive and can encourage small Canadian businesses to grow.

I say to the NDP: "I do not mind, take a position, but for Heaven's sake do not be so hypocritical to the people of Canada. On the one hand do not say that you do not believe in any tax exemption, any tax breaks, and on the other hand when the flow-through shares are introduced"—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Ms. Copps: I saw the House Leader for the NDP wearing a button which stated: "Go with the Flow".

Mr. Cassidy: I wore one too.

Ms. Copps: The Hon. Member wore the button in the same week that he was standing in the House saying that we should eliminate all corporate tax advantages. I want to say to the NDP that it was a Liberal Government that permitted the tremendous success story of the Canadian steel industry, including the Steel Company of Canada—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member for Hamilton East. It is 5 p.m. She will have five more minutes in her speech after Private Members' Business.

I recognize the Hon. Minister of State for the Treasury Board on a point of order.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the Parties, and I think Your Honour would find that there would be agreement to the following. When we drafted this it was before 5 p.m. so that is intended to mean after Private Members' Hour.

This afternoon and this evening we shall continue debate on Bill C-139, the income tax reform Bill.

• (1700)

Should the House finish debate on this matter this evening the vote would be deferred until 6 p.m. on Monday, July 25, 1988. In the event that the House does finish debate on Bill C-139 this evening, the House will not sit tomorrow, Friday, July 22, 1988. However, the *Journals* will be open on Friday, July 22, to receive any motions and other documents which are normally received.

On Monday, July 25, 1988, at 11 a.m., the House will consider Bill C-136, the Broadcasting Act, and complete debate before 1 p.m. After Question Period on Monday, July 25, the House will consider third reading of Bill C-82, the Lobbyists Registration Act, and complete the debate on that Bill before 5 p.m. All votes will be deferred until 6 p.m. The House will then recess until 11 a.m. on Tuesday, July 26. Between the hours of 11 a.m. and 1 p.m., July 26, the House shall consider other business to be arranged among the Parties.

Directly after Question Period on Tuesday, July 26, 1988, the House will commence debate on the abortion motion, and such debate shall continue within the normal hours of debate until the final question is called. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that this would be pursuant to the hours of sitting adopted June 20, 1988. The House will then consider a motion to adjourn until August 10, 1988.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, this statement by the Deputy Government House Leader reflects the discussions that have been held. There is one part of the statement that I believe requires some clarification, in order to make the record complete. As stated, on Monday, July 25, 1988, at 11 a.m., the House will consider Bill C-136, the Broadcasting Act, and complete debate before 1 p.m. The Government House Leader should state exactly what stage of debate he proposes completing before 1 p.m.

Mr. Lewis: I believe it was intended that that would be second reading, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cassidy: I, too, rise on a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker. There were several votes anticipated on the subamendments to the motion on Bill C-139. From what the House Leader has stated, I would assume that there has been some agreement that those will be voice votes, because any vote if called would then defer further debate until 6 p.m. on Monday. Has that problem been ironed out?

Mr. Lewis: I must confess that I discussed that with the House Leader of the Official Opposition. I read the text of what I have just stated to the House Leader of the NDP. We did not discuss that. I would suggest that it is something that perhaps we could discuss later and come to some accommodation on. The Hon. Member makes a valid point. If recorded divisions are called, there would have to be some accommodation to reach an end to this at some time. That is what was intended, that is the sense of the discussion we had, and we will make sure that it is clarified.

Mr. Cassidy: My desire to have votes is tempered by my realization that it would do the House good not to be here tomorrow, so perhaps it can be worked out privately.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business, as listed on today's Order Paper.

[*English*]

The House has heard the terms of the motion proposed by the Hon. Minister of State. Is it the pleasure of the House to agree to the motion by unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is agreed and so ordered.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In case we sit tomorrow, it is my duty to read the written notice I received from the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) informing me he will be unable to move his motion under private Members' Business, on Friday, July 22, 1988.

As it has not been possible to arrange an exchange of positions in the order of precedence pursuant to Standing Order 39, I instruct the Table to put that item at the bottom of the order of precedence.

Since the notice will be withdrawn, private Members' hour will be cancelled and, pursuant to Standing Order 39(3)(b), the House will continue with the business before it prior to private Members' hour.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

MEASURE TO CHANGE NAME OF CHAPLEAU CONSTITUENCY

Mrs. Claudy Mailly (Gatineau), by unanimous consent, moved that Bill C-308, an Act to change the name of the electoral district of Chapleau, be read the second time and, by unanimous consent, referred to Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, on the request of the Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Mailly). I recognize that we may be setting some type of precedent in the House by bringing this Bill forward so quickly through all stages. There are many other Private Members' Bills waiting to come through the House in a similar fashion. Within the context of parliamentary reform, we should recognize that we are setting a precedent. I support the Bill of the Hon. Member. I have no objections to it, but I am concerned about the process. In spite of that, I will give my consent to allow it to proceed, recognizing that we are setting a precedent that may tend to cause other private Members to wish to bring their own Bills forward in a similar fashion.

Mr. Gauthier: I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would like to disagree with my hon. colleague, the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Carleton (Mr. Turner). There is no precedent being set here. This has been going on for at least 16 years. I changed the name of my riding some 14 years ago with the same procedure, and over the years it has been done by other Members. There are no precedents being set. However, I appreciate the fact that the Hon. Member gives his concurrence.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would like to confirm that unanimous consent does not in fact constitute a precedent.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and, by unanimous consent, the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Danis in the chair.

Clause 1 and 2 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

Mrs. Mailly: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to abuse the generosity of my colleague from Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) who has been kind enough to give me a few minutes to have my Bill passed. I would also like to thank the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) who has kindly accepted to help me, and also the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis), the NPD House leader, for his support, the members of my party caucus who, yesterday, gave me their support, and you, Mr. Speaker, for your good work. I will always cherish this moment.

Today is my son's twenty-first birthday, and I wish to dedicate this to him as a gift.

* * *

• (1710)

[*English*]

CANADA POST CORPORATION

OPPOSITION TO REMOVAL OF MAILBOXES IN BURNABY, B.C.

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should order Canada Post Corporation to cease immediately its plans to remove a number of street mailboxes in Burnaby, B.C., and further, that the government order the Corporation to consult fully with the municipal council, local Members of Parliament, and the residents and businesses affected before any future steps are taken to close street mailboxes in Burnaby.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to participate in the debate on this important motion with respect to postal service in my constituency of Burnaby. I tabled this motion sometime ago, in February of last year, in response to a series of steps that were taken by Canada Post that adversely affected the quality of postal service in my constituency. Just briefly, what happened is that notice was given that many street mailboxes throughout my constituency would in fact be removed. This was done in a manner which involved no consultation whatsoever with the residents that were affected. It was done in a way which really demonstrated contempt for the residents of that community. One day the street mailboxes were there, the next they were gone.

Quite understandably there was an outcry in the community. The businesses that were affected, the residents that were affected, and the local council, all urged Canada Post to reconsider this decision.

I took up the battle on behalf of the residents of Burnaby on this important question. Following that fortunately some sense prevailed, some sanity prevailed, and Canada Post was persuaded to restore approximately 50 of the street mailboxes that had been removed.

Some might ask why this motion is still on the Order Paper if in fact some steps were taken to resolve the dispute which the motion addresses.

• (1720)

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[*Translation*]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Deputy to the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Deputy Speaker with the House went up to the Senate Chamber. And being returned:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that when the House went up to the Senate Chamber the Deputy Governor General was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

Bill C-75, an Act to implement an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Nova Scotia on offshore petroleum resource management and revenue sharing and to make related and consequential amendments—Chapter 28, 1988.

Bill C-77, an Act to authorize the taking of special temporary measures to ensure safety and security during national emergencies and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof—Chapter 29, 1988.

Bill C-89, an Act to amend the Criminal Code (victims of crime)—Chapter 30, 1988.

Bill C-93, an Act for the preservation of and enhancement of multiculturalism in Canada—Chapter 31, 1988.

Bill C-111, an Act to amend the National Housing Act and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation Act and to repeal certain enactments in consequence thereof—Chapter 32, 1988.

Bill C-124, an Act to amend the Canada Labour Code—Chapter 33, 1988.

Bill C-137, an Act to provide for incentives to assist in financing exploration for ministerial resources and hydrocarbons in Canada and to amend the Canadian Exploration and Development Incentive Program Act—Chapter 34, 1988.

Bill C-55 an Act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976 and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof—Chapter 35, 1988.

Bill C-84, an act to amend the Immigration Act, 1976 and the Criminal Code in consequence thereof, Chapter 36, 1988.

Bill S-17, an Act to authorize the Montreal Trust Company of Canada to be continued as a corporation under the laws of the Province of Quebec.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

CANADA POST CORPORATION

OPPOSITION TO REMOVAL OF MAILBOXES IN BURNABY, B.C.

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Robinson:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should order Canada Post Corporation to cease immediately its plans to remove a number of street mailboxes in Burnaby, B.C., and further, that the government order the Corporation to consult fully with the municipal council, local Members of Parliament, and the residents and businesses affected before any future steps are taken to close street mailboxes in Burnaby.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate with the Hon. Member for Burnaby. He will be given full time for his speech.

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, when one is interrupted by Her Majesty, one always yields graciously.

Before the knock on the door I was indicating that in the early part of 1987 Canada Post had removed a number of street mailboxes from my constituency of Burnaby. I intervened on behalf of my constituents and was successful in having a number of them restored. This affected both residents in the area as well as a number of businesses, including Transport Equipment Control Systems whose President, Mr. Bob Nakashima, sent a note along saying that he appreciated very much the work that I had done on his behalf as his Member of Parliament to restore postal service in his area.

Some might ask why is it necessary to pursue this question of postal service at this time some 15 or 16 months later. Under the Conservative Government the quality of postal services has declined and the cost has gone up substantially. This is still a very timely and an important question.

New Democrats have taken a clear stand on the Post Office, particularly the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Keeper) and the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Ms. Dewar). The New Democratic Party strongly believes that door-to-door delivery should be extended to all suburban residents and that all urban residents should be treated equally. We have opposed the corporate plan of Canada Post since it was approved by the Conservative Cabinet and tabled in the House last fall.

Let us look at some of the elements of this corporate plan which will have a disastrous effect on the quality of postal service in Canada. It calls for the elimination of 8,700 jobs and the closure of some 5,200 rural post offices across Canada. There will be an increased centralization of mail sorting, which will lead to even more delays in mail delivery. There will be the privatization of counter services to inadequate retail outlets and the replacement of door-to-door mail delivery with so-called supermailboxes.

In other words, effectively what Canada Post is doing is dismantling the service over a period of some 10 years. As New Democrats we believe in this public service. We believe that the Post Office is an important and a vital service. We believe that we should allow the Post Office to expand and get into areas in which it can make money, gain revenue, and cross-subsidize some of its less profitable operations. That has been done by the Post Office in Great Britain and the Post Office in Australia very successfully. I suggest that we look at the same kind of thing here in Canada.

Today some 54 per cent of Canadians receive door-to-door service. That percentage will drop dramatically over the next 10 years under Tory cuts in postal service. This is an issue of basic fairness, for those who live in communities across this land are entitled to that door-to-door delivery and should not be treated as second-class citizens because they happen to move into a suburban area which does not have the service.

I received a letter from a constituent, a Mr. Geoffrey Thomas who said:

> We are generally very satisfied with the postal service however we just moved into our first home (townhouse) to find that our mail is not delivered to our door. We must walk every day to a commercial post box to pick up our mail. This is unreasonable since homeowners in Burnaby have door-to-door delivery. I would appreciate an explanation for this situation.

This constituent is certainly entitled to that explanation. We know that the failure to provide door-to-door postal service hits particularly hard the disabled and our senior citizens. We know as well that letter carriers play an important role in the course of their daily delivery. They are not just delivering mail but in many cases they perform an important social function, particularly with elderly people. They check on them and make sure they are okay. For some elderly people this is virtually their only contact with the outside community. Now they are being told to walk several hundred yards to pick up their mail at some sort of a big supermailbox. That is unfair.

What is the rationale for this cut in service? It is set out in a letter to me as follows:

> Due to the rapid rise in housing starts, Canada Post has been faced with the fact that the cost of providing door-to-door delivery to all new homes is prohibitive, without massive increases in postal rates or greater dependency on taxpayers' dollars.

What absolute nonsense that is. This same Government which refuses to extend door-to-door delivery across this land is prepared to spend in excess of $8 billion on nuclear submarines. What kind of a twisted priority is that? To refuse to provide door-to-door service and to cut back on over 5,000 rural post offices at the same time as it is squandering taxpayers' money on nuclear submarines is absolute madness.

• (1730)

This applies not only to residential communities but also to industrial parks, for example. A Mr. Keith Beedie, one of my constituents, is a business person in Burnaby. He noted that he and a number of his business colleagues have put together an industrial park in Port Coquitlam called the Meridian Industrial Park. They wanted to get postal service at each of those businesses. What were they told by Canada Post? They were told to forget it, that Canada Post was not prepared to give them the service that the businesses across the street have had for decades. We as New Democrats do not accept that kind of abdication of responsibility.

Further, I note that in the lower mainland of British Columbia, a new franchise has been opened in a 7-Eleven store in Lynn Valley, North Vancouver. This has been criticized severely by the postal workers involved because the work that was formerly done by its members will be done by non-union employees at low wages and under conditions that are quite unsatisfactory. This attempt to franchise operations in 7-Eleven stores not only results in far lower wages and poorer working conditions but results in poor postal service, and I will come to that in a moment.

I mentioned rural post offices, and I want to take this opportunity to place on the record the concern of Canadians in rural communities across the land about the shutting down of rural post offices. I recently spoke out in Chilliwack, British Columbia, where many residents expressed their concern about the fact that the sub post office at Cultus Lake, British Columbia, which had been there for many years, had burned down recently. Canada Post is saying that it will not replace that sub post office, that it will open up a post office in some 7-Eleven store or another store that is open 24 hours a day. Hundreds and hundreds of the residents of that community have signed a petition asking for the service to which they are entitled.

I would note as well that in the case of rural post offices, it is women who are disproportionately hit because I believe over 80 per cent of rural postmasters are women. This is the only source of income for many of these women, and they are being told that their jobs are gone. They will be replaced by people making the minimum wage at local stores. That is Tory economics, and we reject harsh and unfair Tory economics.

Some time ago, I held a public forum in my constituency on postal service, and I also sent out a questionnaire about postal service to my constituents. I think the results are very interesting and I would like to share them with Members of the House. Some 71 per cent of those who responded to my questionnaire were dissatisfied with postal service. They said that the quality of postal service had gone down. In excess of 80 per cent had had mail either lost of damaged. Over 85 per cent strongly believed that there should be universal door-to-door delivery.

The main complaints cited by my constituents of Burnaby would, I am sure, be echoed by constituents across Canada, whether in rural communities or in urban communities. The largest complaint by far was the complaint about delayed mail. I heard about this issue time and time again. We know that the advent of these private sub post offices will mean even more delays.

Damaged and lost mail was another concern as was the increasing amount of junk mail. People are getting fed up with the amount of junk mail they are receiving. As well, they were concerned about long waits and high postal rates while service is going down. Finally, they are seriously concerned about the so-called supermailboxes. They point out, for example, that among discarded junk mail has been found valuable mail like personal cheques. They have been interspersed in the junk mail and have been lost. These are the kinds of concerns that have been raised.

We as New Democrats have concrete proposals to improve the quality of postal service. We are opposed to the recent cuts in service. We support universal door-to-door delivery. We oppose the closing of postal services.

I want to pay tribute to my colleague, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre, who has led the battle for New Democrats on this question and has done an outstanding job in bringing to the attention of Canadians the concerns particularly of rural Canadians but also of urban Canadians about the decline in postal service.

Finally, we believe in the expansion of postal services in Canada. We believe in selling more packaging materials, introducing electronic mail, and allowing banking services in post offices the way they do in other jurisdictions and the way we did in the past. Postal workers themselves have a number of concrete suggestions for improving the quality of service, including the addition of revenue-generating services, consumers' post, financial services, and bill payments. They suggest that Canada Post should get into package distribution and electronic bulk mail services. They note that the British Post Office has expanded its services in this area and has become profitable and even more efficient. The British Post Office has service six days a week, twice a day, yet it makes a profit. Why can we not learn some lessons from that postal system, pioneered by the Labour Government of Britain, I might add?

The postal workers also suggest that a major initiative should be taken to reduce workplace injuries and work-related illnesses by improving working conditions. In too many cases, the working conditions of postal workers are primitive. One of the worst safety records in Canada is with Canada Post. Canada Post spends in excess of $20 million annually as a result of workplace injuries. Finally, the workers note that adequate staffing is absolutely essential in order to be able to perform services efficiently.

In drawing to the attention of Hon. Members these concerns with respect to postal service, not just in my own constituency but across Canada, I would like to mention some specific concerns that were raised by the postal workers in a recent submission to the Burnaby Municipal Council, a submission made just last month. The concerns that were raised by postal workers in Burnaby are concerns that have been raised by postal workers across Canada, in Hamilton, in Winnipeg, in Quebec—all over Canada.

The postal workers noted that the new plan involving sub post offices and franchises involves a carded parcel system which will mean delays in picking up registered mail at post offices. Before May of 1987, if a person was not at home when a registered letter or parcel was delivered, he or she would get a card telling him or her to go to the nearest post office to pick

up the mail or the parcel. Now people get cards telling them to go to the nearest pharmacy, drugstore, or retail postal outlet. For the residents of Burnaby and other places, that means a delay in mail service. It means at least two days' further delay because that registered mail or parcel has to be taken back to the post office, then to the franchise operation. That means delay, and Canadians are fed up with delays in the postal system. This means even further delay in receiving important registered mail.

As well, in too many cases the cards that are left in the mailboxes do not even have telephone numbers on them that would allow people to contact the sub post offices in question to find out if the parcels are big or small. That makes a difference for senior citizens. They have to know if they will be able to carry the parcels, and they cannot find out if there is no telephone number on the card.

As well, the operators of these little sub post offices which are not run by Canada Post, sub post offices in drugstores, grocery stores and so on, are offering postal services as a sideline. They are more concerned with selling groceries, diapers, and the like than they are with first-class postal services.

• (1740)

There are concerns about the security of mail in these places. Other concerns deal with the lack of training and lack of familiarity with postal products and regulations. There is a high staff turnover because in many cases these are minimum wage jobs, language difficulties, and real problems with difficulties in handling the volume of parcels and mail at Christmas. Sometimes staff are simply spread too thin to give decent service.

The bottom line is that staff in these little grocery stores and so on are not trained to handle postal services. They are trained, if at all, to do the kind of routine work involved in a grocery store, not the important work of postal workers. I would note that the permanent and relief clerks at the South Burnaby postal station have a total of something like 17 years and 4 months of experience in serving Burnaby residents. The same is true of the clerks in the North Burnaby postal station.

Instead of opening up even more of these sub post offices, we should be expanding postal service by, for example, opening a New Directions outlet under the operation of Canada Post in the Brentwood Mall in Burnaby. This would be an important and viable expansion of service. If we continue the way we are going, both the South Burnaby and the North Burnaby postal stations will be shut down in the future, and that is something that the residents of Burnaby are not prepared to accept.

There are other dangers as well. I mentioned already the question of supermailboxes and the importance of providing revenue-generating services within the system. We believe that Canada Post should be putting service before profit, but we also believe that it can achieve both those goals by expanding the range of services it offers.

In short, we say no to the closure of rural post offices. We say no to cut-backs in the quality of service. We say yes to universal, door-to-door service across this land. We say yes to a quality post office in Canada. We reject the attack by the Conservative Government on postal service in Canada.

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) not only protests too much, he protests far too inconsistently. Therefore, it is my pleasure to talk about one of the great consistencies of the NDP, for in this they are absolutely consistent, and that is their inconsistencies.

The Hon. Member spoke about the reduction in post office outlets. I could see from here, and I suspect it was noticeable to other Hon. Members and those watching on television, that his tongue was in his cheek when he said that.

Mr. Robinson: Oh, no.

Mr. Malone: The Hon. Member knows the new postal plan allows for thousands more postal outlets.

From there he went on to talk about rural Canada where he said they were closing down even more post offices. He knows the Canada Post corporate plan allows for some 5,000 new postal outlets.

Mr. Robinson: Outlets? Oh.

Mr. Malone: The NDP does not believe in more service as the Hon. Member claimed it does in his speech. It specifically believes in the most expensive service. Yes, I know it would be nice to have door-to-door delivery in every community of Canada. It is a fact, of course, that that is impossible for rural Canada, but it is also impossible for the rest of the country if we are talking about affordability. For Members to pretend that somehow we can have service and close our eyes to cost—

Mr. Robinson: What about nuclear submarines?

Mr. Malone: Let us come to the nuclear submarines because that demonstrates something about the NDP as well. They talked about the $8 billion cost of nuclear submarines. They conveniently forgot to say that it was spread over 20 years. That is a very small price to pay to be a partner in NATO, a group of countries that have come together to ensure the freedom of Canadians, among others. We have bound ourselves to that organization in our policy, because we recognize that as members of the free world we have a joint responsibility for the preservation of freedom. Given that, we will play our part to ensure that this group of nations will always remain free. I just wanted to set aside categorically the nonsense that we can leave off part of the facts, make a comparison, and presume that somehow we can have door-to-door delivery in every community irrespective of where it may spring up.

The Hon. Member talked about cuts in postal services. He then went on to refer to "the Tory cuts in postal services". He calls it government cuts. We on this side cut the postal service. Yet the NDP, along with the Liberals and ourselves, supported the idea that Canada Post be set up as a crown corporation.

What does that inconsistent political Party really believe? They voted for the Crown corporation. Are they really saying now that they want a Crown corporation but they want the Government to manage it? Surely, members of the NDP have to sit at one end of the teeter-totter or the other. They cannot scream that the teeter-totter is too high when it is up, or complain they are having no fun when it is down. The fact is they voted for the Crown corporation, they got the Crown corporation, and they cannot stand in this House and tell the Government to run it.

The Hon. Member then talked about the elderly. He had them jogging halfway across Burnaby to get their mail. He said that they had to walk several hundred yards. If he looks at the postal plan, he will note that in hospitals, senior citizens' residences, and other places the plan is to attach mail boxes to those facilities.

Mr. Robinson: Seniors live on their own, too.

Mr. Malone: That is a good point. That is why his point of a walk of several hundred yards is wildly wrong. That is not what the plan says. It is to be within walking distance for seniors, yet he misses the point.

The Hon. Member opposes 24-hour post offices. He does not want Mac's Milk, 7-Eleven, and all the rest of these outlets running extended hours post offices, yet he turns around and champions women. He says that the NDP love the women out there and that the majority of workers at the post office are women. If there are less people working in the post office, he says that somehow puts women down. That is an interesting and strange piece of logic, but let me give him some bits of information that he might find useful. Whether we like it or not, only one woman out of six is like the traditional family where the man works and the female is at home with the children.

• (1750)

Ms. Dewar: Working.

Mr. Malone: I shouldn't say working. I apologize for that instantly. I do not mean to imply that. I mean "employed". Anyone who has ever been in the home or ever been a mother knows what absolute full-time work is. I meant to use the word "employed".

The fact of the matter is that today most families have both partners working out in the community. Under the system advocated by the Hon. Member for Burnaby, by the time they come home the post office has been closed for an hour. Under the old system of the old dinosaur Party the post office is usually located downtown in the big building with the tower and the clock, with no parking for blocks around. It is never open except when you are at your employment, and often it is closed over the noon hour.

That is what the Hon. Member for Burnaby proposes for the modern society rather than the shopping centres with parking areas and extended hours, that is, the kind of situation which is appropriate today.

The Hon. Member for Burnaby talked about junk mail. I have only received one piece of junk mail in my life. It was a request for money from the New Democratic Party. I took one look at it and said that I was going to write to someone because they were sending me junk mail. If there were in fact a category of mail called "junk mail", no one would send it. I agree that there are receivers of mail who sometimes do not like what they are getting, who wish they did not get this flyer or that brochure. When I return from my home in western Canada I am always amazed at how many new pizza companies have opened up in my area. Their flyers are always under my door, and I already eat too much pizza as it is.

However, the people who send the mail and the flyers do not think they are junk. If it were truly junk to the senders they would soon quit sending it. They do not send this mail only to watch their bank account go down. It is only junk to some of the recipients. People send that mail with a purpose in mind. For the Hon. Member to make that submission is, in fact, to deny the entrepreneurship of many people in the business community.

This inconsistent Member, who is only consistent in his inconsistencies, then said that the 7-Eleven and Mac's Milk stores are awful places, that they are terrible places to work and are insecure, et cetera. Later on he said that Canada Post has one of the worst safety records in the Canadian enterprise. This fellow would have everyone walk to the sender to pick up their mail. He cannot have it all these different ways. The argument must be better developed than that.

In all fairness to the Hon. Member, post office concerns have always touched the hearts of everyone in urban and rural Canada. It is important for him to remember that the Canada Post Corporation will show a profit next year. It has already been demonstrated that there is a speed up in the turnaround of mail. The operation of the Post Office is becoming more efficient. There will be more and more postal outlets as a result of the new Canada Post Corporation plan. I thank the Hon. Member for bringing this issue to the floor of the House of Commons, because I think people will now recognize that we are in fact on the right track.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would like to advise the House at this time that the time provided for Private Member's Hour will end at 6.05. The time taken by the Private Member's Bill of the Hon. Member for Gatineau is not taken away from the time of the Hon. Member for Burnaby, but unfortunately the time taken for Royal Assent is. Therefore, Private Member's Hour will end at 6.05.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Edouard Desrosiers (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, I represent a riding in the heart of Montreal, the beautiful riding of Hochelaga—Maisonneuve. For the benefit of those who aren't familiar with the neighbourhood, this is next door to the Olympic Stadium. A few years ago, a decision was made to build housing units on what used to be the Angus yards. So far, there are about 5,000 new residents. There are six or seven units for the elderly, and this week, I met one of the directors of the well-known Lucie-Bruneau Institute which is involved in integrating the disabled in housing co-ops, in housing units.

Today, I think we have to give some serious thought to the fact that beyond political Parties and ideologies, there are certain situations that must be dealt with. The director of the institute told me that in my riding, on the Angus property alone, there are 300 disabled persons in wheel chairs. How can you expect these people to pick up their mail, even if they have the best possible superboxes in the world? It was decided the boxes would be located on the street corner, but we are talking about disabled persons who cannot deal with this. We have elderly individuals who are 82, 87 and 89 years old. They have trouble walking. They are ill, they are tired, they are exhausted. They couldn't pick up their mail even if those boxes were made out of solid gold!

I wrote to the President of the Canada Post Corporation. I received an acknowledgement, informing me that he would look at the situation, but he never sent a reply. The injustice of the situation is appalling. These are Canadian taxpayers just like everybody else. They have the same rights and privileges and are entitled to the same services as the guy on the other side of the street who is in perfect health and gets his mail delivered. That is the honest truth.

I understand the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson). He has problems in his riding, and in our Party, we have people who have problems with those damned boxes. They are no good. I am against the whole principle, and I want to ask my Government and my Minister and to the President of the Canada Post Corporation as well, a corporation that is a Crown corporation, and I know it means we can't always get these people to do what we want them to do, but I ask him to give this his special attention. In the heart of Montreal, right in downtown Montreal, the mail is being delivered on one side of the street and not on the other. It doesn't make sense. This is unacceptable, and I think the Hon. Member for Burnaby is to be commended for presenting this motion, and I support it one-hundred per cent.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion (Mr. Robinson) agreed to.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

INCOME TAX ACT AND RELATED ACTS

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) that Bill C-139, an Act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, 1977 and certain related Acts, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs; and the amendment of Mr. Garneau (p. 17724); and the subamendment of Mr. Boudria (p. 17770).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

• (1800)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on the amendment of Mr. Boudria. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Amendment (Mr. Boudria) negatived.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate.

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking on the main motion before we proceeded to Private Members' hour, I was making a point about the hypocrisy of the members of the New Democratic Party who express their opposition toward tax breaks except when it deals with an issue like flow-through shares. We all recall the flip-flop of the finance critic and House Leader for the NDP. One minute his Party was against flow-through shares and the next minute, when they realized that the Liberal Government's introduction of flow-through shares had resulted in the creation of thousands of jobs, they changed their mind.

Canada has the most competitive steel industry in the world. The heart and soul of that industry happens to be in my riding, where I represent Local 1005 of the United Steelworkers of America, as well as Dofasco which recently was involved in a bid to acquire Algoma, which would make it potentially the No. 1 steel producer in Canada.

Stelco, Dofasco and Algoma are very competitive because Liberal governments, through tax policies that allowed accelerated write-offs, encouraged companies to upgrade their steel-making capacity so that they could compete on a world-wide scale. While we may hear the NDP say that this type of tax incentive is a corporate rip-off, and would deny such a tax incentive, when it comes to actually eliminating an accelerated write-off to a company like Stelco or Dofasco, or eliminating the flow-through shares, reality hits the NDP hard. Reality dictates that there are certain tax incentives that can be introduced by governments to help business, particularly small business in this country, remain competitive with other countries.

Unfortunately, the NDP would like to play both ends through the middle. They criticized our past record for tax incentives. They also criticized the Liberal Party for believing that when there is an opportunity to assist Canadians, one should try to assist those at the lower end of the income scale.

I am not sure what the NDP would do, but there is a distinct difference in the approach taken by the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party in relation to tax policy.

One example is the area of child care, which has had much discussion in the last number of months. The Government's position with respect to child care is that there is only a certain amount of money that can be allotted to assist families facing this desperate need. If one follows the Conservative philosophy, why would the Government introduce a policy on child care strictly from the taxation point of view, which permits child deductions as opposed to child credits? The Government has potentially doubled the tax deduction available for parents. For a high income earning Canadian like myself, with the salary I receive as a Member of Parliament, the tax deduction will mean two or three times more money in my pocket than that for a steelworker or cleaning lady claiming the same deduction.

A cleaning lady in my riding works for a minimum wage of $4.50 an hour. She will not benefit from the child deduction in the same way as I will benefit.

If the Liberal Party had been in power for the introduction of a child care package, we would have told Canadians that we recognize that each family has a responsibility to be involved in the raising of their children, including financial involvement when it comes to child rearing and organizing for child care. At the same time, there are many Canadians in the middle class, particularly in the $25,000 to $30,000 a year range, who are being attacked from all sides. According to the Government's policy, rather than introducing a credit that will give the cleaning lady a better financial return than a Member of Parliament, it is giving more tax deductions to assist the higher-income individual to a much greater degree than a lower-income individual.

Even if we accept the amount of money that the Government is considering, we believe that the portion being set aside for family deductions should have been directed toward tax credits so that a mother working outside the home and earning perhaps $15,000 to $20,000 a year will be able to get a larger return on her income tax than the mother who was earning $50,000 or $60,000 a year.

That would be sane tax policy. It is a fair tax policy which recognizes that the role of Government is to redistribute from those who have to those who have not. It would give those women in the middle class the opportunity to go out and participate in the paid workforce if they so choose. We should have the opportunity to be able to remain at home and look after our children if we have the tax base that gives us that support. Unfortunately, the Government's policy has resulted in an erosion of support for the family. The family allowance was deindexed. This suggests to me that the Government is not prepared to give the same kind of support to people with children.

The principle is simple. Someone who earns $40,000 a year and supports a spouse and children should be able to pay less tax than a single person earning $40,000 a year who can spend their disposable income on one person. Such a policy indicates support for families, rather than cutting back on family allowances. This so-called tax reform has the largest tax increases in the history of this country. According to the Government's own figures, the only people who will be able to take advantage of tax reform are those earning over $117,000 a year. That is not tax reform, that is tax robbery. It is tax robbery of the middle class in particular by a Government that realizes its mandate was not to serve the ordinary man and woman.

• (1810)

This mandate was to serve the big moneyed operators who are able to take advantage of the half million dollar capital gains write-off. That was one of the first actions of this Government. Ordinary Canadian men and women are taking it at the gas pumps. There has been a total increase of 27 cents a gallon since this Government came into power. They are taking it in indirect taxes. The average family is now paying over $1,000 extra in taxes. The people who are being helped out are the high-income earners like the person who can take advantage of the capital gains exemption and the person who is earning over $117,000 a year.

We do not believe that is tax reform. We think this document is a fraud. We think the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the Government are about as honest in this particular venture as they were when they told senior citizens that their pensions would never be touched. We hope the Prime Minister and the Government will have the courage to call an election so that the people can decide for themselves whether or not they want to face these exorbitant tax increases.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have received written notice from the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez), informing me that he is unable to be present to move his motion during Private Members' Hour on Monday July 25, 1988. Since it was not possible, in accordance with Standing Order 39, to arrange an exchange of positions in the order of precedence, I instruct the Table to put this item at the bottom of the order of precedence.

Since the notice will be withdrawn, Private Members' Hour will be cancelled, and pursuant to Standing Order 39, the House shall continue with the business before it prior to Private Member's hour.

[*English*]

There are no questions since we are into 10 minute speeches. On debate, the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy)

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the amendment moved by the Liberals on the tax legislation, but I think you realize, Mr. Speaker, that I probably would not accept all the words of the previous speaker from the Liberal Party, especially those words which were critical of the New Democratic Party.

It is obvious to many in this House and across this land that there is a need for real tax reform. The sense of unfairness Canadians have with respect to our tax system is not just a feeling held by a small group of Canadians, it is a feeling held by many, many Canadians. During the last federal election campaign, there was a debate on a minimum personal tax. It was our Leader, the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), who raised that during the Leaders' debate. He pointed out that many of the richest Canadians were not paying one cent of income tax because we had created so many categories they could use for exemptions and so many investment loopholes they could use. They were not paying one cent in taxes. As a result of the debate that took place during the last election campaign, we finally had a minimum tax put in place for individuals. We have some problem with the tax that was put in place because we believe there are still some loopholes and ways that some Canadians can avoid paying their fair share of taxes.

One of the things that did not happen is we did not make the same provision for corporations. So we are now in a situation where corporations in this country which are making money—and we are talking about a significant amount of money—are not paying any taxes whatsoever. We do not believe that is fair. We know that other nations have looked at that situation and have said it is not fair. If we believe that individuals should pay their fair share, that those in the higher income brackets should pay their fair share, that there should be a minimum tax to guarantee they pay at least something, then the same thing should apply to corporations. That is something that many European countries and others have accepted as only natural. We believe that that is something with which this tax reform legislation should be dealing. The subamendment I will be putting forward in a few moments will deal with that aspect.

We believe that it is important that people pay their fair share. We also believe that corporations should pay their fair share. There are a number of problems with our tax system. One of the problems pointed out in my riding is the whole northern tax benefit. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that until the end of April 1988 some communities in the North were allowed to deduct a northern tax benefit which saved many families about $2,000 to $3,000 a year in taxes. However, other communities, such as the community of Thompson and Wabowden in my riding, communities in northern Ontario and communities right across this land, north of the 56th parallel, were not deemed to be northern communities. Because of an outburst of protest from these people that they are indeed northerners, the Government acted on an interim basis and the people of Thompson, which is a community of 15,000, and the community of Wabowden in my riding, which is a community of 1,000 people, are to be temporary northerners. For the next two years they will be treated as northerners in the tax system until the Government straightens out its act. There was a study of costs in northern communities, and there might be some new legislation brought forward at that time.

I bring this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, as an example because I think it points out the problems we have with our tax system. Over a period of time the Government has made decisions but has had to back down. It has ordered studies and has changed its tax system rather than come to grips with all the problems we have with our tax system.

In many ways, I think people who are filling in their tax forms every February, March or April must feel they are playing a shell game. They do not know what the rules are, what they should have done a year before when they received their pay cheques. They really do not know what they should do to look after themselves and their families in terms of paying their fair share of taxes, but not paying more taxes than their neighbours. In an ironic situation, a bank teller earning a very small salary finds out he is paying more in taxes as a bank teller than the bank itself is paying. How does he feel? He cannot belong to a union because every time a teller or someone else tries to form a union, the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce breaks that union by transferring people out. These people receive low salaries and then the tax system makes them pay a certain amount of taxes, but their employer has not paid a cent in income taxes for the last number of years. How do they feel about the fairness of the situation then?

In some ways the system the Government has presented is a step in the right direction. We are calling for a much fairer program. I know our finance critic, the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) has spoken before, and I am sure he will speak again this evening, to explain why the system is not fair and what we could be doing to improve the tax system to ensure fairness for the average Canadian family. Wealthy families will receive an average of $4,365 a year in tax cuts, 60,000 profitable corporations will continue to get away without paying any tax at all and the average Canadian family is left paying $1,000 a year more in income and other taxes than they did in 1984.

What has happened? We have tax reform. Many of the corporations, not all of them, are not paying any tax. Wealthy families are going to receive a very substantial tax cut. However, when we take a look at the entire situation, we find that most Canadians will be paying more in taxes after this tax reform measure than they did in 1984 when the Conservative Government was elected.

I only have 10 minutes to try to cover the whole taxation field, and that certainly is impossible. However, in the few minutes I have left there are two things I want to point out. First, I want to put forward an amendment, as I indicated earlier, and second, I want to say that we have not dealt with the whole question of what the federal Government is going to do with the federal sales tax.

• (1820)

We know that a federal sales tax can be fair or completely unfair. We also know one additional thing, that is, that people with lower and average incomes will have to spend a larger percentage of their take-home pay on basic goods and commodities. If they are taxed on each and every good which they purchase and each and every service that they use, they will be paying higher taxes to the federal Government than they are at the present time. It will not do them very much good to have a low income tax if, when the second shoe falls, as the expression goes, they end up paying more when the new sales tax measures are introduced. I find it meaningful and scary that we will not know what the Government's plans are with regard to a federal sales tax until after the next election. Here we are on July 21 and the Government is moving quickly with what it calls tax reform because it knows that it is good news for it for the next election. But it will not tell the Canadian people what the total tax bill will be until after that election is finished. I find that basically dishonest. It is certainly advantageous to the Government, but it is basically dishonest in terms of what and how it is telling the people of Canada in terms of what it would do as a government.

I realize that my time is up. I would like to move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy):

> That the amendment be amended by deleting the word "Corporation" at the end thereof and substituting the following therefor:
>
> "Corporations, and because the Bill fails to ensure that corporations make a fair and regular contribution to federal tax revenues by imposing a minimum corporate tax."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will reserve on the admissibility of the amendment for a few moments. On debate, the Hon. Member for Edmonton—Strathcona.

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton—Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak against the motion.

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Kilgour: The trouble with my friends opposite is that they are—

Mr. Murphy: Reasonable.

Mr. Kilgour: No. I know them too well. I know what they have done in British Columbia and in Saskatchewan, notwithstanding the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), and what they have done in Manitoba. They have managed in their periods in office in those three provinces to—and part of it had to do with the question of raising taxes on average-income individuals, low-income individuals and against the business sector—to drive thousands and thousands of jobs out of those three provinces while they were in office.

Mr. Benjamin: Get off it!

Mr. Kilgour: I remind the Hon. Member for Regina West that when Mr. Douglas was the Premier of Saskatchewan for many years from 1944—

Mr. Cassidy: We balanced the budget.

Mr. Kilgour: —until the sixties, Saskatchewan was the only state outside, I think it was, East Germany which had a drop in population. I ask the Hon. Member for Regina West to explain that when he gets up to speak.

The fact of the matter is, as he knows as a Regina Member, many people from Regina, Saskatoon, and young people from the North and vigorous people from the West of the province left to go next door to Alberta where the business climate was open and where taxation was not oppressive—

Mr. Benjamin: More of them left Alberta.

Mr. Kilgour: Some of them even went to Manitoba. Then we elected the Government of Mr. Schreyer in Manitoba. I know it sounds incredible but I am told that more than $2 billion in assets left the Province of Manitoba because of his taxation policies.

Mr. Benjamin: Who told you that?

Mr. Kilgour: I think that the Hon. Member can find out quite quickly how that happened. Companies, individuals and families simply moved their liquid assets, their mobile assets, out of the province, again to the advantage of the Province of Alberta.

Then we had Mr. Barrett, who was the Premier of British Columbia for three years, which was too long. At one point there was one mine—and we all know how important mining is to British Columbia—in the entire province that was profitable, I am told in part because of the taxation policies of Mr. Barrett.

What I am saying, of course, is that socialist Governments whether in western Canada, Europe or wherever have managed to remove so many incentives for people that they end up causing umemployment, causing people to leave and generally cause great problems for the economy.

Anyone who has a family believes in incentives. I do not know whether Members opposite have families, but I think you know, Mr. Speaker, since you have a family, that one has to have incentives. One has to have fairness. I fully agree with what has been said about the need for fairness in tax reform. I have written about the subject.

One thing is very clear. It is that if the people of Canada ever elect Members opposite to form the Government, the business climate will go straight down. Unemployment would go straight up and the dollar would go down. Taxation would go up for everybody. Very quickly the result would be that the good which the Government has done in the last three and a half years would be undone.

I know how Members opposite talk before the election. They are all for everything that is good and against everything that is bad. All the people of Canada have to do is elect these people to office, and I am encouraged that that will not happen, and enough will be done to the business climate in Canada that we will all suffer. I refer to the young, the old, as well as to all regions of the country.

Members of the Party say: "We must get the corporations. Strangle them". That is what they did in Manitoba. They say that they should be got rid of.

Mr. Cassidy: That is the law in the United States. What is wrong with that?

Mr. Kilgour: The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre used to be a financial writer. He should know that individuals ultimately pay taxes. Corporations, as he knows, just pass them on in increased prices.

Mr. Cassidy: The Hon. Member for Edmonton—Strathcona wants no corporate taxes. That is what he is saying.

Mr. Kilgour: I have never said that at all. In fact many companies should pay higher taxes. But if the Hon. Member thinks that the answer is to strangle the golden goose, whatever company it is, to the point that the goose expires on the floor and with it its jobs—

Mr. Cassidy: The Hon. Member is speaking out of both sides of his mouth. He is for higher corporate taxes and lower corporate taxes.

Mr. Kilgour: His training at the London School of Economics was grossly deficient. Even *perestroika*, *glasnost* and the East Bloc recognize that incentives are needed. If cement is poured on an economy, which can be done with higher taxes, then nothing is created but fewer jobs, less productive employment and less of a future for everybody in society.

Mr. Cassidy: So 60,000 profitable companies should go tax-free?

Mr. Kilgour: I have written against that. Those companies should pay taxes. I am in favour of corporations paying taxes.

Mr. Cassidy: So you are in favour of a minimum tax? Are you with us or against us?

Mr. Kilgour: I am against what the Party of the Hon. Member will do to the business climate of the country. I am saying that they will do exactly to the business climate of Canada what was done to the business climate in British Columbia, Manitoba, Saskatchewan. Thank goodness there is no electorate in Canada today which wants to put up with the type of things that the Party will do to the business climate in Canada.

Mr. Cassidy: The Yukon has an NDP Government, and it is doing a damn fine job.

Mr. Kilgour: The only point my hon. friend forgets is that right now in the Yukon there are 23,000 people, men, women and children and they have all kinds of special problems. I accept that and agree with them fully. What works in the Yukon will not work in Ontario. I can think of nothing that would create unemployment faster, especially for the riding of the Hon. Member, than the tax policies that some of his more radical colleagues—and I will not name them for him—would impose. I can think of nothing that would do it faster. I can think of nothing that would create more havoc in this country.

• (1830)

Mr. Keeper: Why is unemployment so low in Manitoba with an NDP Government?

Mr. Kilgour: The Member asks why unemployment is lower in Manitoba. I am sure he is perfectly aware that it is because it has a more diversified economy than any other province in western Canada.

Mr. Cassidy: Who created that diversified economy? It was the good management of the NDP Government.

Mr. Kilgour: The Member is arguing that the New Democratic Party Government has created a diversified economy in Manitoba. He knows that is totally false. There are many factors involved going back to the turn of the century and the entrepreneurial spirit of Manitobans, the multicultural nature of the population, and many other things. Surely the Member would not be so foolish as to tell the House that it has anything to do with the past NDP Governments of that province. The economy of that province did well in spite of the governments in office, not because of them. Obviously approximately 80 per cent of Manitobans agreed with that view a fewer months ago.

Mr. Keeper: Do you acknowledge that the unemployment was low in Manitoba, not high, as you predicted?

Mr. Kilgour: Of course it was low. I explained to the Member that it was lower because there were less Manitobans working in the—

Mr. Cassidy: That is after 15 or 18 years of NDP government, almost two decades of good government with the NDP.

Mr. Kilgour: I believe I am being heckled, Mr. Speaker.

In Manitoba there were less people working in the resource sector, and more people working in the garment industry, in services, insurance, and all of the other sectors which were more stable during times when resource prices were very bad. Please let us put an end to the canard that the NDP policies in Manitoba had anything to do with the diversity in that province.

Perhaps the Hon. Member for Regina West can explain why, when the Blakeney or Douglas government was in office, a community like Lloydminster, which is on the Saskatchewan side and on the Alberta side, looked like a balloon. As the Member knows, most development was on the Alberta side of Lloydminster. Anyone who could would live on the Alberta side, and anybody who could not do otherwise would have to live on the Saskatchewan side. The Member is smiling, but I hope he will rise and explain why Lloydminster, Alberta, did well, grew, had good infrastructure, and a growing population, and Lloydminster, Saskatchewan, was like a dwarf beside a giant.

Obviously, a great deal had to do with taxation policies and business climate. Since my time is up, I simply wish to make the point that I agree that each and every tech corporation should pay a proper and fair tax based on the ability to pay. But to let this bunch ever get their hands on the levers of the economy of Canada would do to Canada what they have done to the three western provinces.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion moved by Mr. Murphy and seconded by Mr. Benjamin, the Chair finds to be in order.

On debate the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray).

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, the more Canadians understand the tax reform legislation of the Government, the more they will realize they have been the victims of a gigantic Conservative scam. The Conservatives are attempting to convince Canadians that they will benefit from this legislation through lower taxes. The facts are quite to the contrary. Starting July 1 of this year Canadians, on the surface, are having less federal taxes withheld from their paycheques. However, what they are getting by way of tax reductions amounts to a small fraction of the billions of dollars that have been taken from middle and lower-income Canadians since the Conservatives took office in September, 1984.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) claims that his tax reform will exempt approximately 850,000 lower income persons from paying tax. The Minister omits the fact that his own measures were responsible for taxing an additional one million Canadians. This situation is mainly the result of the partial deindexation of the tax system, and the elimination of the federal tax reduction. Most people who are exempted under this legislation were put on the tax rolls in the first place by the Conservative Government. If we compare the total amount of tax that will be paid by taxpayers in 1988, after tax reform, with that paid in 1984 when the Conservatives took power, we realize that only families with incomes more than $117,000 a year will pay less tax in 1988 than in 1984. Those families account for the top 1 per cent of all Canadian families. Some tax reform! The Conservative tax reform is aimed at helping the top 1 per cent of Canadian families, not the millions of middle and lower-income families who were promised relief by the Conservatives but who will get just the opposite.

In *The Windsor Star* on Monday, June 27, 1988, Brian Bannon, the Star's Business Reporter noted:

> Three dollars.
>
> That's what "the most significant tax reform in Canadian history" will add to the average Windsor resident's next paycheque.
>
> After July 1, the long-awaited tax cuts promised by Finance Minister Michael Wilson start showing up on payrolls across Canada. But before you celebrate, check your take-home pay.
>
> If you are married with two children under age 19, earn $35,000 a year in wages and your spouse earns nothing, your weekly paycheque will rise from $512 to about $515.
>
> That's better than nothing—an extra $156 a year—but accountants like Windsor's Christopher Renaud question whether it really lives up to all the rhetoric from Ottawa.
>
> "With all the hoopla", he said, "you would expect more".

Here is the truth about the so-called Tory tax reform for the type of people whom I represent in Windsor, Ontario. One can see why I describe the Tory tax reform legislation we are debating today as nothing more than a gigantic Conservative scam, an attempt to fool millions of middle and lower-income Canadians and to try and convince them that they are actually paying lower taxes because of Conservative initiatives. The facts are quite the opposite.

When one takes into account all the increases in personal income tax, federal sales tax, and excise tax, the reduction of $156 a year, $3 a week, for that family with two children under age 19 earning $35,000, would appear to be wiped out, and that family would still be far behind where it was in 1984 before the Conservatives took office because of all the other increases in taxes.

Let us look at some examples: sales tax was increased from 9 to 10 per cent on October 1, 1984, and another $1 billion was taken out of the pockets of middle and lower-income Canadians by the Conservative Government; there was an increase from 10 to 11 per cent on January 1, 1986, and another $1 billion was ripped from the pockets of middle and lower-income Canadians by the Conservative Government.

• (1840)

There was an increase from 11 to 12 per cent in sales taxes on April 1, 1986, another 1 billion ripped from the pockets of middle and lower-income Canadians by the Conservative Government. On July 1, 1985, and on July 1, 1987, there was an extension of the sales tax to candy, soft drinks, health goods, dental instruments, even snack foods, another $460 million taken from the pockets, not just of middle and lower-income Canadians, but even children who want a little snack on their way home from school.

What about the increased excise tax on gasoline, totalling some five cents a litre, between the September 3, 1985, to the April 1, 1988? Here we have an increase of over $2 billion. In a country like Canada, obviously for most Canadians it is essential to drive a car. They cannot write it off as some kind of business expense, like many of the top 1 per cent, who, the statistics show, will be the only ones really benefiting from this Tory tax reform.

What a contrast the way individual Canadians, middle and lower-income Canadians, are treated by this Conservative Government through this tax reform legislation with the way the larger corporations are going to be treated. Even after tax reform, some 60,000 profitable corporations will still pay no tax. Yes, the number will be reduced from 100,000 to 60,000, but 60,000 will still pay no tax.

Even after the implementation of a minimum tax, 5,220 taxpayers who earned over $50,000 did not pay one cent of tax in 1986. There is nothing in this Conservative tax reform legislation that cures that serious defect in the Conservative approach to so-called fairer taxation in this country. There is no doubt about the Conservative approach to tax reform. What a contradiction in terms to call this legislation tax reform. There is no doubt that it is to the detriment of middle-income taxpayers and small businesses.

I think it is clear from what I have just said and from the facts that I have put on the record why, when the next election comes—and I believe it should be very soon—the bulk of people in this country, middle and lower-income Canadians, will say no when asked whether they approve of the Conservative Government, especially in its approach to fair taxation. What the Conservative Government is trying to do through this legislation for middle and lower-income Canadians is definitely not fair for them.

Look at what the Institute for Research on Public Policy said in a recent study, as reported by Brian Bannon in *The Windsor Star* for Monday, June 27:

> In fact, middle-income individuals who see their take-home pay increase after July 1 are really no better off when compared with 1984.
>
> The Institute for Research on Public Policy, an Ottawa-based think tank, says that tax increases imposed since the Conservative federal government took over in 1984, took away more than tax reform gives back.

This is a confirmation of the point I made at the beginning of my remarks. On behalf of middle and lower-income Canadians, I say that this is not tax reform. This legislation is a gigantic tax scam at the expense of millions of middle and lower-income Canadians who deserve better from this Government, and they are not getting it.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, I hope I get a chance to speak on this Bill three or four times. I have a couple of hours' worth of material which will have to be put into 10-minute speeches, which will not be easy.

I want to say that all this Parliament has to do—starting tonight—is blow the dust off the Carter Royal Commission on taxation of 1966. For the ensuing two or three years, when the Government of that day refused to act, Mr. Carter, like Mr. Justice Emmett Hall, finally got angry and went public. The tragedy is that he died of cancer before his intervention in the public domain. He was unable to have the time to force the Government of that day to implement real tax reform, that a buck is a buck and no matter how you earn it, it is taxable.

He called for—and many others have called for, including members in all the political Parties—some fundamental changes to the tax system in this country.

I listened to the Hon. Member from Edmonton a few minutes ago who dredged up mythology, falsehoods and inaccuracies from 30, 40 and 50 years ago which I thought had been so thoroughly discredited that nobody, not even a Conservative, would have the gall to even raise them again. He talked about depopulation in Saskatchewan, under the CCF. Under Conservative and Liberal Governments in that province from 1923 to 1944, we lost 400,000 people. In the equivalent period, under Tommy Douglas and the CCF, we regained more than half of that number. Then, under 11 years of Al Blakeney, our population got back up to the million mark.

No matter what the numbers are, the point is that we have always had a different social regime in our province. Even Liberals and Tories did not dare abolish programs that we have started. They have nickelled away at them, they have undermined them, they have reduced their effectiveness, they have increased the cost to consumers, but they have not dared to do away with them. It would be political suicide for them to do so, and they know it.

The costs of services that the people of Canada need and want have to be shared equitably by every taxpayer, no matter who they are or what their station in life is. Those below the poverty line must be totally exempt from the tax system. The only way that you get them to the position of paying some of their share of taxation—which they would like to do if you could get them to an income level where they would be willing and able to—is to put them to work and provide them with the services that every Canadian needs, rich or poor.

Every one of those services paid for through our tax system is shared by everyone. It is what we like to call a co-operative commonwealth. Taxes paid for services like drugs and senior citizens, housing and chronic care beds and air ambulances and telephones and power and automobile insurance and a host of other things, are essential public services. They are not businesses; they are services. I include the Post Office in that. It is not a business; it is a public service.

• (1850)

There are no taxpayers in this country, no citizens that I have ever heard of other than someone from the Chamber of Commerce, or from the Tories, who complain about the deficit in the Post Office. The deficit is shared by all taxpayers in the country. Their first priority is service. It should not only be priority post, it should be priority service.

I want to mention something since the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) was being so vitriolic about us. Under a Liberal regime toward the middle or the end of the Korean War, we had something called corporate tax deferrals. As of this day there are between $35 billion and $40 billion of unpaid corporation taxes on the books of this country. That is a debt. If you look at the annual reports of corporations whether Canadian Pacific Investments, Canadian Pacific Limited, Inco, Bell Telephone, Air Canada, CNR, you name it, it does not matter whether it is a private or a public corporation, they have hundreds of millions of dollars of deferred corporate taxes on their books carried as liabilities. But the little corner grocery store owner, the farmer and the fisherman cannot defer their taxes. Neither can we. We have to pay them. If we are late, we are charged interest.

Canadian Pacific Limited, one of my favourite friends, owes something in the order of between $1.5 billion and $2 billion in deferred corporation taxes which will never be paid. International Nickel and Bell Telephone owe that much or more. The Government of Canada has something near $40 billion in taxes receivable which will never be paid.

If the Government were to charge those corporations just the straight bank rate of interest, the Government would pick up between $3 billion and $4 billion in extra tax revenues. That is a cheap loan, at the moment it is is an interest free loan. The theory was if you let corporations defer their taxes they would invest the money in new equipment, new plants and would create more jobs. That was the theory. They did. International Nickel, Canadian Pacific and Bell got investments like you would not believe in Mexico, Chile, Indonesia and anywhere else in the world you want to go. When 3,000 men were laid off in the Sudbury area, International Nickel opened a new mine in Chile. That is where deferred taxes went. Nobody should be allowed to defer tax until they can prove that the money was invested in this country and nowhere else.

Mr. Forrestall: I agree.

Mr. Benjamin: I could not get a single Tory or a Liberal Government in the 20 years I have been here—and it is my anniversary in a couple of days. They all agree as my hon. friend from Dartmouth—Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) agrees—to do it. We have tens of thousands of Canadians on high incomes. We have thousands of Canadian corporate leaders, making $2,000, $3,000 and $4,000 a day.

Mr. Forrestall: That is not true.

Mr. Benjamin: And we have farmers losing farms and fishermen losing their boats and little storekeepers going broke. These high earning guys have tax benefits, preferred stock options that are non-taxable. They have tax dividend credits. The president of the one corporation I know makes $4,000 a day. That is more money than 90 per cent of Canadians make in one, two or three months. Do not talk to me about private enterprise, free enterprise and market forces when you allow that kind of an unfair system to prevail. It is so patently unfair.

This Government said it would do something. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) in the television debate, after the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), our Leader, raised the subject about tax fairness and tax reform, said: "You are right, Ed". That was four years ago. The Hon. Member for Oshawa is still right and the Prime Minister is still wrong. We still do not have tax reform. We have nothing but the juggling of the books. I will keep talking until you cut me off, Mr. Speaker. Do you want to do it now?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Benjamin: Go ahead.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member. Debate. The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, the amendment put forward by the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) calls for the inclusion in the total amendment on this particular Bill the requirement that there be a corporate minimum tax. I will read it. We are saying that Bill C-139 as it stands right now should not be brought forward at this time among other reasons because the Bill fails to ensure that corporations make a fair and regular contribution to federal tax revenues by imposing a minimum corporate tax.

Mr. Forrestall: Who is the author of that?

Mr. Cassidy: I am the author of that, Mr. Speaker. As the spokesperson on taxation and finance for the New Democratic Party, I am proud of the last two and a half years in a very responsible way to put forward policies which will be fair to average Canadians, not the kind of Tory tax reform we have been having which seems to be much fairer to people who are rich and to corporations than it is to the average citizen.

After Conservative tax reform there will still be some 60,000 Canadian corporations which are profitable and which each year will not pay any tax at all. Is that easy to defend? I do not think it is. When we begin to tax families below the poverty line and when we begin to tax individuals far below the poverty line, why is it that we turn around and have this unusual consideration for all these profitable corporations, not loss making, but profitable corporations, leaving them in a position where they do not pay any tax at all?

You may recall that I indicated the concerns of my colleagues in the New Democratic Party over the question of the unfairness of the tax system which in 1983, and I believe in 1984 and 1985 as well, took more in income tax from a teller working for the Royal Bank of Canada than it took from the Royal Bank of Canada in its multibillion dollar entirety. There is something wrong and fundamentally unfair about that.

I heard with interest the comments of the Hon. Member for Edmonton—Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour). I was glad he entered the debate but I was confused by what he had to say. I think perhaps the Conservatives are somewhat confused about this as well. They have tried to wrap themselves in the rhetoric of progressive tax reform, but as in so many other things that is a deception, a snare. It is false and it is wrong. They are legitimizing and perpetuating tax privileges for wealthy Canadians.

Wealthy Canadians get an average tax cut of $4,165 whereas the average Canadian at $25,000 a year, a very modest income, gets a cut of only $140. Average Canadians will pay more tax under the Tories after four years despite tax reform. Wealthy Canadians will pay less tax under the Tories after four years because of tax reform.

I have a couple more things I want to put on the record which I think are extremely significant. I have the summary for taxpayers which was released last December by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson). On the front page it says "Lower rates, fairer system". What is fair about this, Mr. Speaker? Income earners from $20,000 to $25,000 pay a marginal rate of federal and provincial tax at 26 per cent. If their income goes from just over the poverty line of $25,000 to $30,000, their marginal rate rises to 38 per cent. If their income goes from $30,000 to $40,000, just getting into the middle-income range, then they pay a marginal income rate of 46 per cent.

• (1900)

It is interesting that if these couples then go from $40,000 to $50,000, the marginal rate is 40 per cent, actually lower. If they go from $50,000 to $60,000, the Government's own figures indicate that the marginal rate is lower again, 43 per cent. If they go from $60,000 to $75,000, the marginal rate bounces back up to 46 per cent.

Beyond that, if Mr. Jean de Grandpré, the Chairman of Bell Canada Enterprises, gets an increase in his income from $1 million to $1,100,000 per year, he too pays a marginal rate of 46 per cent, give or take 1 per cent. There is something fundamentally wrong with that when a family not far above the poverty line will be paying the same marginal rate of tax as one of the high-priced corporate executives with an income of $500,000 or $1 million a year. In fact, the Conservatives have actually used the language of tax reform but have put in place a flat tax for most Canadians.

It is interesting that while the Conservatives copied that flat tax from the United States, when it came to a progressive measure found in the United States, the minimum tax on corporations which is a part of the package Congress put into force just two years ago, the Conservatives were not prepared to adopt that measure. The Conservatives in Canada are even softer on corporate taxation than the Republicans in Ronald Reagan's America. I find something reprehensible about that.

The Americans are taking increases in corporate taxes at about three or four times the rate of the increase taken here in Canada. The average of the contribution to federal tax revenues from corporations after tax reform will be a lower percentage of total tax revenues in Canada than it was in 1984 when the Progressive Conservatives took power.

I know that my time is limited, but I was just looking at some very significant calculations which I would like to note on the record. These are some figures prepared by Trestet Resources, a firm which did an excellent analysis for the Finance Committee, which it submitted to us a few months ago.

Taking the example of one earner with two children earning $30,000 a year, this report indicates that that family was paying $3,300 in income tax in 1984. That figure has gone up to $4,436 in 1988 before reform, it will drop to $4,200 after reform and rise again to about $5,000 in 1991 if we take it all in real dollars. This means, as we have been saying all along, that Tory tax reform is not tax reform at all.

People come to us and say that they are puzzled about their taxation rates, they feel that they are paying more but they cannot put their fingers on it. That is because it is hard to remember what we were paying four or five years ago. However, average Canadians are paying more and more under the Conservatives. They are being soaked one way or the other.

That same family making $30,000 a year paid in consumption taxes $1,575 in 1984, up to $1,800 before tax reform, a bit higher after tax reform and up to $1,925 in 1991, post-tax reform. Over-all, the taxation on that family under the Progressive Conservatives will have risen from about $4,900 in 1984 to about $6,900 in real dollars in 1991. That is a measure of how duplicitous the Conservatives have been with their tax reform.

These figures show as well that the increase in the tax burden over that period of time has been the highest for families earning average incomes. What about wealthy Canadians? They are actually paying less or getting very small increases in their tax burdens.

We will be fighting an election very shortly. I will be talking about how the Progressive Conservatives have ignored my constituents of Ottawa Centre. I know that my colleagues from Hamilton Mountain, Winnipeg North Centre and Regina will be talking about how Tory tax reform has ignored their constituents as well.

My constituents expected fairness when tax reform came down the pipe. They did not expect to see the rich pay less while average Canadians paid more. My constituents expected fairness. They did not expect to see corporations continuing to go tax-free while families living below the poverty line had to pay more. My constituents expected fairness. They did not expect a tax system in which the Conservatives held back the sales tax reforms because they were going to soak average Canadians with increases in sales taxes if they managed to get themselves re-elected.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, Canadians are intitled to fiscal fairness. They did not get it from the Progressive Conservative Government. I ask all Members here in the House to support our subamendment which calls for a measure of fairness by imposing a minimum tax on corporations. It exists in the United States, even under President Ronald Reagan. I don't see why it could not exist here, to ensure that we have a fair system and to make sure that all corporations that are making a profit pay taxes every year.

That is our amendment, Mr. Speaker. It is part of our campaign for fiscal fairness and for a government that is honest and fair to its citizens.

[*English*]

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would have liked to have had an opportunity to pose questions, but I understand that that is not possible right now. I want to focus on the NDP amendment, which is an amendment to the Liberals' amendment. Today we have taken some time in the House to point out the inadequacies of the Government's policy on taxation and the unfairness of the Government's approach to taxation. It is not surprising that the Liberals would be able to come up with an amendment that appears to make sense.

The Liberals are basically saying that this House opposes in principle the taxation measures of the Government because the Bill seeks to impose a tax system that first is lacking in progressivity. What is that? Progressivity simply means that those who earn little pay little in taxes and those who earn a lot would be expected to pay a lot in taxes. It means that those who can afford to pay ought to be able to pay. It is a great principle.

Second, the Liberals say that the tax system places unfair burdens on families. That is true and it ought to be stated. Third, the Liberals state that the tax system unjustly taxes middle-income earners. That as well is true, and I spoke earlier today about the very heavy tax burden that has been placed on the middle-income earners of Canada.

Fourth, the Liberals say that the new tax system is more complex than the one presently in place. Anyone who had to fill out a tax form or who had to hire someone to fill out a tax form knows that the taxation system is very complex. There is a need for simplicity as long as that simplicity leads to greater justice in the tax system.

The fifth and sixth points made by the Liberal Party are the ones that I find interesting. The Liberals say that the new tax system discourages capital formation and reduces the competitiveness of Canadian corporations. Obviously we need capital in order to have economic growth, and our firms must be competitive, so those are good points. However, that is where the Liberals stopped. Therefore, we moved an amendment adding that we oppose the Bill because the Bill fails to ensure that corporations make a fair and regular contribution to federal tax revenues by imposing a minimum corporate tax.

• (1910)

We seek to complete the circle. The Liberals have indicated they are in favour of those things that will help people, such as a progressive tax system, because the burden is unjustly laid upon middle income earners. They make that point but fail to explain how the revenue loss will be made up. When they deal with the corporate side of the ledger, they deal only with the need of corporations to be competitive and a necessity for the tax system to recognize that fact. They fail to deal with the other side of the ledger, which is that if we are to relieve the tax burden on ordinary families, as they suggest in their motion, then we have to find the revenue some place.

We in this Party believe in putting the whole picture before Canadians. The place to find that revenue is from those corporations which are making profits but not now paying taxes. I understand there are some 60,000 of them. Our amendment points out that if we are to have a just tax system, if we are to give some relief to ordinary Canadian families, it will have to come from those who now get away without paying any taxes.

The Liberals fail to recognize the problem and fail to provide the solution. They criticize the Government, which is a necessary part of being in opposition, but if you want to change the situation, you must have a solution to the problems. The Liberal motion does not do that.

That is why, when I spoke earlier today, I indicated that when Canadians look for an alternative to the tax policies they have experienced over the last four years and they look to the Liberal Party, they are looking in the wrong place and they will inevitably be disillusioned.

That is why we moved this motion. The amendment introduced by the Liberal Party was only a half measure. It was like trying to take a step by lifting up your foot and forgetting to put it down again. They have identified the problem but failed to outline the solution.

We think that problems should not only be identified, they should be solved. We think what is needed is not just a change in government but a change in direction. What is needed is not only a capacity to analyse the injustices in society, but a capacity to take the action necessary to solve those injustices and bring about a better community for all Canadians.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on the subamendment (Mr. Murphy).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion (Mr. Murphy) negatived.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The next question is on the amendment. Debate.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to complete the second stage of my debate.

Mr. Forrestall: Yes, you said you would keep us here until Christmas.

Mr. Benjamin: I will do the 10 minutes on the amendment if you do not mind.

Mr. Forrestall: It is becoming boring.

Mr. Benjamin: I want to raise another matter concerning tax reform and deregulation in the free trade deal which has been festering for months now. Much has been made in the discussions and debate in this House and in the country about privatization, deregulation, free trade, and having a level playing field. It is nice to have a level playing field but what is happening now, before this Bill is passed, before deregulation is fully in place, before the trade deal is in effect, is that we have a level playing field and the other guy has the ball on our 10-yard line. In this case I want to refer to what is happening in transportation, particularly the trucking industry and the railroads.

With the passage of the National Transportation Act, the Motor Vehicle Transportation Act and with the passage of this tax legislation, we will have a situation where Canadian trucking companies will establish profit centres, or whatever they call them in the U.S. This is happening already.

• (1920)

CP Transport has already bought three American companies and closed its biggest Canadian general freight companies. Several Canadian trucking companies are leasing their tractors and trailers in the United States. This is partly because of the Motor Vehicle Transportation Act. We were assured that the purpose of that Act was to get a uniform code of regulations in the 10 provinces and the two Territories at the national level. There is now more chaos than ever before. All you need do is ask the Canadian Trucking Association or any individual trucking company, large or small, anywhere in Canada.

Why is that happening, Mr. Speaker? Let us refer back to the level playing field. Under the so-called tax reform of the Government, a Canadian trucker would be crazy to keep his operation headquartered in Canada. The Conference Board reports that the difference between fuel taxes in the States of New York and Illinois as compared to Ontario, where most of the big trucking operations are located, is the main culprit. The Government proposes to move to a sales tax regime. The Conference Board points out that the difference between the sales taxes and the difference between the corporation taxes means that the Canadian trucking industry is at a severe disadvantage under both this tax Bill and the Motor Vehicle Transportation Act—deregulation.

In the United States a trucking company's tractor is considered three-year property and they can write it off in three years. The trailer is five-year property and they write it off in five years. A Canadian trucker, under Canadian tax law and under this tax reform Bill, has to take seven, eight, or 10 years to write off his equipment.

When you add the differences in the fuel taxes to the depreciation provisions of the tax laws, both state and national in the United States and provincial and federal in Canada, you would be crazy to keep your business headquartered in Canada. People in the trucking industry tell me that many of them have already moved, are in the process of moving, or are negotiating to merge with, buy up, or establish what they call a profit centre, and it will be south of the 49th parallel.

Not only is the playing field not level, the ball is on our 10-yard line and the other guy has it. That is not tax reform, that is not fair taxation. Unless the Government is prepared to amend our tax laws—and I don't give a darn how it does that, whether through rebates on fuel taxes for cross-border traffic or provisions for faster depreciation write-offs—the playing field remains unlevel and our smaller truckers go out of business and the bigger ones go across the border.

The case is similar in the railroads. United States railroads have fast tax write-offs on rolling stock. They have lower fuel taxes, as do the trucking companies there, and they do not allow competitive line rates. However, under our deregulation and tax law, that is allowed in Canada. American railroads can come into Canada and even use Canadian railroad tracks on competitive line rates. However, a Canadian railroad cannot go to the United States because neither the national American Government nor any of their 50 states allow competitive line rates. What are the Tories giving us? They are giving us a crock and it's full of you-know-what.

Not only is this totally unfair to major sectors of our transportation industry, it is driving them out of business in Canada or driving them out of Canada. That has to be the height of economic and social stupidity. Only the organizational genius of a Tory Government could arrange to do that. The Government handed $23 million over to the provinces which are still running in 10 different directions. We are nowhere near a uniform code of safety, performance, and maintenance anywhere in Canada. That is what was promised by the Government.

My hon. friend sitting down the way to my right from the mountains of B.C. sat in the committee too and heard that. I invite him to call up the Canadian Truckers Association and ask about that. I dare him to do so.

Mr. Belsher: I have.

Mr. Benjamin: Then he got an earful. I expect him to make a speech in support of this amendment and we will all be happier with at least one Tory Member in this place.

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate tonight. It was one year ago yesterday that I was elected to this House. I spent a lot of time before that on the doorsteps of the people in Hamilton Mountain. That was just at the time that the White Paper had come out and people were talking about it. The first day that the White Paper hit the news media and people heard about it they rejoiced because they read all the jingo about the progressive tax system and how good things were going to be. It did not take more than 48 hours before they started to read between the lines and the people of Hamilton Mountain were not very happy with the so-called tax reform.

Hamilton Mountain is not a community with a lot of great riches, although we do not have a lot of deep poverty. We work hard and many people have been able to purchase their homes. The people there are not greedy. If they can live with a decent standard of living after having worked hard, they think that is fair and just.

The people have recognized that tax exemptions are not a progressive approach. They started to examine what was happening with tax exemptions. A tax exemption which is very useful to ordinary working people and to retired working people is the $1,000 interest exemption. That was wiped out. The immediate response to that was that they may have been getting an unfair advantage, so perhaps it is fair.

• (1930)

They began reading between the lines to see that there were huge tax shelters and tax expenditures that would not be phased out until after 1992. People with a lot of disposable income were still able to shelter that income while people in my community cannot do so. It has really hurt them.

When we compare what is happening to people with different levels of income, we see that those earning $15,000 or less will have a savings of $90 in 1988, according to the Government's figures and its White Paper. While that is not a lot, someone earning $15,000 a year would be grateful for it.

However, when they learn that someone earning over $100,000 a year gets a saving of $1,615, families and retired people in Hamilton Mountain say that is unfair. They do not mind giving up the shelter if it helps other people, but not when this so-called tax reform only helps the rich.

In percentage terms, it is .8 per cent of savings for the poor and 1 per cent of savings for people earning over $100,000 a year. That is certainly not fair. Those figures do not take into account the various taxes that are involved, so even those numbers are false as far as the Government's information to the people is concerned. The Government does not have the courage to discuss the real situation.

Canadians have talked about tax reform since 1968. Yet we are digging ourselves deeper into a chaotic and messy tax system. The way an efficient and accountable government would approach tax reform is to make it a system that people understand. The Government has done the opposite. It has increased taxes consistently since it was elected, only to introduce the rebate this year. It held on to that rebate until July so that it would look larger than it actually is. It is manipulating people who are working hard to make ends meet within their personal budgets.

The Government is not being honest about its own expenditures. It is hiding taxes within the sales tax at the federal level. One cannot see that tax when paying for an item at the cash register. People of Hamilton Mountain are most annoyed that the Government continues to think it can manipulate them. They are insulted and outraged. They resent this so-called tax reform.

My constituents began looking at the implications of this tax reform on their own lives. They are even more insulted by the fact that tax shelters have been extended so that those who can well afford to pay more taxes not only have a reduced tax rate, their tax shelters are allowed to continue. There has been a constant history of lobbies to continue the tax shelters that are extremely beneficial to the rich. They do not do anything for the economy, and studies have shown that tax shelters do not work as a social tool, especially when there is no accountability to the House of Commons.

The Auditor General has been asking for action for years. The Government has refused to take action. The former Government refused to take action. There is no way of measuring the implication of tax shelters.

It is outrageous that the Government even dares to call this tax reform. It is time the Conservative Government told Canadians that it is really trying to skewer the tax system more than ever to make sure the rich get even bigger breaks than they have had while ordinary working Canadian families have to carry the burden for people to buy their nuclear submarines. It is a disgrace. The sooner we get rid of the Conservative Government the better.

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, the Government's proposal is not tax reform, it is a sham.

This Bill has been dressed up in the rhetoric of genuine reform. When he introduced this package, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) stated: "We all know the tax system allows many profitable corporations to avoid paying their fair share of tax year after year. We all know that it allows some people with very high incomes to pay less tax than the average Canadian wage earner year after year".

After hearing this rhetoric, one would assume that the Minister would follow through with measures to prevent the wealthy individuals from paying less tax than low income people year after year. One would have thought that he would introduce measures to prevent large and profitable corporations from not paying any tax year after year.

When everything is said and done, he has not done that. Right now, an individual will begin paying tax when earning $6,220 a year. Someone living in Ottawa, for example, earning $518 a month will pay at least $250 a month for shelter. That leaves $268 for food, clothing, transportation, telephone and medical bills. The Government is expecting that individual to pay tax as well.

Senior citizens with an income of $6,220 per year are expected to pay tax while there are still many wealthy individuals with incomes well over $75,000 or $100,000 a year who will not pay one cent of tax. There are about 60,000 profitable corporations that do not pay a cent of tax.

• (1940)

In 1986, PWA, with income totalling $39 million, did not pay one cent of tax. In 1986, Union Carbide of Canada with income totalling $28 million did not pay a cent of tax. Somehow those large corporations can make hundreds of millions of dollars and yet pay not one cent of tax while the senior citizen with a bare income of $6,220 per year, $518 per month, is expected to pay tax. Is there no shame? Is there no sense of justice? What we hear is rhetoric from the Minister. We all know that it allows some people with very high incomes to pay less tax than the average Canadian wage-earner year after year. We all know it allows those who are able to use special tax breaks to shift the burden to those less able to carry it.

He is right on. Why in heaven's name did he not introduce a tax package that would correct those inequities, that would ensure that profitable corporations paid their fair share, that would ensure that those who have high incomes, who benefit the most from the wealth of this country, pay their fair share? That would be far better than making those low-income individuals with incomes of some $500 per month carry the burden.

When I see members of the Government standing up in the House trying to perpetuate the myth that this income tax measure is indeed going to reduce the tax burden on the poor and middle-income earners, I am surprised. Speaker after speaker, they stand up in this House and repeat these mistruths. It is as though we are living in *George Orwell's 1984*, where the philosophy was if you repeat an untruth often enough, people will begin to believe it.

It is true, as government Members claim, that compared to 1987 there will be a reduction in the income tax that people will have to pay, but compared to 1984, when the Tories were first elected, the vast majority of Canadians will be paying at least $1,000 per year more in taxes, even considering tax reform. The only group which will be paying less taxes are the very rich, those earning $100,000 or more per year. They will pay less taxes in 1988 than they paid in 1984. They are the true winners in the smoke and mirrors that is called tax reform which was introduced by this Government.

It should not be surprising that this is the type of legislation the Government has introduced. This Government basically believes in the old trickle down theory which is that if the guys at the top are doing all right, eventually the benefits will trickle down. It is something like the notion that if you feed the horse a lot of oats, eventually the sparrow will get some. With this legislation, the horse will get a lot of oats. Some of the very wealthy in this country will see a tax savings of over $4,000 a year. But the benefits will not trickle down. It will not increase employment. It will not ensure that there will be an increase in productivity and that the wealth will be shared.

Mr. Forrestall: Why not?

Mr. de Jong: If the Hon. Member would care to read even basic text, he would find that a lot of the excess wealth is used for corporate takeovers. With this legislation, companies gobbling up other companies will still be able to deduct those expenses as a business cost, can you imagine, Mr. Speaker. Another reason why the trickle down theory does not work is that the $4,000, or whatever extra dollars these rich individuals save on their income tax, will most probably be spent in Mexico, Italy or Morocco.

The third reason the trickle down theory does not work is that people can only spend so much, and their excess wealth is invested in places outside this country. We have seen this. We have seen the outflow of investment from Canada increase in the years the Tories have been in power, creating no jobs, causing no increase in productivity in Canada.

The theory of Ronald Reagan, Margaret Thatcher and our home grown Tories that assumes that if the guys at the top are doing quite all right eventually the people below will begin to benefit is a theory that has not worked. It is a theory that has resulted in armies of homeless people across the United States and in Great Britain. It has resulted in soup kitchens and food banks in this country. The wealthiest countries in the history of the human race have poverty in every major city. That is the result of these bad economic theories and I am afraid we cannot support the main motion. We will be supporting the amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, as the debate on Bill C-139 is nearing completion I too would like to make my contribution. The amendment we are debating at the present time, moved by my colleague the Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau) is quite harsh because we on this side of the House feel that tax reform will be extremely harmful to Canadian taxpayers. The amendment moved by my colleague goes straight to the point and enumerates the main flaws of the Income Tax Act reform that was introduced here in Parliament by the Conservative Government. Under this reform, the new tax system will not be sufficiently progressive. After tax reform, once it is passed, there will only be three statutory tax rates.

What is unfortunate is that the spread between the second and the third bracket is too narrow—there is only a three point spread— while it is too wide between the first and the second brackets, which means that middle-income taxpayers, who make up the majority of those who pay taxes in Canada, will tend to pay more tax and to move closer to the tax rates of high income earners than they should. This unprogressive tax rate scale means that tax reform lays an unfair burden on Canadian families. This so-called reform will mean that we will have to grapple with an income tax system that will be even more complex than what we had before, and that was complex enough.

Certain promises were made by the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to remind you of certain things, one of them being that in October 1986 the Minister of Finance stated in his document *Guidelines for Tax Reform in Canada* that one of the basic principles was the following, and I quote:

> . . . making the tax system simpler so that it is more readily understood by more Canadians.

Well, what has happened is quite the opposite. Canadians who found filling out their tax returns difficult before will now find themselves in an even more complex labyrinth. Let me quote the conclusions of the House Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs, which had this to say on the complexity of the new tax system. And I quote: It is disappointing for the Committee to draw the inevitable conclusion that the proposed tax reform has not successfully adressed the problem of simplifying the tax system. On the contrary, it has become a tax system that only tax specialists and tax lawyers will be able to understand completely. Furthermore, even after the introduction of a minimum tax, some 5,200 taxpayers with income of more than $50,000 did not pay one cent of income tax in 1986, and probably none in 1987 either—those statistics are not available yet—and what is even more unfortunate is that they will probably not pay any in 1988 nor in subsequent years since tax reform does not touch those people; only the minimum tax introduced earlier applies, and it still lets some people slip through the tax collector's net.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) claims that his tax reform will strike some 850,000 names from the taxpayers' list; 850,000 people will no longer pay tax. That is true! What the Minister forgets to say is that he himself had added approximately one million low-income Canadians to the tax roster and forced these people who did not pay income tax previously to join taxpayers' ranks with his successive income tax hikes in 1984, 1985, 1986, and 1987. So the fact that he is allowing 850,000 people to get off the hook shortly before the election is not a bad thing, but I hope these people realize that they are being handed a wooden nickel. The fact is that they were taxed before, and taxed abusively.

What is too easily forgotten, and it will be my pleasure to refresh everyone's memory, Mr. Speaker, is that this Minister of Finance and this Government levied more tax over a period of three and a half to four years than any government since Confederation. Allow me to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that when you yourself were elected to this House, in September 1984, we had a 9 per cent federal sales tax. It increased by 1 per cent in October 1984, bringing $1 billion a year into the Finance Minister's coffers. For my friends across the aisle, a billion dollars is a thousand million. That's big bucks!

In January 1986, the sales tax jumped again, from 10 to 11 per cent, bringing another $1 billion a year into the Government's coffers. Did it end there? Of course not! In April 1986, a mere three months after the increase I just described, the sales tax went up from 11 to 12 per cent, bringing in another billion. I think that the Hon. Member for Duvernay (Mr. Della Noce), who is showing me a graph representing the exponential rise of the sales tax in Canada, thus supports what I have said.

Never has a Government increased taxes as the Conservative Government has. In July 1985, taxes increased on candy, soft drinks, drugs, dental instruments, toothpaste, and so on, raising government revenues by $400 million a year.

I will skip the small increases of $60 million or $40 million. I am coming to the most important, the increases in gasoline excise tax. In September 1985, it went up two cents a litre, bringing the Government $900 million. In January 1987, another cent a litre increase, for my friend from Duvernay who knows gasoline well; this brought the Government $450 million. On February 19, 1987, as if people were not paying enough for their gasoline, there was another cent a litre tax, bringing $450 million more into the Finance Minister's pockets. And in April 1988, not so long ago . . . even as we speak, another . . .

Mr. Malépart: Another one!

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Yes, my colleague from Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) can't believe his ears. I am refreshing his memory. Another cent a litre on gasoline brought in another $450 million for the Minister of Finance. I don't understand where he finds pockets that are big enough to hold all that money!

And that's not all. Excise taxes on alcohol and tobacco went up to punish people with bad habits. In May 1985, an increase of these taxes raised government revenues by $340 million. In February 1986, they went after another $150 million. In that same month, February 1986, there were two increases, Mr. Speaker, that brought in a total of $70 million. In January 1988, more recently, another increase of $175 million hit smokers and drinkers.

But that's not all. There are people who need to make long distance calls to talk to their family at the other end of the country. They were hit with a 10 per cent tax on long distance calls. That does not seem like much, but it amounts to a lot of money. This tax was just imposed in January 1988 and, believe it or not, it brings the Minister of Finance a tidy $945 million a year. I am starting to understand where the Government found so much money to be able to spend $164 million to buy the election in Lac-Saint-Jean.

Only by looking at the public accounts did I realize where it was able to get all that money. So when somebody tells me that this tax reform is fair, equitable and equal for all Canadians, I say: No, it is unjust, inequitable and, because of the indirect taxes that I have just listed, it is regressive since it places a heavier burden on low-income wage earners. That is why my colleague from Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau) has moved an amendment I will support, and that is why we cannot support the government's Bill.

• (1950)

Mr. Grisé: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary for the Deputy Prime Ministre (Mr. Grisé) on a point of order.

Mr. Grisé: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault) just mentioned at the outset of his remarks that we had reached a point where closure would be invoked in this debate on Bill C-139. Therefore, I think you will find there is unanimous consent of the House to put this amendment and defer the vote until 6 p.m. on Monday, July 25 1988, and to vote on the main motion immediately after that deferred division on the amendment without debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the proposal made by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary for the Deputy Prime Minister. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Therefore the question is on the amendment standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: According to the agreement made earlier this day, the division stands deferred until Monday, July 25, at 6 p.m.

According to the other agreement made earlier this day, this House stands adjourned until Monday, July 25, at 11 a.m.

The House adjourned at 8.00 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, July 25, 1988

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to 14 petitions Nos. 332-4901 to 332-4903 inclusive; 332-5008 to 332-5013 inclusive; and 332-5015 to 332-5019 inclusive.

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

* * *

CANADA CHILD CARE ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Doug Lewis (for the Minister of National Health and Welfare) moves for leave to introduce Bill C-144, an Act to authorize payments by Canada towards the provision of child care services and to amend the Canada Assistance Plan in consequence thereof.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the Hon. Minister have leave to introduce the Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

ABORTION LAW INTERIM MEASURES ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mr. Howard Crosby (Halifax West) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-312, an Act to provide an interim measure respecting abortion and to amend the Criminal Code.

Mr. Speaker: Does the House give leave to introduce the Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Crosby: Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment of the time of the House to explain this Bill entitled the Canada Abortion Law Interim Measures Act. As you are aware, the House is about to begin debate on abortion law in Canada, and I wanted to say very clearly and categorically in a Bill what I perceive to be the position that the House can take if it desires to prohibit abortions to the extent permitted by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Therefore, I have taken it upon myself to draft and present to the House a Bill which prohibits abortion except where medically necessary.

It also contains an important exemption which I think allows for compliance with the Canadian Charter of Rights.

Even more important, the Bill also contains a provision requiring the Prime Minister to convene a conference of First Ministers to consider an amendment to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms to protect the life of the unborn. This would complete the right and privilege of making laws with respect to abortion so that a more effective law can be made in the future.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

• (1110)

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

[*English*]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, if I may reiterate the agreement of last week, it is the Government's intention to resume debate on Bill C-136. In accordance with the agreement, that debate will terminate at or before one o'clock. I would just like to point out that the Government has no intention of calling any further business before one o'clock and we will call it one o'clock once the debate on that Bill is finalized.

At three o'clock, after Question Period, the Government will call third reading of Bill C-82. I understand that there is no Private Members' Business today, so once the debate on Bill C-82 has terminated we would call it six o'clock and the deferred division on Bill C-82 and any deferred division on Bill C-136 would take place at that time.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the understanding. Is there agreement?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BROADCASTING ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed, from Tuesday, July 19, consideration of the motion of Miss MacDonald that Bill C-136, an Act respecting broadcasting and to amend certain Acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunication, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, the broadcasting Bill before us today gives us an opportunity to look at the state of broadcasting in Canada. Broadcasting is very important to Canadian culture. Watching television is a major form of recreation for Canadians from coast to coast as, of course, is listening to radio. People spend many hours a day watching television and it is said that children spend more hours before the television set than they do at school. Therefore, the type of material which is sent out to Canadians on our public airwaves is extremely significant.

Unfortunately, the Bill before us today is a step backward in the evolution of our broadcasting system. It is a great disappointment. There are some good things in the Bill but it is a severely flawed Bill. My list of congratulations is comparatively short and my disappointments comparatively long and relate to the most significant items.

We do not legislate in the area of broadcasting very often, only about every 20 years. Therefore, the fact that the Minister has missed the opportunity to bring in a good Bill is doubly disappointing. It is even more so since the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture gave a great deal of attention to the issue of broadcasting. We had an excellent task force report. The Caplan-Sauvageau report was thorough, comprehensive, detailed and exciting. That task force held hearings all across the country. It listened to Canadians and came up with a dynamic report.

Our committee studied that report and held hearings again to listen to Canadian consumers of broadcasting as participants, directors, performers, and broadcasters, private and public. All sectors of the system spoke to us and we listened carefully. Our report on changes in broadcasting contains some very good items, many of which did not make it into legislation.

Moreover, the Minister has tried to give the impression that this is a step forward and will result in more Canadianization. That, however, is not the case. There will be less. The standards required for Canadianization are going down. It is of what we do not see in the Bill and the slight changes in wording that we have to be most careful because that is how this deceptive act has been performed. They are small changes in terms of the number of words but critical changes in terms of the standards we set for the use of the public airwaves.

For both the private and public sectors in broadcasting there has been a diminution. We are not aiming as high as we could. Standards previously set, although not reached, are not even being set. One of the jokes that went along with the Caplan-Sauvageau report was that rather than making recommendations for a new Broadcasting Act the committee should recommend the re-legislation of the old Broadcasting Act with the added clause, "This time we mean it". Well, the Minister did not take that advice and this time she is not aiming even as high as the 1968 Broadcasting Act.

With regard to the requirements for Canadianization, Clause 3.(1)(d) says:

> —each element of the Canadian broadcasting system shall contribute in an appropriate manner to the creation and presentation of Canadian programming, making maximum use of Canadian creative and other resources;

We know that in the case of private broadcasting "making maximum use" has been paltry indeed. They are making enormous profits yet not contributing their fair share. Our committee said that in no uncertain terms and pointed out, as had the Caplan-Sauvageau report, the extensive profits and the availability which existed for Canadian programming. The Minister does not require that at all. Consistent with the financial and other resources available to private networks and programming undertakings they are supposed to, as indicated in Clause 3.(1)(p)(i):

> —contribute significantly to the creation and presentation of Canadian programming—

How much is "significantly"? They will tell you that it does not have to be very much at all because Canadians do not like Canadian programming. They do not have to be predominantly Canadian as was the requirement under the old Act. The 1968 Act said that the CBC should be predominantly Canadian, and private broadcasters at least had to be predominantly Canadian in their creative and other resources. The CRTC

interpreted that to mean at least above 50 per cent. The Act of 1958 said it should be predominantly Canadian for all, public and private, in content and character.

We see this watering down. In 1988 the content and character requirement is gone for the whole system, with the CBC the only one which has to be predominantly and distinctively Canadian. That is a real disappointment. I believe that our committee showed very adequately that the resources were available to the private sector to enable them to be really Canadian in their content and character. We know that the artistic resources are there. We have excellent performers, writers, producers, directors and so forth.

The CBC has also had a diminution in its role. Taking out only one word from the aims of the CBC results in a change of direction which is extremely important. The word "enlightenment" has been taken out. It used to be information, entertainment and enlightenment.

Information is, of course, news and public affairs programming. We all know what entertainment is. The CBC previously had a requirement to provide programming for enlightenment. This was a very important role. The CBC was the only source of this kind of programming for many people in Canada. By dropping this one term as a requirement for the CBC the Minister is telling us that the CBC does not have to fulfil this goal. Information, entertainment, and enlightenment remain a goal for the whole system, but the programming which will provide this enlightenment could be relegated to only the alternative broadcasting sources. We do not know very much about what will be provided. We do not know when they will be on stream or what they will do.

• (1120)

We question why that enlightenment function should be in the alternative sector rather than in the main thrust of the CBC, our public broadcasting system. It is a dereliction of duty and shows the sneaky way in which the role of the CBC is being diminished. It will be forced into a greater role of simply news, public affairs and entertainment programs. It will not have to perform nor be funded to perform the role it has played in the past.

Another significant failure of the Bill is in the area of human rights. The Standing Committee on Communications and Culture was very clear in what it recommended. The important issue for women across the country is that they have been absent or badly represented in many news and public affairs programming, and shown in idiotic roles in much other programming. There have been task forces, committees, resolutions, there have been policies and programs to change this. Visible minorities have been asking for more fair treatment in the media, on the airwaves as well as in the boardrooms that govern them.

Our committee said that the programming carried by the system should provide a balanced representation of Canadian society, reflecting its multicultural and bilingual realities, its aboriginal peoples and the composition of its population with regard to sex, age, national ethnic origin, colour, religion and mental or physical handicap. There must be fair representation in order for broadcasting to be fair and realistic in reflecting Canadian society.

Women make up roughly half the population of the country. They ought to be well represented and not just appear as an occasional minority group on television. The legislation states nothing along the lines we recommended. Instead, Clause 3(1)(c)(iii) states that the broadcasting policy should:

> strive, through its operations and programming, to reflect the circumstances and aspirations of Canadian men and women, including the linguistic duality and multicultural nature of Canadian society and the special place of aboriginal peoples within that society,

That is very weak and far from what was recommended. Its intention is unclear.

Women have been dealt with unjustly and unfairly for many years. The long struggle to correct that has been totally ignored by the Government. Visible minorities who have taken courage by women's organizations are demanding better treatment. Their needs have been similarly ignored.

Sex is not even mentioned as one of the objects in Clause 3(1)(g)(i), which states that the Canadian broadcasting system should:

> be varied and comprehensive, providing a balance of information, enlightenment and entertainment for people of different ages, interests and tastes,

Sex is not even mentioned.

The discrimination against half our population has been the subject of major lobbying efforts, yet research and task force reports are not even mentioned in the Government's agenda. That is wrong. Canadian women expect better. Women represent half of Canadian society and the airwaves belong to the public.

I am also disappointed with the Government's approach to the right to service. We were very clear that it was wrong that Canadians did not get full broadcasting services, particularly in the public sector, because they have paid for those services with their tax dollars. While people will get some kind of CBC service in many parts of the country, be it radio, television or something of each, they will not get all of the services. FM radio is not available in many places, even though it could be provided at not too significant a cost. We heard that many areas get English but not French, and people feel left out because they are not getting the services for which they have paid and which other people in the country are receiving.

Our recommendation 26 was very clear about what we believe should be the case. The Bill should reaffirm that all Canadians are entitled to Canadian broadcasting services in French and English, with this right being implemented if necessary by means of concerted action by the public sector.

If it takes some special measures through public funds to see that people get these services, then that ought to be done.

Instead, the Government has done very little. The Government states in Clause 3(h) that:

> a range of broadcasting services in English and French should be extended to all Canadians as resources become available;

That is not very specific. It states that these services should be available, rather than making clear there is an entitlement to them, as a matter of right. Obviously these services must be provided as resources become available, but I thought there would be some urgency on that issue. It is very vague with respect to the regions.

The clause states that the CBC should reflect Canadians to the nation and the regions to themselves. It has also been relegated as a minor function for the alternative service, to reflect Canada, the regions and its multicultural nature.

The committee was clear that the regions ought to be in the system for the nation as a whole as well as reflecting the region to itself so that people would get the full services in their areas as well as the programming from their own area.

What is the reason for this disappointing situation? The rumour is that the Government had better legislation and would have gone further with the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture, but the draft measures were sent to the trade negotiation office and were vetoed by the American Government. That is the rumour I heard. I would like to see what clauses landed on the cutting room floor and for the Minister to show us what she had planned. While we have come a long way in developing our culture, we have not stopped developing in terms of our artistic qualities, our character and the contribution Canadians can make to the world. We need all of the resources at our disposal to see that our talents and our contribution is developed.

There are measures in Bill C-136 that reflect the free trade agreement. It is one of the first casualties of the free trade agreement. The Government is stating through this Bill that it does not have confidence in Canadians to move forward. Not only will we stay still, we may even move back in some respects. That shows a lack of confidence in Canadians that I do not share.

Our culture has made enormous strides. Different sections have developed at a different pace. It is wrong that we will not even have the tools to develop in the future. As Simon Reisman said, only those measures that are consistent with the free trade deal will go ahead to help develop Canadian culture. He was confident that there were many measures consistent with the free trade deal that could be taken. But the point is that we should not be asking permission to implement our own measures. We should not have a piece of legislation that ties our hands. Instead of making decisions about what is good for Canada, Canada's regions or Canada's cultural community, we first have to ask if this legislation is consistent with the deal we tied ourselves into in 1988. That is a shameful situation to be in, and I think that the far better approach would be to say that we will keep our ability to make decisions.

• (1130)

Let us have confidence in our artists, broadcasters, writers and performers. Let us see to it that the public's airwaves are used for this dynamic expression of Canadian culture. Let us keep all the legislative tools we need to develop policies to protect and promote Canadian culture in broadcasting and in all of the other sectors we would want to protect and enhance in the future.

If the film distribution Bill was the first cultural casualty of the free trade agreement, this broadcasting Bill is the second cultural casualty of the free trade agreement. There will be others in other areas of life as well. I think this is extremely unfortunate, particularly when our culture is booming. We have an enormous amount of talent and we should be supporting and enhancing that talent at this stage. We should not be looking back, freezing the situation where it is now. We should have confidence and we should look toward the future.

I am extremely disappointed about having to talk about this Bill on second reading stage, approval in principle. I have worked on this subject for years. I participated in the hearings held across Canada by the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture, a committee that did listen to Canadians. The Bill reflects a Minister who did not listen to Canadians. It reflects the influence of the trade negotiations office which has certainly not listened to Canadians.

If we were listening to Canadians, we would be having an election right now on all of these issues. I look forward to that election. In the meantime, I am very disappointed that now, in the middle of summer, the Government is pushing forward such a broadcasting Bill. This is one of the few opportunities we have every couple of decades to look seriously at broadcasting and to plan for the future. The Government is missing that opportunity. Instead, it is tying Canadians' hands for the future because it would rather pursue Ronald Reagan's vision of a North American market. It would rather deny the opportunity for us Canadians to develop our own culture as a part of our very exciting Canadian society.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions or comments? Debate.

Mr. Roger Clinch (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I would like to enter into this debate. The new broadcast Bill, Bill C-136, will ensure the continued strength of the broadcasting system and the continued presence of competitive Canadian programming. Accordingly, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak in favour of the Bill.

We would have the impression from the Hon. Member who just spoke that this Bill has been greeted with only negative reactions. I think Hon. Members would be very interested to know that there have been some very positive reactions. If you would permit me to do so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote the words of some of the more recognized newspapers and groups in Canada which have been very pleased by the Minister's new broadcast Bill.

The Ottawa Citizen of Saturday, June 25, had this to say: "The federal Government's long awaited broadcast policy looks solid and impressive". *The Globe and Mail* of the same day said: "It passes the immediate test of increasing the variety and volume of Canadian programming".

[*Translation*]

> ... Instead of burying the Caplan-Sauvageau Report, this Bill embodies its spirit and follows its main policy thrusts.

[*English*]

"A small, well-stuffed goody bag that gives Canadian television viewers their first real hope of an all-Canadian CBC and pledges a second publicly supported network within two years," said *The Ottawa Citizen.*

[*Translation*]

> ... Miss MacDonald's Broadcasting Bill at first glance is very promising for improvement in the quality and quantity of French-language programs.

Daniel Lemay, *La Presse*, Saturday, June 25:

> ... For the first time, the Canadian Broadcasting Act will recognize the distinct character of the French radio and television industry and market.

Manon Cornellier, *Le Devoir*, Saturday, June 25:

[*English*]

The Globe and Mail of Monday, June 27, said: "It is a major accomplishment for Miss MacDonald to come out with a package which not only reaffirms the central role of public broadcasting, and backs it up with some more money, but also takes a swipe at the private television broadcasters for their miserable contribution to Canadian programming". There are several other quotes.

[*Translation*]

The Coalition for the defence of the CBC's French services:

> Miss MacDonald has met our main demands, and in terms of general principles—like journalistic independence, freedom of expression, having two presidents for the CBC and recognizing the distinct character of the French services—we are very satisfied.

And on the French CBC program, *Le Point*, of June 23, 1988:

> ... task force report, the central role of the CBC is maintained and the distinct features of French-language television are recognized ... Many things in this report satisfy me ...

[*English*]

There is also a letter I would like to quote from.

[*Translation*]

From the *Coalition pour la défense des services français de Radio-Canada*, a letter addressed to the Prime Minister.

> Mr. Prime Minister,
>
> This is to inform you that the *Coalition pour la défense des services français de Radio-Canada* supports Bill C-136, the Broadcasting Act, introduced by the Hon. Flora MacDonald.
>
> The proposed legislation largely coincides with the position we have defended for many months and is more sensitive to the needs of our society than the present legislation. We are very pleased with your Government's proposal to recognize in the Act the distinct characteristics of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's French and English services and of the radio-television industries.

[*English*]

How did the Canadian Conference of the Arts respond to the broadcast Bill and policy? It responded by saying:

> —newly elected CCA President, Paul Siren, generally welcomed the bill and policy on broadcasting, tabled yesterday in the House of Commons by Communications Minister, Flora MacDonald.
>
> "In its wording and intent, the broadcasting bill and accompanying policy are a step in the right direction" ... "We applaud the government's objective to strengthen and increase Canadian programming, particularly in English- and French-language television drama, and welcome the new funds for the CBC.

We also had approval from Television Northern Canada which said:

> Minister of Culture and Communications Titus Allooloo welcomed today's announcement by federal Minister of Communications Flora MacDonald on funding for satellite distribution of a new northern television service.
>
> "The new public/educational television network, as put forward by Television Northern Canada (TVNC), is a major step forward in northern communications," said Mr. Allooloo.

These are but a few of the quotes of those who have responded very favourably to this Bill.

We as Canadians already have access to what is perhaps the most diverse and competitive broadcasting system in the world. This system has grown and developed at an astonishing pace over the past 20 years while the broadcast Act itself has remained unchanged.

[*Translation*]

Broadcasting is fundamentally important to our political and cultural sovereignty. That is why our Canadian broadcasting system must be an accurate reflection of who we as Canadians are, how we behave and how we view the world.

It is in fact the purpose of Bill C-136 to achieve this goal, especially with respect to French broadcasting. It must be recognized that French broadcasting and English broadcasting do not operate under the same conditions. The point of promoting Canadian programming in French Canada is to have programs that enable viewers to identify with characters that are like them. It is a matter of linguistic and cultural survival.

French broadcasters have consistently provided the requisite amount of drama programming. Thus, quality, not quantity is the issue here, because as programming costs escalate, broadcasters may be tempted to resort to foreign, less costly productions. Before this starts happening on a large scale, the Bill on broadcasting proposes a legislative solution.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time, the proposed legislation recognizes that French and English markets require different policy approaches, and these differences will have to be reflected in CRTC decisions and within the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation itself.

We cannot discuss the issue of French and English broadcasting without mentioning the presence of our two official languages. In the case of broadcasting, this presence is more than a constitutional reality, it is a fact throughout our broadcasting networks.

The Bill recognizes, for the first time, this country's linguistic duality. Many Francophone Canadians outside Quebec—in Ontario and New Brunswick, for instance—receive very few signals, if any, in their own language. Clause 3 contains provisions in this respect.

To remedy the situation, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation will have to play a more important role. Its services must be offered in both official languages to reflect the specific situation and needs of both language communities, including official language minority groups.

The Bill also provides that the broadcasting system should safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada. The production of drama programming is essential in order to achieve this goal.

• (1140)

[*English*]

Bill C-136 will preserve and enhance the uniquely Canadian mix of private and public broadcasting while providing for even greater diversity in programming choices and encouraging continued technological advancement. It is forward-looking legislation that will guide the Canadian broadcasting system well into the 21st century.

Clause 3 of the Bill states that the programming provided by the Canadian broadcasting system should be varied and comprehensive, providing a balance of information, enlightenment and entertainment for people of different ages, interests and tastes. It should also provide a reasonable opportunity for the public to be exposed to the expression of differing views on matters of public concern.

Just as important, for the first time, the new Broadcasting Act recognizes the great diversity of Canadian society and, in the spirit of the Charter of Rights, the need to ensure equitable presentation for all Canadians within the broadcasting system. The Bill also acknowledges the bilingual, multicultural and regional nature of the country and the special place of aboriginal peoples in our society.

In order to achieve policy objectives, public broadcasting has always been an important part of our broadcasting system. The Bill reaffirms the Government's commitment to a strong and independent Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. The CBC remains the central element of the Canadian broadcasting policy.

It is recognized, however, that the CBC cannot be the only source of Canadian programming, and that it can no longer be expected to provide all types of programming for all interests and tastes. The Bill therefore reflects the need to ensure that all elements of the broadcasting system contribute to programming objectives and takes steps to increase Canadian choices.

To encourage more special interest in Canadian television programming the Bill provides for a new alternative programming service. This will offer the kind of programs that Canadians have said they want to see but which would otherwise not be available because of their non-commercial nature and the high cost of television production. The ultimate form and structure would be shaped by public hearings to be undertaken by the CRTC so that all Canadians will have an opportunity to express their views.

The CRTC will also have access to a wider range of tools to enforce its regulations and conditions of licence. In addition to fines and such legal recourse as mandatory orders, the CRTC is given the power to regulate more flexibly, with a licence fee tied to performance.

Recognizing the regional nature of Canada the Bill provides for decentralization and streamlining of the CRTC's decision-making process. Panels of commissioners holding hearings across the country will be able to make decisions quickly. They will reflect more accurately local circumstances and conditions within the context of a national regulatory framework. These and other changes to the CRTC's structure and administration will improve greatly its effectiveness as a regulator and its responsiveness to the industry and the Canadian public.

For these reasons the new Broadcasting Act as set out in Bill C-136 is legislation of major importance for all Canadians. The Minister of Communications (Miss MacDonald) is justly proud of this Bill. It is an outstanding document reflecting and responding to one of the most important public policy discussions undertaken by this Government.

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the debate on Bill C-138 and to say to my colleague from the great Province of New Brunswick, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Communications (Mr. Clinch), that although he has spoken with his usual eloquence I must say that we are going to have to agree to disagree when it comes to the substantive parts of his remarks.

I would like to outline very briefly some of the concerns that I have with regard to this particular piece of legislation. There can be no doubt of its importance. The fact of the matter is that watching television is perhaps the number one leisure activity for many, if not all, Canadians. Canadians spend more than 24 hours each week on average in front of the television set. Each year Canadian children watch almost 1,000 hours of television compared to attending school for 800 hours. We should reflect on that fact for a moment—1,000 hours in front of the television set compared with 800 hours in school. Can anyone doubt the importance of the substantive arguments that have been made by colleagues on all sides of the House, particularly my colleague from Mount Royal, who has outlined very clearly the position of my Party about the importance that the content of television and radio plays?

Some 95 per cent of Canadians are radio listeners, spending some 18 hours per week at that particular activity. Two-thirds of Canadians say that watching television is their favourite pastime. I do not know if that goes for the proceedings of the House of Commons or not, but perhaps it is with regard to other programs on television. More than 50 per cent of Canadians say that broadcasting is their principal source of news and information. Thus when we sit back and reflect upon the contents of Bill C-136 and when we take into account those facts it is important to recognize that changes ought to have been made in line with those suggested by my colleague from Mount Royal.

The content of our system has been and remains a major problem, for while it is true that society's heavy reliance on recorded media is an important fact, what is even more important is that most of what we watch and hear is in fact not Canadian. It reflects the thoughts and attitudes, the world view and feelings of other nations, primarily our neighbour to the south, the United States of America. Those remarks with regard to the United States ought not to be interpreted by those who are somewhat perverted in their thinking to suggest that we do not like our colleagues to the south. I happen to believe that the United States is a great nation, and Americans are a great people, but there are glaring differences between Canada and the United States.

• (1150)

Canadians must have access to more Canadian programming. At the present time, less than 7 per cent of television drama available to us in English is Canadian, yet we spend nearly half our viewing time watching it. There are more hours of American newscasts available to us than Canadian newscasts. Hon. Members will realize the fact that American newscasts provide more information to us as Canadians about events in their country and their perspective of the global community than in fact we as Canadians do about ourselves. Most thinking Canadians, some of whom may be on the opposite side, but most of whom are on this side, would readily come to the conclusion that, because of our diversity in geography, the smallness of our population and the manner in which it is distributed throughout this country, there is an ever-increasing need for us to have more information and news about our great country, whether one happens to live in western Canada, Québec, Ontario, or the Atlantic Provinces.

In a recent newspaper advertisement the Friends of Canadian Broadcasting introduced Michelle, a typical ten-year old Canadian, who spends roughly 80 per cent of her television viewing time watching American programming. She spends as many hours each year watching American programming as she does attending school. As the ad states: "A foreign power has control of Michelle's mind". If one stops and thinks about it, Mr. Speaker, Michelle spends 800 hours in school and 1,000 hours watching television. Not only is that a difference of 200 hours, but it shows the massive increase in terms of viewing American programming, indeed foreign programming.

As I indicated earlier in my remarks, the position of our Party on Bill C-136 has been outlined very clearly by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Mount Royal (Mrs. Finestone). As she stated, we recognize that the 1968 Act has served Canadians well in bringing about Canadian ownership of broadcasting systems. As a result, the Canadian broadcasting system is the envy of people in many corners of the world. However, there are some things which are missing in this piece of legislation, of which the Minister is well aware. Bill C-136 changes the CBC's mandate by removing the requirement that its programming contain a balance of information, entertainment, and enlightenment. Only information and entertainment remain. Therefore, the question is why? This will undermine the basis of such fundamentally important programs as *Man Alive, The Nature of Things*, and a host of other programs. Removal of enlightenment will weaken the distinctive quality of CBC programming. Members opposite may have a different view, however, that is the view I take on this particular issue.

Does the Government believe that the CBC television should be only a commercial, mass-audience network, and that all enlightenment should fall under an alternative television network? That is an important point to which I believe the Government should give careful consideration in terms of examining what can be best said and done for Canadians in this great country.

Let me turn now to the subject of regional CBC cuts and change in the CBC mandate. The Standing Committee on Communications and Culture in its report entitled *Broadcasting Policy for Canada*, pointed out that the CBC, as a result of its parliamentary appropriation being cut, has been forced to cut by 28 per cent the resources for regional broadcasting in order to maintain network programming in recent years. If one happens to live in Toronto, Montreal, or cities of that nature, this particular fact, which I am underlining for the benefit of all Members, may not strike home to them. However, for those of us who live in the peripheral regions of the country, regional programming and the opportunities that it provides is important to us and to the people we represent.

Bill C-136 reduces the CBC's mandate to meet the distinctive needs of the various geographic regions of the country. The 1968 Act required the CBC to serve the special needs of geographic regions, and now the CBC is to reflect Canada and its regions to the national and regional audiences. Why does the Government want to reduce the CBC's role as a local and regional programmer? That is pretty fundamental. Prior Governments of different political persuasions have done many things to try to unite this great country, from a railroad to the auspices of regional economic development programs, and some time ago the introduction of the CBC. If we remove or reduce the opportunities for regional and local programming, I can only underline the difficulty that that will cause for many people in the regions of the country.

The 1968 Act required that individual broadcasters provide programming that is predominantly Canadian in character. Now Bill C-136 proposes that it be changed. As a result, the

CRTC will be free to reduce its requirement that broadcasters maintain 50 per cent Canadian content and still be consistent with the intent of Bill C-136. The CBC's description is reduced and distinctive. These descriptions are of fundamental importance. We see the Bill as paving the way for the Canadian broadcasting system to become part of what has been known as the North American system.

I believe that the Bill has another serious flaw. There is no recognition of aboriginal services in Bill C-136. The Standing Committee on Communications and Culture recommended that a new broadcasting Act should provide for the CBC to offer service in aboriginal languages considered to be representative, where numbers warrant, and to the extent public funds permit. The Government failed to act upon the recommendation that the CBC offer service in aboriginal languages. The National Aboriginal Communications Society has expressed its dismay with the failure of the Government to act to provide this important protection.

• (1200)

Mr. Speaker, I come back to my earlier thoughts when I talked about Canadian content, about the importance in this country of looking at Canadian content—and it is a reality that we must address—and Canadians, whether they are watching television or listening to the radio, do so in great numbers. There are some individuals who will say, well, perhaps parents ought to have a more active role in the determination of what their children watch or listen to on the airwaves. That is correct. I share that sentiment. But the reality that we must face is that Canadians, in great numbers, are watching a great deal of television and of course listening in great amounts to radio. Therefore, it becomes increasingly important that the Government try to address some of the concerns that I and indeed other Members have raised. I look forward to hearing some of the responses from Members opposite, as well as my colleagues, as this debate continues.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments. The Hon. Minister of Communications (Miss MacDonald).

Miss MacDonald: I just have a brief comment, Mr. Speaker. For the enlightenment of the Member who has just spoken, I think that it is important to note that perhaps he has not read the Bill thoroughly. What has been done in this case was to use the words that had applied only to the CBC in the previous Bill, in the 1968 Bill, words such as "enlightenment", and now move them into a position in the Bill where they apply to the entire Canadian broadcasting system, including the CBC. But what we have done is to stipulate that distributors, carriers, the private network, the public network, all of them take into consideration that word, "enlightenment".

I also want to assure him that if he will read through the Bill carefully he will see that the question of our aboriginal societies are addressed within the Bill. All of these things are introduced into the Bill. Although previously there was a very limited application of these requirements to the public broadcasting service only, they now apply to the whole range of services that fall within the Canadian broadcasting system. Public as well as private carriers, such as cable and so on, all have these particular requirements attached to them now.

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Minister's intervention. I hope that her comments achieve the objective that I have enunciated.

Miss MacDonald: It think they do.

Mr. Dingwall: It seems to me that the removal of "enlightenment" will in fact weaken the distinctive quality of the CBC programming. If the Minister is able to convince me over a period of time that that particular objective that she has spoken of—and that I have just spoken of—is reached in the Bill, well, fine and good. If not, in the interpretation that I and my colleagues have been able to wrestle with as it relates to this particular Bill, we believe it is a serious omission. However, I do appreciate the intervention of the Minister on this matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate with the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow).

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I want to enter this debate because I have been watching what is happening to broadcasting, both public and private, for many years, and the more I see what has happened and how little we have done and how often we have done the wrong thing, the more depressed I get. In this Bill I see very little, if anything, that will begin to change the depressing realities.

First of all, let me point out that what the Minister is proposing in this Bill and what the reality is since the Conservatives formed this Government, has been that the public sector broadcasting is underfunded. In large measure, this is the result of this Conservative Government's four-year vendetta against the CBC, which has led to a $140 million reduction in the network's allocation from Parliament.

I also want to point out that the private broadcasters are not doing their job. Twenty years ago, when I was on the parliamentary committee which dealt with this kind of question, I took the time to look through the applications of the groups or the individuals whose applications were successful, those to be given a licence to set up a TV station and to broadcast from any of the cities across Canada. I am talking not about all of the applications but about the successful applications. Every one of them had grandiose proposals about how they would provide Canadian content if their application was approved. It is not just public affairs and sports, but drama, variety and comedy. You name it, they promised it. Of course, as soon as they got the licence, they proceeded to ignore every promise that they had made.

What we have now is a private system of television stations, certainly in the major cities, that—as one commentator who has studied the question has said—have been given a licence to print money.

It has been estimated that their net profit each year, after taxes, is 50 per cent of their investment. No other field of endeavour in this country is anywhere near as profitable.

Now, let us look at what we believe is a crisis in Canadian television. We see that Canadian films represent only 3 per cent of screen time in Canada. Only 3 per cent of film profits stay in Canada, and 3 per cent of video cassette sales are Canadian. Canadian publishers own only 30 per cent of the Canadian market, and 77 per cent of magazines sold in Canada are foreign. Eighty-five per cent of records and tapes sold in Canada are foreign.

There have been a number of very successful films produced by Canadians: *My American Cousin*, *The Kids of DeGrassi Junior High*, all with public money.

Miss MacDonald: There is more.

Mr. Orlikow: How often are they shown on television or in Canadian movie theatres?

Miss MacDonald: That is why we have a film distribution Bill.

Mr. Orlikow: Very little.

Miss MacDonald: Or on the CBC. But they are going to.

Mr. Orlikow: The Minister said that they are going to. We have heard those promises for longer than I would like to remember.

Miss MacDonald: It is a new policy. The NDP does not want it.

Mr. Orlikow: What is clear at this time is that Canada and its cultural industry need vision and aggressive policies of expansion. This is particularly true because the Mulroney trade deal will make things even more difficult for both public and private broadcasters.

Let us just look at the kind of thing which has happened recently. An example of the Government's performance and attitude is found in the continuing effort of the Minister and her colleagues to sabotage the CBC's bid for an All-News network. After all, the CRTC—supposedly an independent agency which makes decisions—is to study these kinds of questions and make decisions which will be followed. The CRTC awarded this licence for an All-News network to the CBC.

Miss MacDonald: As of September 1.

Mr. Orlikow: It obviously had a vastly superior bid. What happened? The Government intervened and demanded that CBC find a private sector partner. In effect, she and the Government scuttled the plan. What is the result? Canadians now have an All-News monopoly,and that is the American monopoly held by Ted Turner and the CNN. The Government has achieved its end, namely an All-News network run out of Atlanta, which does not cover the Tories sell-out on trade nor the Prime Minister's scandals, et cetera. CNN does not even know what street Canada is on. I have said earlier that this Government has helped, in the way of deliberate policy, to harm the CBC.

• (1210)

Let us look at what has happened. We have had a series of vicious budget cuts which have systematically undermined the network. Let us look at what has happened to CBC funding in real dollar terms since the Tories took power. In 1984-85, the CBC got $905 million. In 1985-86, it got only $826 million. In 1986-87, the amount dropped to $806 million. In 1987-88, the CBC got $789 million, and for this coming year it will receive only $775 million. That is a reduction, according to my rough calculations, of about 25 per cent. That is the record of the Government and how it supports public broadcasting. That just is not good enough, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister has spoken proudly of the so-called new money for the CBC that she has found to help it reach 95 per cent Canadian content level. She is giving $15 million of new money to the CBC's French service and $20 million to the CBC's English service. This does not even come close to making up for the cuts which the Minister and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) have made in the last four years. The President of ACTRA, Dale Goldhawk, said some time ago:

> And while the CBC is expected to fulfil a wide mandate, the money to go forward just isn't there. In short, this part of the announcement doesn't exactly make my socks roll up and down.

Ian Morrison of the Friends of Canadian Broadcasting said:

> The most significant test is whether the Government restores the CBC parliamentary allocation to at least the real level it was in 1984 when the Conservative Government took office. The 1988 parliamentary allocation to the CBC has been reduced in real terms by $140 million from its level in 1984. In this new policy context, funding of $35 million leaves CBC with a net annual shortfall of more than $100 million. The Government has therefore failed this test.

Jamie Portman, writing in the *Vancouver Sun*, pointed out:

> The Government has ignored a recent call from an all-Party Commons committee that it show its commitment to better Canadian programming by increasing it support of broadcasting with up to $250 million fresh funding annually . . . in real dollar terms, the CBC's budget has shrunk by more than $150 million since the Conservatives came to power.

What good was it to have a parliamentary committee headed by the then Member of this House, Mr. McGrath, who spent weeks and months proposing new rules and a new way of handling things in Canada, giving the parliamentary committees more staff, more time saying that parliamentary committees after they have done their work would be listened to, that they would play a major role in how things are done? Here we have a Government which has consistently ignored the parliamentary committee, on which a vast majority of the members are Conservatives. Yet the Government has almost completely ignored the recommendations of that committee.

I want to point out to the Minister that the Canadian people do not share the Government's apparent intense dislike of public broadcasting. A 1986 Environics poll showed that over two-thirds of Canadians were in favour of increased spending on the CBC. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. People want more funds for the CBC, not less, which is what has happened in the four years in which we have had a Conservative Government.

There ar few very minor good things in this Bill. We are pleased to find the Government and the Minister acknowledging in this Bill that "the CBC is the principal vehicle of cultural expression in Canada". Given the views of so many of the right-wing back-benchers of the Conservative Party, many of whom would like to see the CBC disappear altogether, to get this recognition out of the Tories seems like a great victory.

We need a CBC that is capable of having an appeal to a mass audience while at the same time producing such excellent programming of enlightenment as *Ideas* or *Man Alive*. To take off the CBC live drama, music as well as documentaries demonstrates a short-sighted vision. The Government is making commercial factors the litmus test for what should and should not be on the network.

As a Member of Parliament from Winnipeg, I have to join with other Members, including I think some Members on the government side, who are not only dismayed but horrified at the real abandonment by the CBC in the area of regional programming. The standing committee detailed the problems of regional programming in its report. It pointed out that the CBC has been forced to cut 28 per cent of its resources for regional programming in order to maintain regional programming in recent years. The regional managers of CBC operations in every province have noted that in recent years they are "less able to develop new talent, present variety programming, and work with independent producers". We have heard from Winnipeg, Halifax, Hamilton, Windsor and I suppose from Vancouver about the situation.

The 1968 Broadcasting Act established that the CBC must serve the needs of the regions. This current legislation suggests that the network need only reflect the regions to its audience. This is a significant difference from what we came to expect, and it can only lead to the centralization of the CBC, which we in the regions reject completely. The role of enlightenment as well as that of regional and multicultural programming is given over to the alternative programming network. The Minister, however, was not able to secure the funds for this network from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) at this time. She promises instead another two years of studying and delay for a proposal that has already been the subject of intense analysis both by the parliamentary committee and by the Caplan-Sauvageau report. The Government has apparently ruled out a CBC role in this new service and has left it to the CRTC to work out a structure, which I believe is the responsibility of Government.

When we look at private television, Mr. Speaker, we see some very sad facts. The task force pointed out that the private sector has simply not been doing its job, as I indicated at the beginning of my speech. We should remember that the standing committee established that private television broadcasters average a 50 per cent annual return on investment. Surely they should be forced to do more than what they do. Broadcasting licences should be more than a licence to print money. Private networks have to be more than transmission belts bringing in American programs to Canadian viewers with Canadian commercials. What has the Minister done about this in her new legislation? She has watered down, it would appear, the requirement in the current Act that private broadcasters be predominantly Canadian. Instead, she has put in place a form of performance incentives. Fees will be collected in secret by Treasury Board from those private broadcasters who do not meet their requirements for Canadian programming. The money will be distributed to those who do. Rather than getting tough with private broadcasters who consistently fail to meet their conditions of licence, the Minister is offering a shoddy scheme which is fraught with difficulties.

Let me take a moment to illustrate what I have been saying with an example from Manitoba. In Manitoba we have a number of private and public television stations. Most of them are located in Winnipeg because more than half the population of Manitoba is in Winnipeg. What has happened in the last couple of years? The CRTC, for reasons which I cannot understand, gave a licence to a group to set up a television broadcasting station in Portage La Prairie, 50 miles from Winnipeg. So we have Channel 13. But what do we see from Channel 13? It is almost entirely American programming, the game shows and movies. There are some very good movies, but almost no Canadian content at all.

• (1220)

Why did the CRTC issue that licence? I do not know, but part of the reason that they were able to do so is that the message they get from the Government is that it is not very concerned about Canadian content. The Canadian people are concerned about Canadian content. Sure, they want to be able to watch American programs. Sure, they want to watch American baseball games or American football games or drama or *Dallas* and all the others when they are on. However, they should have the ability to choose what they want to see.

Canadians who really believe that Canada is a separate country and needs its own culture if it is to survive and not become the fifty-first state, also believe that we need a broadcasting system, both public and private, which provides Canadian content. That is what they have seen less and less of since the Conservative Government was elected in 1984.

What we have here are a Bill and a Minister who says some of the right things, but their desire and determination to do the right thing is, in my view, to say the least, sadly lacking.

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to say something about Bill C-136, the Broadcasting Act, which the Government brought forward for debate in these last days of July. I think it is appropriate to say that it is a real shame to be debating this matter now. Broadcasting is one of the most important issues that could possibly be put before the country as it relates to culture and society and understanding ourselves. Broadcasting is absolutely central to culture in our time. To have a Bill, which will play such an important part in determining how the broadcasting system evolves over the next decade or two, brought forward for debate in July when there is not as much readiness to debate carefully and critically, seems to me fits in with the Government's agenda of moving things along with not as much critical attention as should be given in order to gloss over the shortcomings of legislation.

I am therefore pleased this morning that there is critical attention being given to these matters and I hope others will come into the debate and continue the exploration necessary at second reading to determine whether the Government has met the challenge or to clarify the extent to which it has fallen short.

I listened with great interest to the comments of my friend, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), as he debated a variety of shortcomings in the Government's practices and in Bill C-136. I ask those who are listening to take those as a given for my own sense of the situation. I want to expand particularly on one area which, of necessity, has had limited attention in much of the debate, and that is the question of how adequately this Bill recognizes the multicultural policy of the country stated in this Parliament almost 17 years ago, and to which we have in this Parliament given legislative expression.

I refer, of course, to this House passing Bill C-93 and sending it to the other place. In doing so we declared that multiculturalism is a view of the country and describes a policy of the Government of Canada which is to characterize every federal institution. That Bill was available to us when the Broadcasting Act was reaching its final stages, and I think it is eminently fair to ask ourselves to what extent Bill C-136 has been developed and put before us in the context of Bill C-93.

I do not think it is going to be difficult to say that this Bill falls far short of what we would expect in the context of multiculturalism. It only underscores the extent to which our supposed commitment to multiculturalism is a matter of slogans, specific events and days, but is not acceptance of a reality that should be reflected in all the institutions the federal Government directs and controls. It is certainly not going to be adequately expressed in Canadian broadcasting if this Bill passes the House unchanged.

In order to justify those comments I want to take a look at Clause 3 of the Bill in particular. That clause sets forth at some length a broadcasting policy for Canada. To do so I shall have to cite a number of paragraphs indicating how much the Bill reflects the context of the 1960s, lives within the world of official bilingualism, and only in occasional references suggests that larger view that should have been basic in elaborating a broadcasting policy.

We are told, first, that the Canadian broadcasting system will operate primarily in the English and French languages. Then, of course, there are other references. We are told further on that it is designed "through its operations and programming to reflect the circumstances and aspirations of Canadian men and women, including the linguistic duality and multicultural nature of Canadian society, and the special place of aboriginal peoples within that society." That describes an aspect of the entire broadcasting system.

When we turn to those sections that describe the programming provided by the CBC, we find no such broad vision at all. The programming provided by the CBC should, it says, "be in English and French, reflecting the different needs and circumstances of each official language community, including the particular needs and circumstances of English and French linguistic minorities." Nothing better spells out our view, based on the experience of the 1960s, inadequately developed beyond our view of the country as officially bilingual, of the constraints within which the CBC and Radio Canada have carried on their functions.

Certainly the Bill continues to provide a requirement for enlightenment, the point the Minister was debating earlier. However, the very point that she and I were briefly discussing earlier this morning, the widespread ignorance about our citizens of various cultures, seems to me here, in the most important area where the CBC carries out the federal Government's mandate for informing and enlightening Canadians about other citizens, to lack any explicit declaration that the CBC is to ensure that the multicultural nature of the country is recognized.

Certainly it is part of the general broadcasting policy, yet we know how far short our broadcasters have fallen in achieving that. To leave the CBC without an obligation to do that is just an indication of how limited the vision of the Government is, and to how limited an extent the multicultural policy of 1971, legislated now in Bill C-93, has been put before the directors of the CBC and Radio Canada in ensuring that they will respect the reality of the country.

• (1230)

There is in this area a fundamental point to be made. The federal Government will operate in English and French. The federal Government will speak to all Canadians in those two languages with some very limited recognition that there are Canadians who need to be addressed, presumably through the ethnic press or multilingual broadcasting, in other languages as well. Immigrants come to this country, persons of diverse cultures from all the continents of the earth and live in this country and work in public life in those two languages. To assume that the cultures that they reflect, which continue to

underlie their public lives in English, should not be reflected in broadcasting, that this is not an obligation explicitly laid on the CBC and Radio-Canada, is to recognize one of the most fundamental shortcomings of broadcasting.

I make this point because we spend a certain amount of money in the Department of Secretary of State, the multiculturalism directorate or sector, whatever one wants to call it, especially in the new context of which the Conservatives make so much. It has a bit more money and some new initiatives and is trying desperately, as an election draws near, to catch up on the past. However, whatever happens over there, precious little happens in the broadcasting area, and the Department of Communications quite clearly carries on along the old lines. Certainly there is some stirring of recognition of more needing to be done. I want, in a moment, to get to the matter of alternative broadcasting services.

In Clause 3.(1)(n)(iii) we have the declaration that the broadcasting will:

> —be in English and French, reflecting the different needs and circumstances of each official language community—

That is, it seems to me, a refusal to recognize, to lay explicity on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and Radio-Canada, the obligation to reflect the multicultural reality of the country in various ways, even if it does that in English and French broadcasting.

The changes that need to be made in these areas might well be recognized if we look at one other clause which is an important addition to the Bill. The recognition of the need for broadcasting in aboriginal languages and to the aboriginal peoples is provided for in subclause (k) which states:

> —programming that reflects the aboriginal cultures of Canada should be provided within the Canadian broadcasting system as resources become available for the purpose—

There is that fatal last clause, of course, always the limited resources. What has been made available in the various regions of Canada, and I think particularly of northwestern Ontario where I have some sense of it, including the hour of broadcasting in Oji-Cree which occurs on CBQ radio in Thunder Bay every Friday afternoon from two o'clock to three o'clock is an example, a perfectly appropriate, absolutely essential recognition within the Canadian broadcasting system, within the CBC English language service on this station of another language group.

If it is recognition of the aboriginal peoples, let that provide an instance of compensation for those enormous crimes of the past carried out by agents of English and French Christian civilization in this country, the missionaries particularly and the schools which sought to stamp out the use of the various languages as pagan excrescences for which there was no place in today's Canada. Let us make that good.

There in the Bill, in a paragraph which says all the right things—although I regret the last clause about the constraints of finances—is an instance in a Canada of which my view of multiculturalism is a view which recognizes that we begin with official bilingualism and recognize the fact of aboriginal peoples. Having done both of those things there is no way that we can stop with biculturalism and the aboriginal peoples. We must recognize that the country is multicultural.

In recognizing the fact of a diversity of culture there may still be that old attitude, a mix of white man's burden of Christian missions, completely secularized of course, that these cultures will disappear, that you do not have to do very much except give people some vague sense of what these people do, of the peculiar ways of these ethnic communities, and if you have enlightened them to that extent you have done your job.

That sort of attitude which is in the legislation has permeated communications policy throughout the history of this Department back to the 1960s. Those attitudes fall completely short of providing for the reality that we have in a multicultural Canada.

What are we given in the Bill as the prime means of making up for the great vacuum which exists in CBC, Radio-Canada and obviously in far too much of the private broadcasting which is a matter of some information? The broadcasters say proudly that news comes first. Well, that is about the only local thing that they do, so inevitably it comes first. There is very often nothing after it except perhaps a bit of community broadcasting shoved into some of the lowest listening hours on Sunday morning. For the rest we get American shows, the travesty in the Canadian broadcasting system which CTV has provided over the years with a bunch of stations which exist simply to print money, not to do anything for the Canadian people. That system quite obviously is not going to meet the need which I am addressing.

What are we given in the Bill to respond to recommendation 24 from the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture which declared that the programming carried by the system should provide a balanced representation of Canadian society reflecting its multicultural and bilingual realities, its aboriginal peoples, and the composition of its population with respect to sex, age, race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, and mental or physical handicaps? There, in language from the Charter, we have the points of diversity in the Canadian population cited.

What does Bill C-136 do in addressing that particular recommendation? Well, be it noted that we are given some provisions for alternative television broadcasting services in English and French. I went over to chat with the Minister for a few moments to be quite clear about this because I was looking for some kind of provision in the Broadcasting Act for multilingual radio and television. I thought this was where the Minister of Communications was providing a gap for it.

In fact, although this particular term is not defined in Clause 2 of the Bill where the definitions are provided, alternative television programming services are not an attempt to provide for all those stop gaps, if you will. I do not mean to disparage any one of them which provide broadcasting in various languages and try, in the metropolitan markets of our

cities, to find commercial support, the means to carry on this response to the desire of people to hear broadcasting in their own languages, languages other than English and French. Subclauses (i) and (j) of Clause 3 contain the Government's response to the realities I have just sketched and the attempt to provide for them.

What will the programming provided by alternative television programming services be like? One short line says that it shall reflect Canada's regions and multicultural nature. There, of course, is the vital adjective. It shall, as far as possible, be acquired rather than produced by those services.

• (1240)

This third network is only a concept within the legislation. The resources have not been provided and study is to continue. It is a service that will be loaded with responsibility not just for multiculturalism but the regional realities and other diversities in Canada. It is feared that as a result of this third network, CBC and Radio Canada will pay less attention to the regional nature of the country.

We are told that this third network will provide for the multicultural nature of Canada and that the programming will be acquired rather than produced by those services. I can only conclude that this will be a very limited service. It is still only a concept because the Government has not provided the resources. We shall see what the next Government will do, but can only hope that it will move quickly to provide those resources.

This service could broadcast excellent NFB productions to Canadians. This service will hardly be able to develop a philosophy and view of Canada which needs to be reflected in broadcasting, or carry primarily the production of programming designed to reflect that reality.

There is no provision for broadcasting in languages other than French and English. Will there be a channel in the predominantly English speaking parts of the country to broadcast this kind of acquired programming in English while the areas that are predominantly French speaking will broadcast on another channel? Obviously, minorities will be neglected. What will the effect of such terribly limited resources in our metropolitan markets be on those producing such programming?

While there is some vision, there is not much evidence of that concept being developed. As long as this remains broadcasting primarily in English and French, it may serve to enlighten Canadians who know the official languages well but will do nothing to fill the gap in order to recognize multiculturalism as also being multilingual and that the diversity of languages spoken by Canadians needs some reflection in broadcasting policy.

I regret that we are likely to see just this one round of debate on this Bill, without amendments in order to continue the discussion that is so badly needed if the multiculturalism policy we have enunciated is to become more than just a motto but a reality of federal institutions in the broadcast area.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, the Member talked about the need for programming in languages other than English or French. Not only is there very little broadcasting on radio or television in languages other than English or French, there is almost no programming which explains the life and problems of our native people and people who come from countries whose knowledge and comfort in English or French is limited.

The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Keeper) is here. There are elementary schools in his constituency and part of my constituency, where 95 per cent of the students come from either native families or new immigrant families whose language is neither English nor French.

Does he not agree that it is time that both public and private television and radio began to face up to the reality of what is happening in cities like Winnipeg, which is a small example of what is taking place in other areas like Toronto and Vancouver? Should they not deal with these problems? Is it not time for the Government to instruct them to do so? It has not called upon them to do the kind of job that is so essential if these people are to be integrated into the mainstream of Canadian life.

Mr. Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for his question because it gives me an opportunity to expand on this important matter. He is right about the need and the limited response.

I alluded to CBQ's broadcasting of an hour of Oji-Cree in Thunder Bay every Friday afternoon. It is a rare exception to this generalization that the need is not being met. It is a very limited response in an area of enormous importance. The population in northwestern Ontario that speaks Ojibway and Cree often live in isolated communities. They live in sufficient numbers for the languages to have their own vitality. Nothing in the age of electronic information does more to strengthen the use of language and the belief in a future of it than to be able to hear it on the radio or television.

There is a diversity of population in cities from coast to coast. Aboriginal people and others from all over the world deserve to have broadcasting in their language so they may have an opportunity to live something of the strength of their own culture through the existence of their language.

The culture we see at folklore festivals is often reduced to food and dance partly because we do not know the languages. When the languages are reduced to the level that one communicates in a family, a great deal of the beauty and strength of a culture is lost.

If Barbara Ward's observation years ago about Canada being the first international nation is to be a reality, then our broadcasting must operate in more than just English and French. There must be a recognition of the need in our cities and wherever people live with a diversity of languages, to

develop those languages and hear them spoken on radio and television.

Canada can play a role in the development of language, as I understand it is doing in French. The French spoken in Canada responds to technological development more imaginatively than is sometimes the case in France. That is an example of a Canadian cultural contribution out of our richness of language.

The Member for Winnipeg North might particularly appreciate my referring to Dr. J.B. Rudnyckyj, the former commissioner on the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. That commission played an important part in the limited linguistic development to where we have achieved recognition for the equality of status in English and French in federal institutions.

Occasionally I correspond with Dr. Rudnyckyj because he remains a powerful proponent of a larger recognition of language in this country, including the recognition of regional languages. He wants to move beyond the provisions in the Official Languages Act that legislate against the destruction of language, or "linguicide" as he terms it. We need actively to find those means that could strengthen language. There I think is where the broadcasting policy of the Canadian Government has failed ever since 1968. Of course, in 1968, the official languages policy of Canada was only being elaborated. It had not been legislated when the Broadcast Act of 1968 passed.

• (1250)

Unfortunately, in this Bill there is not that further recognition of the necessity of making the Canadian broadcasting system multilingual, with care, of course. I know that this arouses fear in many Canadians, English-speaking and French-speaking both, who are anxious enough about maintaining official bilingualism and who think that federal responsibility for additional languages and for broadcasting in them would only arouse opposition to our policies.

This is country that is drowned in American culture. The CBC particularly, and Radio Canada obviously less so, fight for listeners and viewers by re-broadcasting American shows. These broadcasters have given little thought to the possibility of reflecting the diversity of the Canadian population in radio and television. If they were to do so, they would attract viewers who now simply do not bother to watch. These viewers might be attracted if they saw themselves and their ways on the television screen or heard them on the airwaves. That is the challenge that faces us. This Government has obviously failed in that challenge.

We are so aware of the fact that these days, the Conservative Party is doubtful about CBC and Radio Canada, even though back in the early 1930s, the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission was a product of the Bennett Conservative Government. These days we are grateful for small mercies, for the good words that exist in Bill C-136. We probably could not have expected a Government that discovers multiculturalism just at election times to have done very much about the needs that I am expounding on. It is a challenge to the three Parties to elaborate policies and to develop the means to ensure that the multicultural reality of Canada is really reflected in our broadcasting.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Order made Thursday, July 21, 1988, the recorded division stands deferred until six o'clock today.

[*Translation*]

I have received written notice from the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap), informing me that he is unable to present his motion during Private Members' Hour on Tuesday, July 26, 1988.

[*English*]

It has not been possible to arrange an exchange of positions in the order of precedence pursuant to Standing Order 39. Accordingly, I am directing the Table Officers to drop that item of business to the bottom of the order of precedence. Since notice will be removed, the hour for Private Members' Business will be cancelled and, pursuant to Standing Order 39, the House will continue with the business before it prior to that hour.

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

At 12.54, the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—POSITION OF NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, when it was time to stand up to be counted with my Leader's efforts to let the people decide the fate of the Mulroney trade deal, the NDP ran away from the challenge. Not only did the NDP's weekend retreat represent a reversal of its initial position of support, it also depicted a Party lacking political backbone.

When the purpose of this political stand was to guarantee the people of Canada a say before the deal is finalized, the NDP ignored this principle and chose instead to attack the role of the Senate. Yet it was the same NDP which encouraged Senators in their crusade against an unjust drug Bill. It was the same NDP which cheered the Senate on as it studied and challenged the legitimacy of the Government's two refugee Bills. Does not this trade deal, which will alter the very fabric of our country, merit similar scrutiny by the Senate?

History will show that when the political going got tough with the trade deal, the NDP got going. Members of the NDP wimped out. They blinked. In so doing, they failed to stand up for Canadians' indisputable right to shape the destiny and future of their own country.

* * *

ABORTION

INTRODUCTION OF NEW DRUG TO INDUCE ABORTIONS

Mr. John Oostrom (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, there exists the strong possibility that Canada could become the North American testing ground for a controversial drug that will revolutionize abortions.

RU 486 is a pill which induces abortion without the need for a physician or medical facilities. This new drug will allow the killing of an unborn baby in the privacy of one's own home. This drug, if produced, would serve to cheapen further the value of life—for killing will become a simple act of taking medication to cure some ailment. The duty of all mankind is to protect all life, and any attempt to cheapen life must be challenged.

I intend to do whatever is necessary to fight any attempt to introduce RU 486 into Canada.

S. O. 21

AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

AIRBUS MAINTENANCE CONTRACT—AIR CANADA'S WINNIPEG BASE

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the residents of Winnipeg are being asked to celebrate the fact that the maintenance contract for the Airbus aircraft to be purchased by Air Canada will be done in Winnipeg. What we are being asked to celebrate is the fact that we have not been shafted by the Government. The 727 maintenance work is already being done in Winnipeg. By placing the Airbus work there we simply maintain the *status quo.*

At the present time promises are also being made to the effect that by having the maintenance work in Winnipeg we will become the North American centre for Airbus maintenance work. This echoes the promise that was made about the CF-5 when by doing the work in Winnipeg we were supposed to obtain global contracts for the CF-5. That has not materialized.

This sounds like another inflated promise. I wonder if the Government could give this one in writing. In that way we could have some assurance that, if we are going to be the North American centre for the maintenance of Airbuses, there would be a guarantee that the work will come there rather than be simply another inflated promise from a Government that is desperate for re-election.

* * *

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

ROYAL CANADIAN ARMY CADETS—VICTORIES AT BISLEY RIFLE CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, the young people of Canada who become Canadian Forces cadets serve us well and deserve recognition.

Within the last two weeks Royal Canadian Army Cadets have competed against over 2,400 young target rifle shooters at the annual competition in Bisley, England. Led by Colonel Bert Cafick and coached by Mr. Clem Tremblay, the team of 18 cadets from across Canada won team competitions against 62 other teams.

Special mention must go to Kirsten Watt of Orleans, Ontario; Cory Roberts of Regina, Saskatchewan; Tom Sutton from Baldonnew, British Columbia; and Jamie Metlin of Truro, Nova Scotia, who won medals in events. Cadets Watt and Roberts, in different events, both beat 2,460 other shooters for their gold medals.

These are some examples of the accomplishments of Canadian young people who are cadets. I am sure that all Hon. Members applaud these achievements. We must continue the support given to cadet programs across the country.

S. O. 21

AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

HELICOPTER ASSEMBLY CONTRACT—AWARD TO HALIFAX ADVOCATED

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage the Government of Canada to ensure that the assembly of NSA helicopters takes place in Nova Scotia. This is a relatively short program. The suggestion of setting up new facilities in Québec when there are already existing facilities in Halifax, Nova Scotia, and a workforce to go along with them, boggles the mind.

In Halifax the IMP group is designing a new hangar for the ongoing support of the Sea King helicopter and its replacement, the new shipborne aircraft. We have an experienced workforce to which we need to transfer the technology and we must maintain their jobs until there is sufficient maintenance type work for them to continue this traditional Maritime program which is the core of our aerospace industry in Nova Scotia.

Québec has already been assigned two-thirds of this whole program. Québec also has the Airbus contract of over $1 billion to look forward to, and the F-18. Nova Scotia has the manpower, the training, the technology, and the infrastructure to do the assembly and maintenance work; Québec has none of these. In fairness and equity this contract must go to the workers in the Province of Nova Scotia.

* * *

• (1405)

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—POSITION OF CANADIAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. Gus Mitges (Grey—Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce in its submission to the House of Commons legislative committee respecting Bill C-130, the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States, stated that it sees the FTA as a means whereby more Canadian jobs would be created, with a higher standard of living for present and future generations, and greater wealth and opportunities for our children.

The Chamber emphasized that the Canadian community must be prepared to step forward and compete internationally, that we cannot afford to sit on our hands and let the opportunities offered by the FTA be squandered. The Canadian Chamber of Commerce has faith in the skills and ingenuity of Canadian business, and in the confidence and strength that Canadians have as a people.

It emphasized that the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement was a good deal for Canada when it was announced in October, 1987; it was a good deal when it saw the fine print in December; and it is now an excellent deal and worthy of speedy passage through both Houses of Parliament.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—POSITION OF LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. André Plourde (Kamouraska—Rivière-du Loup): The real face of John Turner! Mr. Speaker, in his editorial in *La Presse* of July 22, Claude Masson qualified Mr. Turner's decision to oblige the Senate to delay passage of the Free Trade Bill as inconceivable and unpardonable. He even described Mr. Turner's gesture as undemocratic.

Personally, as a Member of this House, I believe that by this action Mr. Turner has once again shown he is incapable of playing his role as Leader of the Opposition. His use of this cowardly subterfuge is positive proof that he has no respect for this House and even less for the Canadian people.

How can he claim to have the qualifications for being our next prime minister, when at the first opportunity, and this only as Leader of the Opposition, he hides behind an institution like the Senate whose members are not even elected? He hasn't fooled Canadians, and I am sure that Mr. Turner will not prevail over their common sense.

* * *

[*English*]

HIGHWAYS

ALASKA HIGHWAY—FUNDING REQUIRED FOR MAINTENANCE

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, Public Works Canada has recently released a pamphlet on "Driving the Alaska Highway". It states: "A trip along the Alaska Highway can be a once in a lifetime experience".

I would agree that it is a wonderful trip, with unsurpassed scenery. However, since 1982 the former Liberal Government, followed by the present Government, continued to cut the funds for the maintenance and construction of this one vital link to the Yukon and northern British Columbia, to the tune of 42 per cent.

The Association of Yukon Communities, Chambers of Commerce, and the Yukon Territorial Government have made numerous pleas to the Government to prevent further deterioration of the highway which impacts on tourism, transportation costs, and the long-term goal of self-sufficiency in the North. All to no avail.

In the past two weeks unseasonable rains have resulted in washouts, long delays, and sections of the Yukon being cut off from any road access.

The 50th anniversary of the highway will be in 1992, just a few short years away. I urgently call on the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McInnis) to restore funding for this historic highway so that it can truly be, as this pamphlet states, "A great highway of the North".

* * *

THE SENATE

POSITION OF LIBERAL MAJORITY

Mr. Reginald Stackhouse (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, the Trudeau Government did not have an election mandate for wage and price controls in 1975. Although it had no such mandate and had actively campaigned against such controls, although its program affected every working person and business in Canada, the Liberal majority in the Senate did not block it. It made no demand for approval by the electorate. It let the program go by.

The argument now that the Senate is entitled to block the free trade agreement, on the basis of a 75-year old precedent from the semi-colonial past, defies belief.

Are those people correct who think that the Liberal majority in the Senate works hardest when it is protecting the chartered banks and the Liberal Party?

* * *

• (1410)

APARTHEID

TENNIS TOURNAMENT—PARTICIPATION OF WHITE SOUTH AFRICANS

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, as August 6 approaches, Canadians are wondering whether the Government will change its policy with respect to the South African athletes who will be playing at the Player's Tournament for Tennis Canada, which is in my riding. For us, it is a great affront to see the federal Government have a policy which permits South African athletes to play in this tournament under any guise whatsoever.

Whether visas are the issue, whether federal government financial backing for Tennis Canada is the issue, a way must be found for the Government to prevent these athletes from participating. This is what the spirit of the Gleneagles Accord among Commonwealth countries calls for, and I call on the Government now to act so that a racist Government will not be represented, directly or indirectly, at the Player's Tournament in my constituency of York Centre, Toronto.

S. O. 21

[*Translation*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—POSITION OF LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. Gabriel Fontaine (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, when I was younger, I use to like reading the Gaston Lagaffe strips.

That was some years ago, but I still see people who are past masters at the art of the "gaffe".

The Leader of the Liberal Party decided that in this country, laws are no longer made by our elected representatives but by the non-elected members of the Senate. That was the first gaffe.

The duly elected Liberal Government of Quebec is in favour of free trade. The Liberal Leader in Ottawa is against free trade. That was the second gaffe.

Seven Canadian provinces are in favour of free trade. The Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada is against free trade. Third gaffe.

In Quebec, we had Gaston Lagaffe, now we have Turner "la gaffe"!

* * *

[*English*]

BANKS AND BANKING

ROYAL BANK—REPORTED TREATMENT OF SAULT STE. MARIE BUSINESSMAN

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, well, the banks have struck again. There is a new user fee that the banks are applying, and that is to businessmen in northern Ontario who dare to speak out about bank policies.

Ms. Copps: What about business women?

Mr. Angus: Well, there are no problems at all; this is a man. Fred Goodine from Sault Ste. Marie spoke out at the Premiers' conference on northern development in Thunder Bay last fall, on bank policies as they relate to businesses.

Now, his company has been frozen out by the Royal Bank from any business because of his public statements. That is an unacceptable way for banks to act. I am sure that they are not going to stop donating to the government Party just because the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre) happens to say things against them.

Oral Questions

POLITICAL PARTIES

THE SENATE—POSITION OF LIBERAL PARTY

Mr. Benno Friesen (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, well, four years of opposition have done nothing to diminish Liberal arrogance. For years they campaigned on any kind of catchy slogan, and then they legislated as they wished. It was campaign, sloganeer and legislate, and they called elections as they wished.

They seemed to think that calling an election was their absolute right as the elected Government. However, now, since they are impotent in this House, they have made a deal with—is it John MacEachen, or Allan Turner, or is it Allan MacEachen?

Ms. Copps: They are not impotent.

Mr. Friesen: At any rate, they will gladly sell off the role and the rights of this House, and expand the role of the Senate in order to catch a glimmer of hope that would enable them to hang on to power in the other place and maybe expand it in this one. Well, that is the kind of arrogance that drove them out of office, and that is the kind of arrogance that is going to keep them in perpetual opposition.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING—USE OF *AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL* AS BACKGROUND MUSIC

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, imagine my surprise as I was driving to work this morning and I heard an anthem playing very melodiously on the radio, *America The Beautiful*. It talked about the great continent of North America and how we had great agricultural programs and great environmental programs. In fact, the whole ad was sponsored not by the Government of the United States but by the Government of Canada, using as background music *America The Beautiful*. It seems to me that if the Government is bound and determined to move us down on the road of free trade, for heaven's sake could it at least pull advertisements that I as a Canadian find offensive? If the Americans want to run ads talking about *America The Beautiful*, let the Americans do that.

Canadian tax dollars and government sponsored ads should not be used to propagate the idea that agricultural programs are North American. The word "Canada" is not used once in that ad, and I see that as part and parcel of the Government's move to make us simply a part of the continental United States.

• (1415)

AIRPORTS

PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—PRICE OF SOFT DRINKS

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago I brought to the attention of the House that snack bars at Pearson International Airport were charging outrageous prices. A small sized Coca-Cola is $1.29. This is an unbelievable price when you consider that a small sized Coke is half that price in the city and also consider that the Government is responsible for the terms on which concessions are operated at Pearson International Airport.

I called on the Government at the time not only to manage the airport from the point of view of a good landlord but to bear in mind as well the situation of passengers who are sometimes there for very long periods of time, with children, and who are forced to pay prices that are set with really no competition at all behind them.

Since I made that statement in the House I have received dozens of representations from people in my riding and elsewhere about the fact that prices are far too high. Does the Government intend to do anything at all about that? Will ceilings be set so that gouging at the airport will be brought to an end?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

CHILD CARE

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my question of the Acting Prime Minister. It took the Government four years to deliver on the Mulroney promise for a child care package. It will take it another 7 years for a total of 11 years before we ever see the light of day totally given to this package.

How does the Government feel about introducing today a Bill into the House of Commons that does absolutely nothing to ensure the safety of Canadian children, that will leave more than half a million Canadian children without access to licensed and organized child care spaces, and that will not assure the mothers of this country that when they have to go out to work their children will be left in safety? Is this the Mulroney promise on child care?

Hon. Jean J. Charest (Minister of State (Youth) and Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Health and Welfare is out of the House on business. I am very happy to acknowledge the Hon. Member's question and point out to her that we are the first Government that has brought forward legislation in the House of Commons on child care. The previous Government had

ample opportunity to do that but never did so when it was in office.

Mr. Gauthier: Stick to the facts.

Mr. Charest: The Hon. Member said I should stick to the facts. The facts indicate that we will be putting $6.4 billion into child care over a seven year period. If the Hon. Member is wondering how fast the legislation will get through the House, that will depend upon whether his Leader will ask the Senate to put it through or not.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

REQUEST FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, if this is supposed to be the centre-piece of the Conservative election, I am not surprised the Minister did not have the guts to come into the House of Commons today to defend it because it is absolute garbage.

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Ms. Copps: If the Government does not listen to the Liberal Party and does not listen to child care groups and concerned parents across the country, will the Government call an election and let the parents of Canada decide if they want to have a child care program that has no national standards, that does nothing to ensure the safety of children, and that will only meet the needs of one-quarter of those children who are desperately in need of increased spaces?

Hon. Jean J. Charest (Minister of State (Youth) and Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): Mr. Speaker, I think any reasonable citizen would recognize the fact that this is a substantial commitment to the area of child care in Canada on behalf of this Government—any reasonable citizen except for the Hon. Member for Hamilton East.

As far as the election being called is concerned, we now know the position of the Liberal Party of Canada is that the Senate should decide when elections should be called and not the democratically elected people of Canada. We are not run by the Senate of Canada. The Liberals are, and soon they will have an election on many issues.

Mr. Speaker: Before the Hon. Member for Hamilton East is recognized again, as she will be, I do want to remind Hon. Members that reference to other Hon. Members, whether they be Ministers or otherwise being in or out of the House, is not appropriate. I cannot help but notice today that that tactic could be carried on by both sides. Perhaps it need not be pursued.

[*Translation*]

QUALITY OF DAY CARE CENTRES—NATIONAL STANDARDS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Members should be ashamed for what has been brought forward today, which guarantees no child . . . and you have children, you over there! It guarantees no national level of quality for child care facilities.

Why has the Conservative Government decided to subsidize provinces like Alberta, which only has commercial profit-making child care services? Are those the Conservatives' standards for child care? I would like to have an answer, at least from those who are parents: Would they leave their children in commercial profit-making day care facilities or do they want national standards, to be respected by the Conservatives?

Hon. Jean Charest (Minister of State (Youth) and Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): Mr. Speaker, the national child care policy presented by this Government is an investment of nearly $6.4 billion over seven years, to which another $1 billion has recently been added. The purpose is to provide flexible services and leave parents a choice, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the Hon. Member for Hamilton East is still not happy with that, unfortunately! Perhaps she could consult the Liberal Senate, since it decides and leads the Liberal Party of Canada. We will see if the Senate will decide and if Mr. Turner intends to ask the Senate to approve the legislation or not, because he said he was God in the House of Commons.

* * *

• (1420)

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—TERMS OF U.S. LEGISLATION

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. As she will know, the American Free Trade Bill will be tabled today in the U.S. Congress. The Government should know that it still contains several provisions contrary to the Canadian Bill. First, it contains a provision which will allow the American Government to monitor and oppose Canadian imports which might be subsidized. Second, there is a provision which says that the free trade agreement will be subject to American law in the U.S. The Minister for International Trade said he did not like either one of those provisions.

In these ridiculous circumstances why does the Government not submit this trade deal to the Canadian people and let them decide if this is what they want for Canada?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the U.S. legislation is being tabled in Congress today and that it is proceeding as people in the Congress and the administration indicated it would. I only wish I could say that the Hon. Member who speaks for the opposition Party recognizes that the same kind of process should apply to legislation in this House. However, that is not the point of the opposition—and one could hardly say the "Loyal Opposition" any more. Nevertheless—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some Hon. Members: Loyal to the Senate.

Mr. Speaker: I remind the Hon. Minister that she cannot say the contrary either. I know she will want to withdraw that.

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the new slogan of the Liberal Party is "Let the Senate decide". "Let the Senate decide on trade legislation". Now I suppose it is "Let the Senate decide on child care". "Let the Senate decide on the major issues before this country". It is a complete abdication of responsibility.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, if the Canadian people were to decide in an election that they want this trade deal, the Senate will respect their view.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Allmand: The Government is afraid to submit this deal to the Canadian people because it knows it cannot be supported.

TERMS OF CANADIAN LEGISLATION

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, Article 8 in our Bill, contrary to the American Bill, provides that the free trade agreement will take precedence over all other Canadian law, including regional development law, agricultural law, fisheries law, environmental law, trade adjustment law, employment equity law, and so on. That places the free trade agreement next to the Constitution and only the Constitution in importance, and this is a major change in our country.

Why does the Government not let the people decide in an election if they want that kind of major change for this country?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): First, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member's preamble is totally wrong. Section 8 pertains only to legislation affected by the free trade agreement, not all legislation as the Hon. Member would like to pretend.

• (1425)

I remind the Member that Section 8 is included in the safe transportation of goods legislation brought in by his Government. It is also in the Cree-Naskapi Act, the James Bay Indian Act, and the Western Grain Transportation Act. I have a list of Acts in which it is included. It is used in Canadian law quite frequently. The Hon. Member cannot stand up and mislead this House with that kind of inaccurate information.

* * *

CHILD CARE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Youth who is responding on the child care legislation. The Minister of National Health and Welfare told the Senate committee studying child care that the Government would augment provinces' child care expenses up to 90 per cent of the national average.

This Bill clearly states that the Government will pay only up to 70 per cent of the expenses need to reach the national average. Why has the Government again broken its promise to the people of Canada?

Hon. Jean J. Charest (Minister of State (Youth) and Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): Mr. Speaker, it was with great pride that the Government introduced in the House today for the first time legislation on day care. This $6.4 billion package over a seven-year period is a substantial commitment to the issue of day care for all Canadian families.

I hope that the Hon. Member will assist in its rapid passage through the House in order that it can also be put through the Senate as rapidly as possible.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, the Government has consistently said that it would bring in a child care strategy program. This legislation has no national standards or national objectives. The Government has gone back on its word with regard to the 90 per cent topping up.

Why did the Minister of National Health and Welfare decide to change the topping up from 90 per cent to 70 per cent and break his promise to the Canadian people?

Hon. Jean J. Charest (Minister of State (Youth) and Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): Mr. Speaker, the legislation provides a 50-50 cost sharing of operating costs of commercial and non-profit agencies, a 75-25 cost sharing of capital cost of non-profit agencies during the period ending March 31, 1995, and, finally, a top-up to certain provinces based on national average entitlement per child care formula. That is what the legislation contains.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, the Government promised 90 per cent topping up. It is obvious that is not there. Over and above that there are areas in Newfoundland, the Territories, and other provinces which do not have an infrastructure for child care which need that 90 per cent topping up. I would like the Minister to tell this House why the Government has broken its promise on this.

Hon. Jean J. Charest (Minister of State (Youth) and Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member wants to make that representation she may do so in committee as soon as this legislation goes through the House. She and all Members of the House will have the opportunity to make whatever representations and amendments they want to put before the House. I hope she will help the legislation get through as rapidly as possible, as a responsible Member would do.

* * *

NUCLEAR ENERGY

FERMI II NUCLEAR PLANT IN MICHIGAN—LEAK OF RADIOACTIVE STEAM

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs. The Detroit Edison Company operates the Fermi II nuclear generating plant in Munroe, Michigan, just a few miles from hundreds of thousands of Canadians in the Windsor-Essex County area.

Two weeks ago the Nuclear Regulatory Commission of the United States gave that plant a very bad report card saying it was operating at minimally acceptable levels in five key categories. Last Saturday we learned there was a leak of radioactive steam from that plant and that it has been closed down temporarily.

Will the Government insist that the U.S. Government not allow that plant to re-open until it is absolutely certain, on the basis of it being satisfactory to Canadian authorities, that there is no risk to the health and safety of Canadians in the operations of that plant? In particular, will the Government ask that there be a special inspection of that plant by the International Atomic Energy Agency of the United Nations?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the concerns that have been raised by the Member for Windsor West. Those concerns have been raised by a number of Canadians and we have conveyed them to the United States administration.

It is important to note that all Members in this House share a public concern about the operations of Fermi II. As a result of that, Canadian officials have asked the United States administration to consider placing Fermi II under an appropriate IAEA safety mechanism for a review, specifically to take into consideration what has happened during the past weekend.

• (1430)

REQUEST FOR MONITORING BY INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, in light of what happened this past weekend, will the Government on an urgent basis reiterate the need for an International Atomic Energy Agency inspection? Second, will the Government accept my request that the Government have the Americans agree to a permanent reference to the International Joint Commission of the inspection and monitoring on an ongoing binational basis of this Fermi II plant so that there will be assurances to the hundreds of thousands of Canadians living all too near to Fermi II, that if it is allowed to operate again, it will not be any threat to their health and safety?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, as I have already said, the Canadian Government has raised with the United States administration the matter of steam leaks and other occurrences at the Fermi II plant. We have asked that it be reviewed under the IAEA.

The Member suggests that this be done under the IJC. We thought it would probably be better under the multilateral standards, but we will certainly take his suggestion into consideration.

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT DEMAND CLOSURE OF PLANT

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. I want to pursue the question asked by the Member for Windsor. After months during which Atomic Energy Board of Canada and the Government refused to act at all in any serious way, we are pleased to hear that a reference to the IAEA has been made.

This plant has been described as a dinosaur of the industry, and the worst in the country by NRC officials themselves. It has been described as an accident waiting to happen. Within two days of the publication of the evaluation that showed its operational efficiency in five areas was the worst possible, there was another radioactive steam leak.

Will the Government demand of the U.S. Government that this plant be closed down until this evaluation takes place?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated that we have conveyed our concerns to the United States and made certain suggestions about how to deal with the Fermi II plant. The Hon. Member goes on to make a further suggestion.

We have asked that the matter of steam leaks and other occurrences be considered within the broad parameters of the

international regulations. He has made a further suggestion. I will see that that suggestion is referred to the Department and given consideration.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, we are making progress, so I would like to pin the Hon. Minister down on this issue. We have had no answers from the Government, and the Atomic Energy Board of Canada said that it was strictly an American concern and the plant was no problem. Suddenly, after a steam leak and a report from the NRC, the Government will act.

We want the answer to be clear. Will the Secretary of State specifically request that the plant be closed until this evaluation takes place?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, there have been suggestions from both the Member for Windsor West and the Member for Windsor—Walkerville about what should be done in this particular situation. I have indicated to both of them that I will convey their suggestions to the Secretary of State for External Affairs so that the suggestions could be given consideration.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

GREAT LAKES—DUMPING OF WASTES BY INTERNATIONAL SHIPPING

Mr. John Oostrom (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment. Ships from every nation now ply the waters of the Great Lakes. It is reported that many vessels dump untreated human waste directly into the lakes.

The recent closing of some of Toronto's beaches has been attributed to some ships dumping waste directly into the harbour. This poses a serious problem for our drinking water and creates the possibility of tropical diseases being introduced into Canada. Will the Parliamentary Secretary investigate this dumping practice and bring down tough legislation to prevent waste from being dumped into the Great Lakes?

Mrs. Pauline Browes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for this very important question and for his interest in environmental concerns.

The control of vessel waste is covered under the Canada Shipping Act, which is administered by the Canadian Coast Guard. Environment Canada acts in an advisory capacity to the Canadian Coast Guard.

Let me assure the Member that the Canadian Environmental Protection Act which was passed in Parliament a few weeks ago—the first piece of environmental legislation to pass the House in over 11 years—will enable us to review and bring in strong controls if necessary and where appropriate.

* * *

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

MEMBER FOR YORK—SIMCOE

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. In light of the election by the York—Simcoe Conservative Association of the present Member for York—Peel as the Conservative candidate in the forthcoming election—

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Kaplan: You have not heard the question yet. And in light of the finding of 14 conflicts of interest against that Member by an independent judicial inquiry established by the Prime Minister, and in view of the Prime Minister's statement that he accepted the findings of the independent judicial inquiry, does the Prime Minister intend—

Mr. Speaker: I have listened very carefully to the question. I have to say that that question is out of order.

Mr. Kaplan: I would then ask the Acting Prime Minister whether she will state categorically on behalf of the Government that the Member for York—Peel—

Mr. Andre: Out of order.

Mr. Kaplan: That the Member for York—Peel will not be part of any Government or Cabinet—

Some Hon. Members: Order.

An Hon. Member: You know better than that.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the Hon. Member will know that that is also out of order. The Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—IMPLEMENTATION DATE

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. The general counsel for the U.S. Special Trade Representative Office has said that in the event that Canada is not ready to go with the trade deal on January 1, "we will just have to wait to implement".

Does this mean, in the Government's interpretation, that the January 1 date fixed for the trade deal to come into force could be easily postponed by the Government?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, we negotiated an agreement with the United States which says that it comes into force on January 1, 1989. This Government is working toward that deadline, as is the Government of the United States. Neither the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, Allan MacEachen, or whoever, will prevent us from reaching that deadline.

REQUEST FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, at least to me and my Party, this quotation suggests that the Senate announcement by the Leader of the Opposition will mean very little in terms of the timing of the next election. Therefore, the moral issue still faces the Government.

• (1440)

The Government has to make a decision, and I ask the question directly. Will the Government let the people of Canada make a decision with respect to whether this deal should go forward or not? Will the Government let the people of Canada decide?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Hon. Member has read the trade agreement and that he knows that Article 2105 states that the agreement is to come into effect on January 1, 1989. He is also very aware that the legislation is proceeding in committee through the House of Commons.

I want to assure the Hon. Member that that process will continue. I also want to assure him, as the Prime Minister has stated, that there will be an election at an appropriate time. I have no doubt that there will be a number of issues discussed in that election campaign, trade being one of them.

I want the Hon. Member to know that yes, indeed, we will be proceeding with the legislation. Second, there will be an election in due course. I ask the Hon. Member to be sure to put those two things together.

* * *

ABORIGINAL RIGHTS

DENE AND MÉTIS LAND CLAIM

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane—Superior): Mr. Speaker, I have a question that falls under the category of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I will put the question to the Acting Minister, if one is present, or to the Acting Prime Minister.

My question concerns one of the most important aboriginal land claims in Canada at the moment, one which is in fact teetering in the balance. On July 10 the Dene and Métis of the Northwest Territories said yes to the proposed agreement-in-principle provided that certain matters could be either negotiated or re-negotiated, and a request to this effect has gone to both the Minister and the Prime Minister.

I would like to know if the Government has considered this request, and what exactly is the position of the Government at the moment with respect to the settlement of this vital northern claim.

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Hon. Member would be pleased, as we are, that the Yukon Indian leaders have voted to accept the land claims settlement for that northern territory. As the Hon. Member also knows, the negotiations for the settlement with the Dene and the Inuit have gone ahead. There are a couple of outstanding items still. These are being negotiated. The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has himself spent a great deal of time and effort on this particular claim, and those negotiations and discussions are continuing.

CONCLUSION OF NEGOTIATIONS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane—Superior): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. It will come as some surprise to the Dene, the Métis and the Government of the Northwest Territories that those negotiations are in fact continuing. The Deputy Minister for the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development said that there would be no negotiation on the outstanding items.

I am asking the Government to say today whether or not the door is still open. Is the Government prepared to pursue every avenue and examine every option in order that there may be a successful conclusion of all aspects of this claim?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the Hon. Member is aware, and as I have said, there have been considerable negotiations that have taken place to date. There are still a couple of major areas outstanding.

I will certainly refer the Hon. Member's question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, but as I understand it there is now a process under way to negotiate or to ratify an AIP. Following that ratification, the negotiations with 13 different groups will be continued, hopefully to the same successful conclusion that has been worked out with the Yukon claim.

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT ATTEMPT TO NEGOTIATE OUTSTANDING ISSUES

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Acting Prime Minister. Following on the same line of thought about land claims, I

would like to say that the ratification last week by the Council for Yukon Indians of a framework agreement put together by the three principals in the negotiations, the Council for Yukon Indians, the federal Government, and the Yukon Government, was indeed historic and did go beyond what happened with the Dene and Métis. To that extent, I must say that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development deserves some credit, as do the other negotiators.

Having gone this far in this important and historic step in the longest outstanding land claims negotiation in Canada, is the Government now prepared to initiate immediate talks with the principals to clear up the two outstanding issues, and what is the time frame for that?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to refer that request for information to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I was pleased to hear the Hon. Member's comments at the time that historic step was taken, and I know that she and others have done everything possible to try to move this forward. However, I will refer her request for the next stage, the final ratification, to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development so that he can give her information with regard to the proposed timetable for the final steps.

YUKON LAND CLAIM SETTLEMENT

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the Acting Prime Minister knows, this particular ratification does require the consent of the three parties and will eventually have to go to Cabinet for certain aspects of it. Therefore, I would ask the Acting Prime Minister if she is prepared to say what the commitment of the Government is, now that the Council for Yukon Indians has kept its end of the bargain by ratifying its framework agreement, to complete this agreement. Will Cabinet deal with this expeditiously so that we can finally have, for the first time in nine years, a settled land claim in Canada?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member was quoted in the press the other day as saying that this is really just a framework, not a final settlement, and she wants to know what the details of that final settlement are. I am not in a position to give her the details of that final settlement today, but I have said that I would refer the requests she has raised to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

I can tell the Hon. Member that this is considered to be a major and important priority for the Government, and there will be continuing attention paid to all the details so that we can bring in that historic final document that she mentions.

HOUSING

METROPOLITAN TORONTO—CNR LAND HOLDINGS

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the two Ministers of Transport, I address my question to the Acting Prime Minister. My question concerns the Government's silence on the intensifying crisis in affordable housing facing many Canadians in Metropolitan Toronto.

Earlier this month the City of Toronto announced a $1.2 billion housing program that would include a parcel of land which holds 15 acres owned and controlled by Canadian National Railways, a federal Crown corporation. In support of the public interest in reliable and affordable housing in Metropolitan Toronto, has the federal Government instructed the CNR to release its land holdings and therefore to become a viable and co-operative partner in this housing venture? If so, when can we expect a formal agreement to be signed between the federal CNR and the City of Toronto?

Mrs. Shirley Martin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member knows, Canadian National is a Crown corporation, and of course, works at arm's length from the federal Government. As well, the federal Government has instructed all Departments that hold lands in the city of Toronto to review the need for those lands, along with the Bureau of Real Property Management. We are looking at the lands, we are looking at what is available, and as soon as we know what is available, they will be disposed of in an equitable manner.

• (1450)

Mr. Marchi: Mr. Speaker, I tell the Parliamentary Secretary that this is not a case of reviewing lands. This is a golden opportunity that cries out for a federal partnership with federally available land. The Government must make up its mind whether it will be a partner or not.

CANADA POST CORPORATION LAND HOLDINGS

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister responsible for the Post Office. Given that many people are requesting that federal surplus lands be first and foremost considered for federal housing, can the Minister inform the House whether the Government is prepared to utilize the very substantial and surplus post office lands in Metropolitan Toronto for badly needed housing rather than selling these sites for top dollar value, which not only loses us the federal lands which are very valuable but which ironically also increases the spiralling costs of land for housing?

Will the Government finally take advantage of these land opportunities and provide some real federal leadership in the area of housing in Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, a great proportion of Canada Post's capital facilities in lands and buildings are in fact leased from

Public Works Canada. Public Works handles them in a manner with which the Hon. Member is acquainted. In terms of other lands and buildings and so on, I am not aware that the Post Office has surplus lands. Any surplus lands that it might have will be dealt with in a way consistent with government policy.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LEVEL OF PURCHASING IN WESTERN CANADA

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Supply and Services. Last week in western Canada he announced that his Department would be increasing the level of purchasing to 12.4 per cent in western Canada. Why did the Minister set a level below the 1984 level of 14.2 per cent? Why is he actually decreasing the percentage of money that will be spent in western Canada?

Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, as always the Hon. Member has his facts wrong. What we announced last week in Regina, which was followed up with a specific announcement in Calgary a day later with my colleague, the Minister responsible for western diversification, was that we would increase, over current purchases from the West, western procurement on a yearly basis by some 17 per cent, with an ultimate goal of bringing in equality of opportunity to all regions.

We will be able to do this for two reasons. First, we have put a greater emphasis on Canadian purchasing. In fact, last year we reduced offshore purchases by 26.6 per cent, that is, foreign purchases, thereby giving more Canadian businesses an opportunity to sell to the Government of Canada.

When—not if—the free trade deal comes into effect, there will be an additional access of up to $4 billion of opportunities for Canadian businesses. We will be able to increase the share for western Canada without taking away from Ontario and Quebec.

EXPENDITURES IN WESTERN CANADA

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, the Minister seems to want to ignore the fact that western Canada was getting a higher percentage four years ago than it is now. I want to know why the target is even less than the despicable record of the Liberals. The Tories then were saying that the Liberals were not spending enough in western Canada. Now that target is even less.

Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, as I have just said in the House and in the West, something which has been agreed to by my provincial counterparts in a recent federal-provincial Minister's conference on procurement in Quebec City, the West had been ignored for 20 years by the Liberal administration. There is no doubt about it. Thus there was a lot of catching up to do.

We have already increased procurement in the West by some 25 per cent in the last couple of years. Now, with the western procurement initiatives which were announced last week, we are increasing that even further and working toward reaching an equitable proportion of purchases in all regions of Canada.

I suggest that the Hon. Member get his facts straight. I invite him to come to my office, to give him a briefing and to let him know exactly what is happening in this area.

* * *

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

EASTERN ONTARIO—REQUEST FOR INDUSTRIAL AND TOURISM INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister for Regional Industrial Expansion I direct my question to the Acting Prime Minister.

Last week I pointed out in this House that as of June 30 the Conservative Government has dropped the industrial incentive regional development programs in eastern Ontario. I asked the Minister when he would be bringing in a new industrial and tourism incentive program for this part of the province. He chose to insult the people of eastern Ontario by quoting provincial-wide unemployment figures and by bragging about government economic policies. He ignored the high pockets of unemployment that exist in eastern Ontario. He ignored the tens of millions of dollars that the Government has cut out of the eastern part of the Province of Ontario.

Will the Minister give the House a commitment today that the Government will take the unemployment problems and the economic problems of eastern Ontario seriously and bring in an industrial and tourism incentive program?

Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of State (Science and Technology)): Mr. Speaker, as everyone here would know, this Government does not need any lessons from our predecessors in terms of regional incentives that are geared to build upon the strengths of the various regions of the country and that are successful in terms of the creation of permanent jobs rather than part-time jobs, programs that are less geared to digging holes and filling them up again, but which stimulate industrial growth and opportunities in the various regions of the country.

The region about which the Hon. Member speaks has not been ignored, nor will it be ignored. Under this new arrangement there has been developed the Western Diversification Fund, ACOA, the eastern opportunities fund, a fund for northern Québec, and other regions of the country.

GOVERNMENT MEASURES

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, it is a farce that that Minister should have answered that question since he is personally responsible for some of those tens of millions of dollars of cuts in eastern Ontario.

As a complement to an industrial and tourism incentive program for eastern Ontario, will the Government start by dropping its self-imposed 15 per cent export tax on softwood lumber, which is very important to this region? Will the Government cease the cuts in the Public Service of Canada? Will the Government restore research and development funding to the Chalk River laboratories and to the National Research Council of Canada which has been devastated and where we have lost several hundreds of jobs? Will the Government bring in an agricultural and forestry program in that regional development for eastern Ontario? How about doing something for a change other than just cutting?

Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of State (Science and Technology)): Mr. Speaker, obviously you have been very generous with the Member, giving him an opportunity to point out all the strengths that there are in eastern Ontario.

Indeed, to be fair, we announced a couple of months ago a $1.3 billion boost to research and development, particularly in the area of industrial incentives, to permit the various regions of the country to build upon their strengths, to allow the traditional industries to revitalize themselves—forestry, agriculture, fisheries, and mining—while at the same time lessening the dependence of Canadians on some of these traditional industries and working toward a more future oriented industrial sector. All of these things are done within a framework of a new national policy on science and technology, and a new industrial strategy from which all regions of the country will benefit, particularly the region which the Hon. Member represents.

* * *

CANADA POST CORPORATION

REVIEW BOARD PRESIDENT—REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE REFERRAL

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for the Post Office. When the Minister appointed Allan Marchment as the watchdog over postal rates he did it with great fanfare. Now the Government is trying to hide this new appointee.

Why has the Government not referred the appointment of the president of a review board to the parliamentary committee? Is the Government afraid that an examination of his qualifications as a watchdog over the Post Office will not stand up? Will the Minister make sure that his Government now refers the appointment of Allan Marchment to the parliamentary committee so that his qualifications for this job can be examined?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I thought the Hon. Member was at the committee meeting at which I appeared to talk about the board and the fact that Allan Marchment had agreed to serve as chairman.

Sally Hall, past President of the Consumers Association of Canada, agreed to be one of the members.

A former Member of the National Energy Board, Mr. Senneville, agreed to serve as a third member.

If the Hon. Member would like to talk to these outstanding Canadians about their qualifications for serving the public of Canada in this fashion, why does he not suggest it to the chairman of the committee and send the invitation?

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, obviously the Minister is not aware of the parliamentary procedure whereby such appointments are referred to a parliamentary committee on an automatic basis. The committee took the unusual action of writing a letter to the Deputy Prime Minister asking for this appointment to be referred to the committee because it has not been referred up until now.

Why is the Government trying to hide Allan Marchment? Refer him to the committee.

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I thought the Hon. Member was there—I am sure he was—when I appeared before the committee and talked about Allan Marchment's appointment. If that is hiding Allan Marchment, it is a peculiar definition of hiding. I do not know why the Hon. Member is getting into such a lather. If he would simply send a letter to me requesting such a—

Mr. Keeper: The letter is gone.

• (1500)

Mr. Andre: He just indicated that he sent a letter to the Deputy Prime Minister. Since it is not a Governor General appointment, but an appointment by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, perhaps he should address the request to the appropriate person. I have already answered orally that I would certainly consider such a request.

FISHERIES

CLOSURE OF HIGHLANDS FISHERIES PLANT IN GLACE BAY, N.S.

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. Last Friday the Minister met with civic representatives, union leaders, and myself in Glace Bay to discuss the closure of the Highlands Fisheries plant in Glace Bay, thereby putting 310 individuals out of employment.

The Minister gave an undertaking to the gathering that he would have conversations with the president of Clearwater, Mr. John Risley, to secure from him undertakings, hopefully written undertakings, as to the future of this particular plant, and more important as to when the hiring of the 310 employees will be resumed. The Minister gave a date of August 1, 1988.

I ask the Minister to respond as to whether or not that date has been firmed up and the plant will open on August 1.

Mr. Pat Binns (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Hon. Member that the Minister is intent on having Clearwater live up to the commitment that he is looking for from the company. The Minister visited Nova Scotia on Friday with the purpose of having that plant reopened in order that the workers could return to their jobs. That was specifically undertaken for that reason. The Minister has no reason to look for anything but a concrete plan from the company. That is why it has an enterprise allocation and access to inshore fish.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last question. The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond.

BLOCKADE MOUNTED BY LAID-OFF WORKERS

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for that response. I wish to remind him that it was a Clearwater representative who said to the community that there was no fish available. Subsequent to the meeting on Friday with the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, in the darkness of night a ship arrived in port with 30,000 pounds of fish. As a result there has been a blockade of Highlands Fisheries by employees in Glace Bay.

In view of the fact that 310 employees are out of employment, in view of the fact that the Minister has given the community an undertaking, would the Hon. Member not give this House an undertaking that he will return later in the day and give us a status report on what is taking place at the Highlands Fisheries Ltd. plant, in other words, whether the Minister has received written undertakings to open this plant on August 1, 1988?

Mr. Pat Binns (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Hon. Member that the Minister is following the situation very closely. He has asked the company to keep in mind the concerns of the workers, and hopefully the 310 workers will be back to work in the near future.

The Minister has a few cards that he can play in this matter, and he is following it on an hour-to-hour basis. I am sure he will use whatever means he can to help the workers return to their jobs.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

LOBBYISTS REGISTRATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved that Bill C-82, an Act respecting the registration of lobbyists, be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to speak to the House today during third reading of Bill C-82, the proposed Lobbyists Registration Act. It is an important step toward the establishment of a lobbyists' register.

In September, 1985, the Right Hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) announced this initiative as part of public sector ethics. Soon after, a discussion paper, *Lobbying and the Registration of Paid Lobbyists*, was tabled in the House and was referred to the Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges and Procedure. Early last year, the committee presented a unanimous report that recommended the establishment of a lobbyists' registration system. Bill C-82, which I tabled in June, 1987, is faithful to the spirit of the standing committee's recommendations.

From the start there have been four guiding principles in the development of a lobbyist registration system. First, openness. A registry should allow the public and public office holders to know who is making representations to Government, giving transparency to the public's relations with Governments. Second, clarity. It should be clear who is required to register and who is not. Third, access to Government. The requirements of a registry system should not impede access to Government by the public. Fourth, administrative simplicity. Administrative processes should be kept to a minimum so that the purpose of the program is fulfilled without imposing an administrative burden on those affected by it.

It was not an easy task to put these four principles in one package. Some seem at odds with others, but I believe the Bill remains true to its principles.

The proposed registry has two levels or "tiers". Tier I lobbyists are professional third party lobbyists who represent clients to Government. We know them as government relations consultants, lawyers, and accountants. A Tier I lobbyist would be required to disclose his or her name and business address and, if applicable, the name of his or her firm. In addition, this lobbyist would disclose the name and address of the client, and

if that client were a corporation, the names and addresses of the clients parents and subsidiaries. Finally, the subject matter of the lobbying activity would also have to be disclosed.

Tier II lobbyists are often called "in-house lobbyists". They are employees of corporations or organizations who, as a significant part of their duties, lobby on behalf of their employers. Because the interests behind those lobbyists are more readily apparent than in the case of Tier I lobbyists who have an arm's length relationship with their clients, Tier II lobbyists are required to disclose only their names and the names and addresses of their employers. In both cases, the onus is upon the lobbyist to register, not the client or the employer.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, although a two-tier system was not part of the recommendations of the Standing Committee, as the Hon. Members for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) and Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) felt obliged to remind me, we believe the system is better suited to reflect the principles I mentioned just now. Furthermore, it contributes to administrative simplicity without sacrificing openness.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to a two-tier system, disclosure requirements will be more straightforward for most lobbyists, and registration will consequently be easier to administer. It is important that the system should not become an administrative burden, either for those who have to register or for the Government, or become a maze of red tape for those seeking to obtain information.

[*English*]

The Lobbyists Registration Act is a very solid proposal for a registry. It will provide the information needed so that the public as well as public office holders can find out who is making representations to Government. In a democratic society, the ability to find out who is lobbying is as important as the ability to lobby. This system requires only as much information as is necessary to identify who is lobbying for whom and, in Tier I, on what subject. The registry will not be burdensome for lobbyists to comply with or for the Government to administer. The amendments made by the legislative committee have improved the Bill in terms of the clarity of what is or is not lobbying, and who is or is not a lobbyist. I am pleased to put this Bill before you for final consideration.

• (1510)

Over the past weeks and months we have discussed and debated the who, what, why and how of the lobbyist registration system. I hope today that Hon. Members opposite will agree that the when is now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On debate, the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I may say it is a pleasure to finally have an opportunity to rise in the House and speak to the Bill respecting the registration of lobbyists.

The subject has been discussed for quite sometime. The House will recall that the first legislation in the United States was introduced an passed in 1946. So it would be inaccurate to say the Conservative Government invented the wheel in this respect.

The first Bill in Canada concerning the registration of lobbyists was tabled in 1969 by then Member of Parliament Mr. Barry Mather. The second Bill was tabled in 1974 by a Liberal Member, Mr. Ken Robinson, Member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore at the time.

In 1976, the late Walter Baker also tabled a Bill. In 1985, our colleague, the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez), tabled another bill to register lobbyists, and finally, also in 1985, the former Member for St. John's East, now His Honour the Lieutenant Governor of Newfoundland, tabled a Bill on the registration of lobbyists in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we must not forget that the Conservative Government was elected largely on its promise to abolish patronage.

[*English*]

It is important to remember this mandate that the Government gave itself in 1984 during the election campaign. The Conservatives talked about the patronage, and they said that if elected they would reform the system. They said that they would reform the system of political appointments. They talked about the fact that, in their view, things could be done in a better way. Well, Canadians believed the Leader of the Conservative Party during the election campaign. After the election, Canadians became disillusioned by the Conservative Leader—who became the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) after the election—because he did not live up to the promises that he had made to the people of Canada.

You will remember that this Government was criticized by the Opposition, and rightfully so I might add, in a non-partisan way, of course, by members of the Opposition and by the Canadian people, the media, editorial writers and so on, for the way in which it was dealing with the issues involving public sector ethics.

On September 9, 1985, the Prime Minister decided that he had had it with scandals, with things going wrong in his Government, and he presented himself in the House of Commons and made an impassioned speech for reforming the public sector ethics that he had allowed to decay under his leadership, gave us a speech and a package of documents wrapped in a nice blue ribbon, although blue ribbons are very seldom nice. He asked a Page to table it right here on the table of the Clerk of the House of Commons. He sent a letter to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner), the Leader of the NDP Party (Mr. Broadbent), to all MPs and Senators, and gave instructions to his Ministers. In this speech of September 9, 1985, and in an open letter to MPs and Senators, the Prime

Minister promised a new conflict of interest code. He promised another one after that, but he did offer us a new code on that day. He offered instructions to Ministers, imposing limitations on the hiring of family members. We know that some of his colleagues in Cabinet had appointed sons and daughters and cousins and in-laws, and all sorts of relations, to various positions. He wrote a letter to the opposition Leaders concerning the ethical standards for MPs and Senators. He established an experimental program for parliamentary scrutiny of Governor in Council appointments. He said at that time that we would have a system of registration of lobbying activity. Now, what he said is very important. I will repeat it. He said, and I quote from point five, dealing with the registration of lobbying activity, not that we would just register lobbyists, not that we would just register lobbying, he said that we would register lobbying activity. I see my friend from Nickel Belt is paying very close attention to this, because he and I are very interested in the registration of lobbying activity.

I want to read to you from page 9 of this letter. It is a very long letter that the Prime Minister sent to Members of Parliament. I guess the Prime Minister had a lot to think about on the weekend before that. He wrote long letters to MPs.

An Hon. Member: He knew what he wanted.

Mr. Boudria: On page 9, he said:

> The fifth component of this comprehensive approach to public sector ethics is the undertaking of this Government to introduce into the House of Commons, at an early date, legislation to monitor lobbying activity and to control the lobbying process by providing a reliable and accurate source of information on the activities of lobbyists. We will require, among other things, paid lobbyists to register and identify their clients.
>
> This will enable persons who are approached by lobbyists for Canadian corporations, associations and unions, and by agents on behalf of foreign governments and other foreign interests, to be clearly aware of who is behind the representation.

I repeat that part: "Who is behind the representation". I see that you are paying very close attention to this, Mr. Speaker. I will read further:

> I have accordingly asked my colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, to prepare, on an urgent basis, legislation to govern lobbying activity.

I did place emphasis on certain key words in there, and you will see why. I want to read a little further from this letter of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister does have a pretty mean pen sometimes, and it is important for us to be fully apprised of what it is that he has told us. On page 10, he states:

> This initiative should not be misinterpreted to mean that this Government is aware of particular improprieties in the conduct of lobbyists or that it considers lobbying to be an inappropriate activity. On the contrary, the practice of lobbying plays an important role in ensuring that governments, in taking the decisions which affect the lives of all of us, are able to take properly into account the multitude of diverse interests involved. This Government is simply saying that something so important should not be shrouded in mystery.

It was said by the Right Hon. Prime Minister.

I thought that the Government was going to introduce on an urgent basis legislation to govern lobbying activity. I believed the Prime Minister, which I suppose is the first mistake. I believed he was going to do what he said he would. I know it is extremely unfair to quote the Prime Minister, using his own words, but I am doing it anyway so that all Canadians will understand that we were not quite given the merchandise that we were promised. I would be the last person to say that this Government broke a promise, because, of course, I am non-partisan. Nevertheless some of us, shall we say, have been somewhat disappointed that the Prime Minister let us down one more time.

• (1520)

I want to apprise you, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that a number of Canadians have not been satisfied with the actions of the Government as they pertain to lobbyists. We on this side of the House wanted to agree to a degree with the Prime Minister when he said that there was nothing wrong *per se* with the profession of being a lobbyist or with partaking in lobbying. There is nothing wrong with someone being a lobbyist and making representation to the Government on behalf of a labour union, on behalf of a corporation, on behalf of the Coalition on Acid Rain , on behalf of Campaign Life or on behalf of anyone else. That is okay. One can lobby for that. If Jean Bazin wanted to lobby to get a position in the Senate, that is okay too. I do not object to that. I thank the Hon. Member for Lotbinière (Mr. Tremblay) for reminding me that people have lobbied for a Senate position from time to time. Perhaps Senator Michel Cogger may have done it. Perhaps Senator Jean Bazin, who is a close friend of the Prime Minister, may have done that. It could be that people have lobbied for Senate positions. That is not illegal nor should it be. People have a right to make a representation to the Government for anything which they feel is important.

Canadians have a right to know who is doing what to whom. If, for instance, Mr. Speaker, you and I worked for the Coalition on Acid Rain we would want to know what that giant corporate entity has done in the way of lobbying the Government. If were lobbying for the Coalition on Acid Rain we would want to know if Inco had lobbied against emission standards. If we were lobbying for Campaign Life we would want to know what the pro-choice group has been lobbying for in the area of the abortion debate which will start tomorrow. We have a right to know these things. I suggest that we have a better form of government when all these activities are in the public domain.

The Government did not initially deliver on the merchandise. As I indicated a while ago, the Government, instead of delivering the Bill that it promised, on December 19, 1985, gave us a White Paper on lobbying. That White Paper, a very thick document, was tabled in the House and everyone looked at the White Paper on Lobbying and asked what it was for. The Prime Minister promised us some legislation on an urgent basis. Remember what I said a while ago when I was quoting

the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker? Three months later this urgent basis had been forgotten because we got a White Paper which discussed the pros and cons of registering lobbyists. How could we discuss the pros and cons of registering lobbyists when the Prime Minister had made a solemn promise? A solemn promise is like a sacred trust, you cannot breach it. Surely the Prime Minister would know you do not breach sacred trust. He has had to deal with that issue before, and I think he found out the hard way that when you make a solemn promise you are supposed to live up to it.

I do not want to digress from the main topic at hand here, but we were disappointed that the Prime Minister did not bring his lobbying Bill at that time. In any case, that was December 19, 1985 and there was still no Bill. The White Paper itself was shelved for five months.

Finally in April, 1986, after a few more scandals, a few more trouble spots for the Government, the Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges and Procedure was mandated by the House to study the report on the registration of lobbyists. On that committee we had the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez), the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields), other government Members and myself. We had, I think, a very good non-partisan study of the possibility of registering lobbyists. We studied this issue here in Canada. Then we went to Washington and to Sacramento, California. Those are two jurisdictions which have a system of registering lobbyists. We looked at their systems and identified the strengths and weaknesses of each one. For instance, the weakness of the system in Washington was that one was only deemed to be a lobbyist if one were lobbying an elected person. If one were lobbying an unelected official, say the executive assistant or chief of staff of a legislator, one did not have to register. Obviously that was a tremendous weakness in the system. If one is lobbying Government, whether it be a Member of Parliament, my executive assistant, my constituency assistant or the chief of staff of a cabinet Minister or even a Deputy Minister, one is still lobbying the Government. Obviously one should have to register the very same.

On the other hand, when we studied the system in California we found that it really asked for a lot in the way of detail. As a matter of fact it asked for so much that the system actually became buried in itself. Lobbyists there, I believe, have to register not only the lobbying activity but the fees they were charging, which I kind of like, but there was much detail, such as having to file with the registrar each month every invoice of every expense over $10 or something like that. It means that if a person went to the restaurant and spent $12.50, that person had to get a bill so he or she could put it with the expense account and file it at the end of the month. Can you imagine lobbyists filing into the state legislature at Sacramento with a great big box full of invoices and stuff at the end of every month so they could prove to the person in charge of registering lobbyists that they had not exceeded the amounts in every category and so on for that month? That kind of a system, needless to say, would be a bureaucratic nightmare. There is no way we would want to hire a group of people to administer that. It would be costly and because it would ask for so much information, the information we were looking for would probably be buried in some other information and we would end up knowing nothing at all. That is not what we wanted.

So our committee made a good and strong recommendation and prepared a report which we tabled in this House. The report which the committee tabled asked the Government to have a system of registering lobbyists. Some members of the committee, and I think I would be fair in saying it was the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt and myself, would have wanted to register the fees and disbursements of lobbyists—in any case the fees of lobbyists, but some of the government Members felt that was to onerous, particularly in the beginning.

In an effort to obtain a consensus of all political Parties we agreed that for the time being we would not ask for the registering of the fees and disbursements of lobbyists so long as we got the name of the lobbyist, the name of the lobbying firm, the name of the company or organization which paid for the lobbying activity and the subject matter of the activity as well as the name of the person or governmental organization which they were lobbying. That was, in fact, what we were looking for initially. Our recommendations also proposed after a period of some years that we review the system with the possibility of increasing the requirements on lobbyists at that time. With that review included in our recommendations we went along. However, we did recommend as well, and I will now read from our recommendations:

[*Translation*]

I read the following recommendation: We recommend prohibiting lobbyists from accepting from their clients any remuneration connected in any way with the results of lobbying. This simply means, Mr. Speaker, that it is prohibited or should be prohibited, according to the unanimous report of the parliamentary committee, that a lobbyist be able to demand fees based on results. For instance, if I am a lobbyist, I cannot go to a client and say: That will be $1,000 for lobbying, and $10,000 as a bonus if I get results. We say that should be prohibited. In any case, I am sure you are aware, Mr. Speaker, that in some provinces lawyers are not allowed to charge fees on this principle. That is the case, for example, in Ontario. Does the same apply to Quebec? I don't know. Some could enligthen us and I hope that during the debate we will have shortly, someone can enlighten us on that.

As I see it, being able to charge fees based on results can lead to abuses. We know of only one firm of lobbyists that sets fees this way now and I assure you that it was quite controversial. Perhaps if this lobbying firm stopped doing so, most Canadians, I think, would feel that the system was much better.

• (1530)

[*English*]

These are the recommendations that we made with respect to what is required of lobbyists. We recommended that registered lobbyists be required first to disclose their name, firm name if applicable, a contact person, address, and telephone number; second, name of clients and their place of business; third, the matter upon which the lobbying activity is to take place. I said moments ago that we should prohibit contingency fees or fees contingent upon a result. We also recommended a definition of lobbyists and so on. We produced a good report that was tabled in this House in early 1987.

Because this was a compromise position, we felt the Government would introduce a Bill which pretty well mirror imaged the unanimous report of the parliamentary committee. After all, the Opposition had watered down its expectations in favour of getting a unanimous report, so we figured the Minister would probably introduce something pretty close to what we asked. Yet that did not happen, if one can believe it. Instead, the Government introduced a two-tier system of registering lobbyists. From now on, there will be a Tier I lobbyist, which is a consultant or, if you wish, a professional lobbyist. That lobbyist would be operating under a contract with a client, or the lobbyist could be a member of any profession when engaged in lobbying for pay; in other words, a lawyer or accountant who acts as a lobbyist. This kind of lobbyist would be asked to register detailed information such as that I described a while ago pursuant to our unanimous report.

There would also be Tier II lobbyists. I have no idea where the Minister got this idea. It certainly is not from my report, not from his White Paper, not from anything any Member ever raised in this House in any speech at second reading, report stage, or anywhere else. It was not even raised in committee.

The Tier II lobbyist consists of employees and officers of trade organizations, labour federations, business corporations, unions and voluntary groups who, as a significant part of their duties, lobby for their employer.

Those people will be asked to supply only limited information by the Government. For example, they will have to register once a year in a manner which has been described by the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt as providing a copy of their business card. The only thing we will be asking them to do is identify themselves once a year with their name, address, and phone number. Providing a copy of their business card would pretty well do that.

My objection is that these people, the so-called Tier II lobbyists, are getting away with something that other people cannot. Why do we offer Tier II lobbyists those kinds of advantages? The Minister says the reason is that in the case of a Tier II lobbyist we know who they are, we know who they act for, and it is pretty obvious what they want. He says in his press release on page 5, that even among paid employees there are distinctions worthy of recognition. Certain individuals may, on rare occasions, represent the views of their business or association, but they are not primarily engaged by the employer for the purpose of lobbying. By contrast, many groups and corporations retain full-time individuals on staff who are responsible for liaison with and communicating ideas and concerns to the Government. While the latter should be required to register as lobbyists, the former can hardly be considered to be a paid lobbyist. That is quite true. He says further that this system of two different tiers of lobbyists is based on the well established distinction between the often hidden interests of the clients of the third party paid lobbyist, in other words Tier I, and the transparent and well understood interests of the corporations, industry associations, public interest groups, and other such organizations whose staff lobby on their own behalf, or Tier II.

Let us look at the distinction the Minister is making. He says that Tier II lobbyists are transparent, well understood interests of corporations, industry associations, public interest groups, and other such organizations. I say to him that sometimes that may be the case. I will concede that, and even that there are occasions where one can tell by the organization what it is they are concerned about. I will use as an example an organization which has been in contact with me lately, one which I have a certain closeness with, and that is the Campaign Life Coalition. They are obviously going to lobby for pro-life legislation on abortion. However, although that is true for that organization, it may not necessarily be that obvious and that transparent and well understood, to use the words of the Minister, in certain other groups.

Let me give an example. Let us say, for example, that someone is a full-time employee of a giant multinational. I will use Imasco as an example, a parent company of several other companies. If someone is a paid lobbyist for that company, how is it obvious, how is it transparent, how is it well understood what he or she is lobbying for or against? There is no logical answer. When the company is so big one cannot tell which one of the subsidiaries the lobbyist is speaking for or against or which legislation they would be favouring or opposing.

Another example is someone campaigning on behalf of George Weston Enterprises or someone like that. That company's list of subsidiaries is the length of your arm, Mr. Speaker. How can you tell which one of the subsidiaries they are lobbying for? They could just as easily be lobbying against the very thing you may think they are lobbying for. It is not, contrary to what the Minister said, transparent and well understood what they are lobbying for or against.

In order to correct some of those deficiencies I offered some amendments, and I know other Members did as well, to the Bill proposed by the Minister. I say this having supported his Bill on second reading debate and having supported the unanimous report of the parliamentary committee. We suggested amendments which would do a number of things.

Let me read the amendments we wanted the Government to include in the legislation. We wanted, first, to ensure that the Bill would provide that someone who collects information for the purpose of having someone else do the lobbying would also be identified as a lobbyist. I introduced that motion. Unfortunately, it did not get anywhere. My second amendment was to ensure that we were asking the same thing of Tier II lobbyists as we were of Tier I lobbyists, that is, of course, to correct the situation I described a moment ago.

• (1540)

I introduced another motion, which was debated but refused by the Government, to prevent a lobbyist from charging contingency fees. Our committee, which for the benefit of Conservative Members listening to this debate was largely composed of government Members, was opposed to lobbyists being able to charge contingency fees. However, that is not in the Bill.

The Minister says he could not make such a requirement because he does not have the constitutional authority to do so. That is, apparently, due to the fact that contract law is provincial and we are obviously dealing here with federal legislation. Although the Minister may technically be correct in saying that contract law is provincial, which is true, we should remember that the federal Government can require someone lobbying it to meet before it will entertain such a lobby. In other words, this Bill could easily include a provision which would prevent an employee or federal legislator from entertaining a lobby on the part of someone who is charging a contingency fee.

The Government had every opportunity to do that. Such a condition in the Bill would prevent legislators from receiving such a lobby. Perhaps there are other means of satisfying that. There are indeed ways in which the Government could have prevented lobbyists from charging contingency fees.

As I indicated a while ago, we are dealing with this Bill today after some delay. I want to make it clear to the House, to the Minister, and to all Canadians that in no way has either Party in the Opposition made any attempt to delay the passage of this Bill. I indicated that in April of 1986 our committee started to do its work on that report. In September of 1986 the Government prorogued Parliament. It recalled Parliament at the beginning of October, and on November 19 the Government decided, through a motion proposed by the Government House Leader, to reactivate our committee. On January 27, 1987, our committee tabled its report in the House of Commons. On June 30, 1987, we gave Bill C-82 first reading. I do not know why it took from January to June.

However, if you think that is strange, wait until you hear what I am going to say next. We only started to debate the Bill on March 8, 1988, some nine months later. I do not know why that gestation period was required, but nevertheless we started at that time.

Perhaps some would think that after we started debate on March 8, 1988, the Opposition may have dragged its feet. No, Sir, Mr. Speaker, the whole debate was concluded on March 14, six days later, and some of those days were used to discuss other legislation. In fact, only about four hours of House time was utilized to debate Bill C-82. You can see, Mr. Speaker, the great co-operation offered to the Government by opposition Members of Parliament in an attempt to have speedy passage of this legislation.

I hear a Conservative Member speaking. If he is congratulating the House on having disposed of the motion so rapidly, I thank him for that. I assume that that is what he is saying.

In April of this year the committee met. After only two or three hearings the committee dealt with the Bill in its entirety. We had had only two or three meetings on the Bill and the Minister was not pleased. He felt it was taking us too long to deal with the Bill in committee after we had had about three meetings. He literally had a temper tantrum.

On April 27, 1988, in an interview given to *The Globe and Mail*, the Minister threatened to shelve the Bill to register lobbyists because it was taking too much time. Can you believe that? The Minister took three years to produce a Bill which the Prime Minister promised on an urgent basis, and because we did not have it ready after three one and a half hour meetings of the parliamentary committee, the Minister literally had a tantrum.

If you do not believe me, Mr. Speaker, I will read to you what *The Globe and Mail* says. Surely you will believe *The Globe and Mail*. An article of April 27, 1988 says that legislation to register lobbyists could be postponed indefinitely if opposition Members continue to push for amendments. The Opposition was guilty of trying to improve legislation. What an awful bunch we were for trying to improve the Government's imperfect Bill!

The article continues: "He directed his comments at New Democratic Party MP John Rodriguez and Liberal MP Don Boudria who have been trying to toughen the Bill which is scheduled to be sent back to the House of Commons for final reading in May". You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that even the media thought this Bill would be dealt with in May. Today is July 25. I have been lobbying the Government since May to bring this Bill back before the House, and it only did so a week ago.

Mr. Keeper: Did you register?

Mr. Boudria: No, I did not register my lobbying activity at that time, in response to the question of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Keeper). We do not have such legislation yet.

I would like to read an article from the April 18 *Calgary Herald*. I ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre), who is reading *Maclean's* magazine, to listen

attentively to what I am going to say because the *Calgary Herald* is published in his riding and *Maclean's* is not. The editorial is entitled "Lobbyist bill overdue". It reads:

> Almost three years since he promised legislation, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney's new law to register paid lobbyists has gone only as far as first reading and committee hearings.

Well, it had actually gone to second reading. It continues:

> It has taken entirely too long for this piece of public interest legislation to become law in Canada.
>
> Since the Tories have asserted, as Mulroney did in 1985, that Canada needs a law requiring the registration of all those who lobby for a living on Parliament Hill, then they should get on with the job of enacting such a law.
>
> The United States has had such legislation since 1946 but Canada's long delayed and slightly bedraggled Bill C-82 had to wait until this month to make it as far as a Commons committee hearing.
>
> It was ushered by an apologetic Consumer Affairs Minister Harvie Andre who argued that the bill ought not to require that lobbyists divulge how much they are paid for their endeavors on behalf of a plethora of interest groups which routinely seek favors from the government.
>
> In short, the bill will ask lobbyists employed by companies or groups to register only such data as their names, addresses and telephone numbers.

Those are the Tier II lobbyists to which I was referring. It goes on to indicate:

> A second category or so-called hired gun lobbyists will also have to report, in advance, the issues they have been hired to discuss with government officials.
>
> But that's the extent of government's attempts to provide for public awareness of the activities of influential but little known lobbyists in Ottawa.
>
> No wonder Bill C-82 is also known as the business card bill. It is almost too weak to bother with, but it is, just barely, better than nothing.

That report is from the *Calgary Herald*. I know the Minister knows the *Calgary Herald* very well.

• (1550)

I believe I have grabbed the attention of certain Conservative Members. I apologize if I spoke too loudly and woke them up. However, there is a price to be paid for sitting in the House of Commons. Tory Members will have to deal with the fact that they have to listen to what happens in here before they vote. I hope they pay very close attention as I lobby them for their support.

The Bill is not as strong as we would have liked. I have made my pitch for a number of amendments both in the House and in committee. If debate on this Bill should end today, it is better than nothing, as the *Calgary Herald* has stated. I will support the motion and encourage my colleagues in the Liberal Party to do so, but there is still a chance, if the Minister asks for unanimous consent of the House to revert to report stage, to accept the amendments I have offered. I would be willing to grant that unanimous consent, and I am quite sure most of my colleagues would do the same, in order to improve the Bill in the way I just described.

I have described what the Bill requires of lobbyists. It does not deal with fees as I would have preferred, nor does it prohibit contingency fees. The Bill does not require a record of official contacts, in other words, who was being lobbied.

The Bill contains no provision to stop someone from registering after they have been fined or jailed for making a false statement. A lobbyist who has defaulted under the Act could continue to practise their profession. That is another weakness in the Bill.

There could be stronger enforcement provisions in the legislation. However, in spite of its weaknesses the Bill still carries out its original objective, which is to register lobbyists.

I support the thrust of the Bill. I would like the Minister to reconsider my amendments. I would be pleased to give my consent, if he asked to revert to report stage to deal with those amendments.

While the Bill essentially follows the recommendations of our all-party committee report in January, 1987, it is lacking in those areas I have identified, including its failure to ban contingency fees and requirements for Tier II lobbyists.

That being said, I recommend that the House support the Bill notwithstanding those deficiencies. We want to register lobbyists. Let me state for the record that when the three-year period is up we should increase the requirements on these people.

[*Translation*]

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to this House that the profession of lobbyist is an honourable one, or should be. I note that many lobbyists in Canada do not want to identify themselves as such. They are called government consultants, vice-presidents of government relations or all sorts of other similar titles. I do not think this should be so. When the Parliamentary Committee visited Washington, we noticed that lobbyists in Washington were proud of their profession, just as lawyers or doctors are proud of theirs. And with a law that would require several things of lobbyists, I feel that we would raise the standards of behaviour and that over time, since it will take time, lobbyists will have a profession that will be better known, better recognized and more credible.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I want to encourage my colleagues to pass this Bill today.

[*English*]

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks on third reading of Bill C-82, let me state that the New Democratic Party voted against the Bill at report stage. In the course of my remarks I am sure it will become crystal clear to the House and those who are listening why the NDP has opposed this Bill.

The Bill represents flimflam by a powder-puff Minister who was not committed to the whole concept of registering lobbyists and lobbying.

An Hon. Member: You mean he is a wimp?

Mr. Rodriguez: There are those who would be so unkind as to use the four letter word in describing the Minister, but I am not in that group. I simply say the Minister knew who his

friends were and who his friends are. He recognizes that he cannot bite the hand that feeds his Government with juicy contributions that come in very handy in an election year.

Who is a lobbyist? We have defined a lobbyist for the purposes of this debate as anyone who, for pay, approaches a legislator or anyone within the bureaucracy with the intent to influence the drafting or changing of legislation, the changing of rules or regulations to the obtaining contracts or appointments to boards or commissions.

Before I came here in 1972, I and many Canadians were aware that there were very powerful interests outside Parliament which seemed to have their own way with the Government in dealing with contracts and appointments. In fact, I have a comment which sums up the way it was and the way it will continue to be in spite of Bill C-82.

It is from an article that I clipped from *The Gazette* in Montreal on December 3, 1986. The headline reads "Lobbying Threatens Parties: Masse". It goes on to say:

> Energy Minister Marcel Masse said yesterday the growing popularity of lobbying is undermining Canada's political party system.

He went on to say, as reported in the article:

> "It has become infinitely more easy to attract the attention of one's fellow citizens, the communications media and even the Government by belonging to a pressure group than through advancing one's ideas inside a political party," Masse said.

He went on to say that the danger inherent in lobbying is that it gives disproportionate weight to the opinions of the rich and the powerful. In fact, if people want to bring about change in our kind of democratic system, they should become involved in a political Party and work to make changes.

• (1600)

There is a further refinement that is even more invidious than the ones the Minister described. There are those who latch on, as a scavenger fish latches on to a shark, to the Government. They become friends of the Government and they work for the election of a Prime Minister or a Government because they know that when that person becomes Prime Minister or when that Party forms the Government, they can then extricate themselves from this close relationship and join or start a lobbying company.

In fact, because of the friendships these people have created within the political Party that now forms the Government, the fruits of their labours can finally ripen and fall into their hands.

Mr. Andre: John, that's a microphone in front of you. You don't have to shout.

Mr. Rodriguez: I see that the Minister responsible for this flimflammery, Bill C-82, has now been awakened. He was deeply plunged into Canada Post's annual report. Now I see that he has removed himself. He cannot stand the heat; he is leaving the Chamber.

Mr. Andre: You're hurting my ears.

Mr. Rodriguez: I am glad that someone can hurt some part of you.

What I have described is not idle speculation. In fact, that is a description of one Frank Moores who was the former Premier of Newfoundland. He was one of the Prime Minister's staunchest supporters for the Leadership of the Conservative Party. In fact, he worked diligently day and night, without pay, without an iota of compensation, doing it all out of the goodness of his heart, working hard for Brian, putting Brian in the Prime Minister's seat. However, everything comes to those who wait. In the fullness of time, as the world unfolded, Brain ascended to the Prime Minister's seat, and of course he rewarded them that brung him to the dance. In his famous words, "You always dance with them who brung you".

What did Frank Moores do? He is not stupid. You don't become a premier of a province if you don't have a little bit of stuff up here. He formed GCI, Government Consultants International. Who did he bring in? He brought in all the flops and flicks and flacks. He brought in Gerry Doucet who was a Cabinet Minister in the Nova Scotia Government, a good friend of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney). He brought in Gary Ouellet, a magician. He has a tuxedo with 12 pockets. I saw this guy at lunch one time, he made a quarter disappear. I saw it. The quarter was in his hand, he did that and the quarter disappeared. He has written 12 books on magic. He makes things disappear and I suspect he can also make them reappear.

Here was Government Consultants International, a mere new kid on the block in 1984. In that short period of time between 1984 and now, GCI has become the most powerful private lobby group in the country. In fact, its clients include Nabisco Brands Canada, Mercedes-Benz, Saint John Shipbuilding Ltd., the Iron Ore Company of Canada—if ever there was a connection—and American Express Canada. As a matter of fact, American Express Canada was with Public Affairs International, and when Frankie baby arrived on the scene with GCI, he approached American Express Canada and it switched. There was a $175,000 contingency fee just on that account alone. How about Microtel, Huang and Danczkay? These groups got contracts for expanding the airport in Toronto.

Business has been booming at GCI. It has very powerful customers. Guess what? GCI does not charge a fee. It has a contingency fee. It says: "If I get you the contract, I get a percentage".

As a matter of fact, this whole thing blew up, and I think that is the reason for this flimflam, powder-puff Bill. In fact, Frank Moores literally and frankly screwed up. He took $2,000 from a fisherman on the Atlantic to get an interview with the Fisheries Minister so that he could make a pitch to get a fishing licence. The fellow got the fishing licence.

Frank Moores also sat on the Board of Directors of Air Canada at the same time as he was representing the Airbus Industrie from France which was negotiating with Air Canada to sell airbuses. Guess what? He got kicked off the Board of Air Canada. Guess what? GCI helped, and Airbus Industrie landed the contract. Do Hon. Members know what GCI's contingency for that little project alone was? It was $30 million.

There is no question that these are the louder voices, those who have political influence and friends in the PMO and the Government. These are the ones who are able to use political influence to land contracts.

The Prime Minister said something I would like to read into the record. Things were supposed to change as of September 9, 1985. The Prime Minister, embarrassed by all these revelations, realized that we needed to have ethics in government. Therefore, he wrote a letter to Members of Parliament and to Senators. I want to read the first paragraph of that letter because I think it sort of ushered in, we all thought, a new era of government ethics.

The Prime Minister wrote:

> Dear Colleagues:
>
> It is a great principle of public administration—I would even say an "imperative "— that to function effectively the government and the public service of a democracy must have the trust and confidence of the public they serve. In order to reinforce that trust, the government must be able to provide competent management and, above all, to be guided by the highest standards of conduct.

Furthermore, in that letter the Prime Minister promised to establish a registry of lobbying. In the letter he recognizes the need that Canadians have every right to know who is doing what to whom, and I would add for how much. That was the underlying principle when I represented the New Democratic Party in the Committee on Elections, Privileges and Procedure which studied the question of lobbying.

• (1610)

We came back with a unanimous report. I did not get everything that I wanted. I wanted to make sure that we knew how much the lobbyists were paying for the lobbying activity. I wanted to know who the contacts were. I wanted to know who was behind the mass mailings, such as the letters we received recently about how having a law on tobacco advertising infringes on the rights of Canadians. I wanted to know who was behind that type of indirect lobbying.

I wanted to ensure that we outlawed contingencies in lobbying. The contingency fee schedule is the greatest incitement to dipsy-doodle around the law, and probably to encourage unscrupulous lobbyists to do dirty things.

I was also interested in having a registrar who would have the ability to verify the information that is placed on the lobby registry. If the registrar is not given the power to verify the information, who will find out if what is put on the registry is in fact correct?

The unanimous report of the committee represented for me the bottom line. It basically said that a lobbyist is a lobbyist. It said that it did not matter if they belonged to the GCIs of this world, or if they belonged to an association, but that they were still in the business of lobbying and therefore ought to be registered. That was the bottom line for me, and it was in the unanimous report. We also recommended in the report that the registrar be given the power to verify the information in the registry.

The Government took the unanimous report and came back with what I have described as a flimflam of a Bill. In fact, it sets up two tiers for the registry. Tier I is for companies—Frank Moores, Bill Neville and a whole host of others—such as PAI and GCI. Under Tier II there would be the associations, all these little innocent associations—and I say this facetiously—which have no power. I refer to the Pharmaceuticals Association, the Manufacturers' Association, the Bankers' Association, the BCNI, the Construction Industries Association, as well as the trade union movement. These would fall under Tier II.

Guess what information we require from Tier I, Mr. Speaker. We need to know the name of the lobbyist, the address, and the company for whom the lobbyist is working, its address and the issue being lobbied on. Under Tier II only the name of the lobbyist and the association has to be listed. That is all. In other words, all that has to be done is that the business card must be turned over.

It is imperative that at least the minimum of what the issue is ought to be included in the information that is put on the registry for the associations. While I have described Frank Moores and the way in which he operates, I have come to the serious conclusion that it is not the Frank Moores type of company, the GCIs or PAIs, which are the ones that have the most power in this country but, after looking at this matter intensively, I have come to the conclusion that it is the associations which carry the power. Those associations, such as the Pharmaceutical Association and the Bankers' Association are the ones that hold the power. One only has to look recently to how Canadian bankers persuaded the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Hockin) not to legislate with respect to the abuses on bank service charges but to accept something called voluntary compliance.

In my view it is the associations which have the greatest power today. Any registry of lobbying and lobbyists—and I include both those concepts—must demand from Tier II the minimum that is demanded from Tier I. Justice demands it. The democratic sense of openness demands that in fact the registry contains that minimal bit of information.

The Minister left the Chamber and came back. He was not interested in any of this which raises the question as to how effectively he was lobbied. Not one amendment was accepted by the Government to give some backbone to Bill C-82. Thus the caucus of the New Democratic Party voted against it at report stage. We are going to vote against it at third reading as

well. All we have to do is work on defeating this Government and we will bring in the type of lobby registry Bill that ought to be brought in, which will assure Canadians of openness and transparency.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there any questions or comments? The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague to elaborate a bit on the very important point he made, that is, that the centre of power in the lobbying industry in Canada may not be with high profile agencies such as Public Affairs International or Government Consultants International. While these are the high profile actors in the whole field of lobbying, it is in fact the associations which hold the centre of power. They do not make the stories on the front pages of our newspapers so much as lobbyists do. I refer to the bankers and the pharmaceutical industry representatives. I refer to the Business Council on National Issues. Who knows how many average Canadians know what BCNI stands for? Will my colleague elaborate a bit on his conclusion that in fact these associations are the most powerful lobbyists in the capital?

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his question. It is an important one. It is a thought provoking one as well.

I would like to give two examples of how these associations have indeed wielded power in this Government. One is the Business Council on National Issues. The executive director of that organization is one Mr. Thomas d'Aquino. That organization is made up of probably the wealthiest corporations in this land, such corporations as Power Corp. They are the *crème de la crème*. They pride themselves on giving leadership to Governments of Canada. In fact, if one were to examine the journey of the free trade agreement that was signed by the Prime Minister and by Ronald Reagan, one would see that in fact here was a Prime Minister who as recently as 1983 said that we will have none of this free trade stuff with the United States. He said that the people said no to it in 1911 and they say no today. What changed his mind? As the piece unfolds it will be recognized that the BCNI was really pushing for the free trade deal with the United States. In fact, it put it on the agenda of the Prime Minister and lobbied the Government to accept the whole concept of free trade with the United States, which led to the subsequent negotiations. That is one point.

• (1620)

The other one concerns the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. Apparently the lobbying association, PMA, approached the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs with respect to a change to the Patent Act that would extend and give protection to drugs for 10 years. That lobbying was ongoing, but because there was no registry there was no way that those who were opposed to that type of action had any inkling that they could present counterarguments to the Government and the bureaucracy. In fact, PMA persuaded the Government, and it fell neatly in line with the free trade deal being negotiated at the time. With the one using the other we eventually saw Bill C-22 brought before the House.

I have mentioned the Bankers' Association only recently hitting the fan. In fact some may say that the banks held up the fan, when all that was happening was that great demands were being made for changes to the Bank Act that would ensure consumers a fair deal with bank service charges. The Finance Committee studied the matter, came back with a report, and demanded that the Government act. Lo and behold the Bankers' Association huddled with the Minister of State for Finance, and we got the Government's acceptance of voluntary compliance with respect to bank service charges. That is where that matter has ended.

I tell my hon. friend and colleague that as I have observed it the real powerful lobbyists around the capital are the associations. I believe that they twisted the Government's arm in setting up the two-tier system. That is why we have the associations in Tier II with only business card information, while those in Tier I have to disclose the issue. Knowing the issue that is being lobbied gives Canadians who may have a differing view an equal opportunity to provide information to government and bureaucracy, it is extremely important.

Mr. Keeper: When the legislation with regard to the generic drug industry was before the House, many ordinary Canadians were seeking to put pressure on the Government and were lobbying the Government to preserve the protection that they had in the generic drug industry against sky-rocketing drug prices. At the same time, the pharmaceutical industry was doing its own lobbying in order to forward its interests and be able to do whatever it wanted with regard to the price of drugs in this country.

At that time I remember hearing about some very quiet lobbying that was going on. In contrast to the public lobbying from ordinary citizens fighting for their rights, there was some very quiet lobbying going on in Washington. There was a leak of information of how the pharmaceutical industry of the United States was able to use the American Government in order to approach the Canadian Government.

Does my colleague believe that this legislation the Government has brought forward with regard to lobbying will throw light on the process of lobbying? Will it throw light upon how power is wielded in the capital? I am thinking of the whole question of the generic drug legislation as a case study.

Mr. Rodriguez: That is an excellent question. When the standing committee visited Washington in the United States, it found out that lobbyists were registered. One can go to the office where that information is kept on file and, for a fee, have the information pulled off the computer. If one has the name of the lobbying firm or the lobbyists, the information can be taken from the computer. The computer lists the name of the lobbyists, the lobbying firms, and the issues on which lobbyists are lobbying, together with a list of all companies that are clients of particular lobbying firms.

If we had such a registry which applied not only to individual companies such as GCI and PAI but also to the associations, we could cross match. If we needed information on who was approaching the Government on what issue—for example, on the pharmaceutical question Bill C-22 that was passed—we could go to the computer to find out who the lobbyist was and, if that were the issue, it could be cross matched with the file in Washington. In that manner we could find out if the pharmaceutical association was lobbying the Canadian Government for certain changes and if in the United States a lobbying firm was lobbying the Canadian Embassy with respect to making sure that the Government of Canada made changes to the Patent Act with respect to pharmaceutical products.

A democracy cannot survive if people do not have information. One of the greatest guardians of democracy is an informed citizenry. If citizens do not have the correct information, they are left to surmise and speculate. I suggest that that undermines the whole process.

There are two other federal Acts of Parliament which are extremely important to this whole question of transparency and the right to know. The first one is the Election Expenses Act, an extremely important Act where contributors of more than $100 are listed. It is important to know who is supporting the political Parties and the candidates and that that information is up front and open. We did not have that before. The second one is the Access to Information Act, not the type that we see here where many things are blacked out, the Government chooses to delay certain information, and the commissioner of Access to Information Act states that the Act is being frustrated by the Government.

In 1983 the Prime Minister was correct when he said that the Liberals believed that Canadians did not have a right to know. He stated that Conservatives believed that Canadians had every right to know. I agree with him, and every right thinking Canadian across the country agrees with those words, but they are only words. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Here we have a Bill which will complement those two federal pieces of legislation and federal laws, and Bill C-82 is an eunuch. The Government has eunuched lobbying registration, and it is a sad day for openness of government. It is a sad day for the transparency of government within a democracy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate with the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre.

• (1630)

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am glad to have the opportunity to put a few comments on record with regard to this legislation. I appreciate the impassioned plea that my colleague who spoke before me made for common sense when it came to lobbying legislation.

I must say that in listening to my colleague, the lobbying critic of the NDP, one is driven to the conclusion that this legislation is simply a sop to public opinion. It comes two and a half years after the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) promised it in an open letter to the public. It is just a way to smooth over troubled waters. It is a piece of legislation without teeth, without real intent to control lobbying, without real intent to throw light on the whole question of lobbying. In listening to our critic, to the critic from the Liberal Party, and to the Minister as he presented his case for this legislation, I have come to the conclusion that this legislation is nothing more than a sop to public opinion, rather than being a real attempt to control lobbyists, a real attempt to bring to public light the activities of lobbyists, or a real attempt to reinforce the democratic traditions of this country. It is just a way for the Government to get out from under the reputation that it developed as a Government of scandal.

It is this conclusion that I want to examine by looking at the facts, at the substance of the legislation. If this conclusion stands up, it is a major condemnation of the Government.

The first limitation in this legislation which stands out is the one with regard to the kind of information that will be provided to the public. We on this side of the House and our spokespeople have said that the information is inadequate. Not only should the name of the lobbyist be made public, not only should the subject of their lobbying be made public, but the people they contact ought to be made public. I suppose that members of a Conservative Party, Members with a Conservative philosophical bent, might argue against a comprehensive provision of information by saying that it will just create another bureaucracy. My reply would be: Why bother with the regulation of lobbyists? Why bother with seeking to create something called a registry of lobbyists if it is not going to have teeth, if it is not going to in fact deliver the goods, if it is not going to provide the kind of information that is necessary if we are to control the activities of lobbyists?

Another inadequacy of this legislation is the fact that it does not provide the kind of information that people need if they want a true picture of what goes on in lobbying in this capital. The parliamentary committee made recommendations which highlighted the inadequacies of the legislation, which is to say, that we should not only have the name of the lobbyist but the subject that the lobbyist is lobbying about, and the contacts that the lobbyist is approaching.

It would be useful as well, if we are serious about registering lobbyists, for this legislation to require lobbyists to disclose the costs of their lobbying activities. Why not provide it by indicating how much they are spending in order to lobby the Government on a particular subject?

Would it not have been useful for the Canadian public to know, in particular all Canadians who used their democratic right to seek to influence the Government when it came to the generic drug legislation and their efforts to preserve the protection they had against sky-rocketing drug prices until the election of this Government, who was lobbying the Government? Who was scuttling that legislation which provided such a unique form of protection for Canadian consumers? Who

was lobbying the Government? Who were they contacting in the Government? How much were they spending in that massive lobbying effort?

I want to note in brackets, so to speak, an article that I read in the paper the other day, dealing with the same subject. It concerned another country, Mexico. The Americans and the American pharmaceutical industry was laying a heavy trip on Mexico in the same area, saying: "Don't you dare do anything that will interfere with the operations of the pharmaceutical industry. Don't do anything that would impede their capacity to set whatever price they want to set for any drug that they should bring on the market".

The importance of that issue is not limited to Canada. It also has implications for the whole continent, and I would suggest the western world as well. Would it not have been useful if we had known how much money was being spent on lobbying when it came to the whole question of the generic drug industry? It is particularly useful to know those costs, because the public opinion polls showed that the public was in favour of the generic drug legislation on the books of this country. It raised a question about the Government's use of a popular piece of legislation that was saving Canadians money, a piece of legislation that was making sure that miracle drugs could be available to people at a reasonable cost. Why would a Government scuttle such legislation? Why would a Government tear the guts out of such legislation? That raises questions.

People must suspect that some pretty powerful interests have been leaning on the Government. There must have been some pretty effective lobbyists seeking to change the mind of this Government, seeking to push the Government in the direction of scuttling this legislation. We would like to know how much they spent on those efforts. Those Canadians who fought to preserve the legislation we had, which was unique in the world, had a right and a desire to know just what they were up against when they were fighting for its preservation, what kind of powerful interests were involved, and how much did they have to take off? That is one comment with regard to the whole inadequacy of this legislation, from the point of view of the information that it provides.

The reason that I am looking at this legislation is that people who have spoken before me have come to the conclusion—or at least their comments have lead me to that conclusion—that this legislation is not really intended to do anything effective about lobbying in Canada and that in fact it is window-dressing.

Let us look at what kind of information the legislation provides for Canadians. It does not provide—and it would be useful for us to know what was going on in any particular lobbying effort—is who is being paid to organize mass mailings.

• (1640)

Who is being paid to manage advertising campaigns directed at influencing government policy? As Members of Parliament we get enormous amounts of mail. We get so much that this House has seen it necessary to assign staff to individual Members of Parliament. In other jurisdictions, such as in Britain, Members of Parliament, for all practical purposes, do their own work. They answer their own mail; they write their own letters. In this country, because of the massive amount of written communication that we receive, we have found it necessary to hire staff, at least three paid employees in the offices of Members of Parliament, to assist in answering the mail. It would be interesting to know how much of that mail is an expression of the spontaneous opinion of ordinary Canadians; how much of it is a direct expression of grass roots democracy; how much of it is a real expression of public opinion and, on the other hand, how much of it is manufactured, how much of it is manipulated, and how much of it is self-serving.

It would have been useful in the generic drug debate for Members of Parliament to know whether the mail being received was something which had been arranged by a lobbyist. Did some lobbyists in Toronto, Ottawa, or Sudbury arrange for people to send in letters to Members of Parliament that called for the scuttling of the legislation, or was it a spontaneous expression? Information requiring the disclosure of names of those who are paid to organize mass mailings and who are paid to manage advertising campaigns would have thrown some light on the situation.

You might ask me, Mr. Speaker: Is it really practical for Governments to monitor all the activities of lobbyists? I must say that I do not know. It has not been done in this country yet. If we are going to bring forward legislation to register lobbyists, to give the public the feeling that we are keeping an eye on them, the legislation ought to be effective. We ought not to undertake legislative activities which are meaningless or simply window dressing.

I want to take a further indepth look, another peak, at the legislation to confirm if the conclusion that we have come to, namely, that this legislation is toothless and is simply a sop to public opinion rather than meant to control lobbyists. Another aspect of lobbying about which we have been informed is something called mapping. Apparently if you want to get something done in this city, you have to know more than a Member of Parliament, and more than just the House of Commons.

There are large government Departments in Ottawa. There are thousands of government employees. There are many managers and there are various kinds of central agencies through which the Government controls itself. Lobbyists are able to map out the way to get to the centre of power. If you have enough bucks to pay them, if you can afford the time and energy of these people who have learned to walk the maze of government decision making, you can get to the centre of

power. Ordinary Canadians, if they come to Ottawa from, say, my riding and want to get a decision out of the Government, would come to myself as their Member of Parliament. That is legitimate, and I would do everything I could to help, but they could not hire an expert or someone who had spent perhaps their working life in the bureaucracy in Ottawa learning all the ins and outs, nor could they hire someone who had spent their working life supporting a political candidate who then becomes Prime Minister and, therefore, has a special insight on how decisions get made in Ottawa.

Why does this legislation fail to provide this kind of information, information that would tell us who is doing the mapping activity in Ottawa? Who leads those people who want to get something out of the Government through corridors of power? Who shows them the dark accesses to power that exist in this capital? Who shows them how to get to the real decision makers and how much are they paid? This kind of information is not available as a result of this legislation. I would say that the public will learn very little about lobbying activities from this legislation, and that is why I say it is a sop to public opinion. It is an effort for the Government to get away from the reputation that it has developed as a Government of scandal.

This legislation has loopholes. We all know the tax legislation has loopholes, but this legislation coming through today is like Swiss cheese; it has many holes.

We have here a two-tier system for the registration of lobbyists. Surely to goodness, if you are going to register lobbyists, you want to register them all and you want to treat them all the same and get the same information from everybody. You want to have a sense of fairness, and you want to know what is going on in all the lobbying activities in the capital. This Government has chosen, instead, to say: "Okay, we will ask for one set of information from one set of lobbyists and something different, something less, from another set of lobbyists".

The Tier II lobbyists are presented to us as the weak cousins, the poor cousins, of the lobbying industry. These are the guys who do not have to give as much information, I assume because they are the 80-pound weaklings on the beach. They will not be able to deliver a punch when it comes to getting a decision out of the Government. Who are these two-tier lobbyists? One is the Business Council on National Issues, BCNI. We have this alphabet soup of the lobbying world: BCNI, CGI, PJI, PAI, PMA, or PAM. It is a maze, but what is BCNI? It is an association, a group of the most powerful corporations in this country. This is corporate Canada. These are the largest companies in the country. They have got together in an organization called the Business Council on National Issues. These are no wimps, Mr. Speaker. The Minister may look like a wimp having presented such toothless legislation to this House, but BCNI is no wimp. This group convinced the Government to bring in the free trade proposal even though the issue was not mentioned in the last election.

Let me sum up. This legislation is full of loopholes. It is letting through the gate the most powerful lobbyists that operate in this capital—the Business Council on National Issues, the trade association, the Bankers' Association, and the Pharmaceutical Association. These are powerful groups which have had a real impact in this House and in this Parliament. These groups have convinced the Government, even though they did not tell the people so, to sign a trade deal with the American Government. These are the people who convinced the Government to scuttle the generic drug legislation and who convinced the Government to remove the protection ordinary Canadians had on drug prices. These people have been let through the gate without being asked the full range of information required of other lobbyists.

• (1650)

Because of the loopholes in this legislation we have to conclude that it is not really meant to control lobbyists. It is not really meant to throw the kind of light on lobbying that would inform the public. It is not really meant to enhance democracy. It is simply a sop to public opinion by a Government that was wallowing in scandals and desperate to get the negative news about it off the front pages of the newspapers.

This is damage control legislation. It is not meant to rein in the lobbyists or the most powerful interest groups in this country. It seeks to improve the image of the Government. It seeks to send out a message to the public that the Government is doing something about influence in the capital.

I have examined the facts and, having done so, I have to agree with the impassioned plea of my colleague who pointed out that this legislation did not deserve the support of this House. It is inadequate not only because it lets the most powerful slip through the net, but even because those little fish it catches do not have to supply adequate information. They are not required to tell us how much they are spending on lobbying, promoting letter writing campaigns, on mass advertising campaigns, or on mapping and leafing through the maze of government decision-making processes. This legislation is nothing other than a token gesture in an effort to make the public believe that the Government is concerned about the use and abuse of influence in the capital.

If the Government was really concerned about that, it would have taken seriously the recommendations of the committee that studied the issue. The committee said that if we wanted to throw light on the activities of lobbyists, if we wanted to enhance and protect democracy, then we had to have all possible information about the activities of all lobbyists.

I am sad but not surprised that after the Prime Minister promised tough lobbying registration two and a half years ago, we are getting a watered down piece of public relations.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, when this Bill was in committee I tried to amend the legislation so that a registry for

associations under Tier II would have to declare the name of the person lobbying, the employer, and the issue on which they were lobbying. The Minister huffed himself up and said: "Yes, that would be registering lobbying and we do not want to register lobbying; we want to register lobbyists". He is sitting there and, if I am not quoting him correctly, he can shake his head. It is obvious I am reporting it accurately.

Does the Hon. Member see any strength in that argument? Is there any logic to the Minister's argument that we are not out to register lobbying and that is why he would not require disclosure of the issue on which the Tier II lobbyists are lobbying?

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, I guess this is part of the Alice in Wonderland quality of this legislation. We want to know who the evil doer is, but we do not want to know anything about the evil doing. We want to hear no evil, see no evil, and we sure do not want to register it.

If any Government is going to throw some real light on lobbying in this city, we need to know more than who is doing the lobbying. We have to know who they are doing it for. We have to know what they are trying to get out of the system. If you are here on behalf of the pharmaceutical industry, what is it that you want? The public has a right to know that. We have to know how much you are spending to do it. How big a budget do you have?

We want to know these things because it is not simply enough to know who the lobbyists are. Otherwise all we need is a collection box for business cards. The Prime Minister could have an in basket at his door and as the most powerful lobbyists in this country walk through, they could take their business card out of their wallet and drop it in. That would be the result of simply registering lobbyists and forgetting about lobbying.

I think the Minister's comments in committee laid bare the fact that the Government does not really want to do anything effective about lobbying. It does not want to expose what goes on when the powerful come to Ottawa seeking favours from the Government. Oh, it is nice to have the newspapers report on the activities of spontaneous grass roots groups such as Rural Dignity. Then the Post Office can send out staff and have that group followed everywhere. We will not ask them for their business cards, but we will sure see what they are doing.

That is a double standard. The activities of ordinary Canadians when they protest the policies of government are visible, but when it comes to those who yield enormous influence, those who can get Governments to make decisions against the public interest, we just want to know who they are; we do not want to know what they are doing. All that says is that the Government is not serious when it comes to registering and controlling lobbyists.

If that is the case, then the Government should not be wasting the time of this House in having us here during the summer months to pass legislation that is not going to throw any new light on what is happening with regard to the making of decisions and the influence that the powerful in this society yield when it comes to the direction of government.

Why does this legislation not ask the Business Council on National Issues or the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association to provide the same information as it does of its friends in the Tier I category, such as Government Consultants International? Why do they not apply a consistent standard across the board? Why is it that the two associations which influence government policy do not have to give information? Why is it that the one group that was able to undercut legislation, that had the support of the vast majority of Canadians, that was able to make the Government go down a road which was unpopular with the vast majority of Canadians, does not have to provide the same information as do other lobbyist groups? Why is it on the Tier II wimp list? Why is it that the one group that told the Government to sell out Canadian sovereignty is not on the Tier I lobbyist list?

• (1700)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. McCurdy: I rise on debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps the Chair will need the help of the Hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs on this matter. On July 21 the House passed a special Order which said that after Question Period on Monday, July 25, the House would consider third reading of Bill C-82, an Act respecting the registration of lobbyists, and complete the debate on that Act before five o'clock.

The Chair understands that at the time this motion was proposed by the Hon. Minister of State he thought there would be a Private Members' Hour today. There is no Private Members' Hour today, but nonetheless there was an Order made that it was up to the Chair to put the question on third reading of Bill C-82.

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, I am in the hands of my colleagues. I understand that the House Leader had agreed that when the debate was completed we would suspend and come back at six o'clock for the divisions. I am hesitant to keep colleagues here any longer. They have now endured two speeches of some volume and lacking any sense. If we had some assurance that there would not be further abuse for long periods of time, I would certainly not be reluctant.

However, perhaps I can delegate this responsibility to the House Leader who has the unfortunate job of having to deal with the NDP on a day-to-day basis. I would not want to undermine any relationship he might have with that organization, although I cannot understand how anyone can endure that task day after day.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I want to say how much I appreciate the comments of my friend, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I am not sure that he has helped me in future negotiations, but it helps my colleagues opposite understand what I have to put up with.

This agreement was worked out last week. The intention was that once we had dealt with this legislation there would be no more business put before the House prior to the vote taking place at six o'clock. We have a choice of calling it six o'clock or recessing the House until six o'clock, whichever the Chair finds to be more appropriate under the circumstances.

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, the Minister who spoke first on this issue wanted some indication of what we have left on our speakers' list. We have one more speaker and if it is agreeable we will have one more speech and then take the vote at that time.

Mr. Gauthier: That is no problem, Mr. Speaker. In our usual co-operative mood we would agree to extend the time to allow for that one speech.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The lucky member of the New Democratic Party will be the Hon. Member for Windsor—Walkerville.

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, far be it from me to impose any additional abuse to that self- inflicted by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre). I appreciate the polite generosity of others in the House in extending to me this opportunity to say a few words about a matter which has not been exhausted in debate here.

I am sure that not even the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs would suggest for a moment that we have before us in Bill C-82 the be-all and end-all on the issue of lobbying. This is a matter of great concern to all Canadians. It was certainly of considerable concern to the Committee on Elections, Privileges and Procedures which submitted its report some time ago and asked a great deal more of the Government than the Government has offered in this legislation.

My colleagues have, with a great deal of eloquence and insight, examined the issue of lobbying. However, I must say that after listening to the debate there might be a temptation to see lobbying as, by definition, evil rather than an aspect and a part of the process of this place which becomes evil only as a consequence of its abuse.

Therefore, it is perhaps useful for the electorate to understand the role that lobbying plays. Lobbying is a special word which is applied to the exercise of individual citizens' rights to petition their Members of Parliament, members of Government, or members of the bureaucracy in order to achieve some end. I think you would agree, Mr. Speaker, that that is a substantial and key part of doing our job properly.

You yourself, Mr. Speaker, have probably come to realize, as have I and my colleagues, that the vast complexity of issues with which Members of Parliament have to deal is far beyond the competence or intellect of Members of Parliament to have mastered. We are required to deal with an infinite number of complex, specialized issues about which we could not be expected to have expertise. It must be added that in many cases, no matter how well aware we are of the environment in which we operate or how well read we are, we may not even know that certain matters are indeed even issues.

When those who ask to see us, lobbyists included, initiate discussions on a variety of matters, very often it is helpful, and not only helpful but necessary in order to give us the impulse to begin the study and investigation which allows for the formulation of points of view.

This kind of lobbying occurs in our offices here on the Hill and may occur in our riding offices back home. It is frequent and involves ordinary Canadians, Canadians who have special recognition in our communities, the wealthy, the poor, labourers, employers, and women. It involves a whole spectrum of people who represent our constituencies.

One does not have to be around this Hill very long to realize the frequency with which one could accept invitations to very exorbitant dinners or fine cocktail parties or, in the case of one significant lobbying organization, an extraordinarily, exorbitantly luxurious party which people vie to attend in order to share the beneficence of those who seek to purchase influence to ensure that the directions chosen are consistent with the will of those able to entertain Members of Parliament at such a level as to bend their minds.

Members of Parliament, of course, have to keep in mind that they have an electorate to face. We also know that lobbying does not include only Members of Parliament but members of the bureaucracy not answerable to the electorate; those who write the legislation, those who can distort and bend the minds of Ministers and shape legislation to reflect, not the interests of the Government but the interests of those special interests better informed and better heeled, and who can determine directions in subtle ways of which we ourselves are all too often unaware. Lobbying is a normal part of the process of democracy subject to abuse.

• (1710)

The issue is that there ought to be full disclosure and transparency of the character of lobbying wherever it occurs. This Bill purports to allow intelligent people to determine whether questions should be raised about a particular lobbying activity, the costs incurred for that lobbying, the pay-off, who is being lobbied, and about what. Those are activities that we ought to be able to track down.

This legislation fails on a number of accounts. Its first failure is that it constructs an artificial distinction between those who may be described as professional lobbyists working for businesses that, for a fee, uses whatever means it has to

pursue Members of Parliament, the Senate, and the bureaucracy to achieve certain ends. Such firms as Government Consultants International and Public Affairs International will make certain contacts for a fee.

One may gauge that the effectiveness of such groups may be based on expertise and intimate knowledge of Government. However, it is perfectly clear that when one examines closely the way these organizations work, particularly GCI operated by Mr. Moores, one must be suspicious that it is not the expertise developed by virtue of education or anything of the sort, but the personal contacts and influences gained over years of intimate involvement in partisan political activity. That is what gives such organizations a special claim.

Furthermore, it appears that such a consulting organization may measure its fee on a contingency basis. If it is pursuing a contract like the Airbus contract, amounting to billions of dollars, such a consulting organization could earn millions of dollars. Obviously, the message to all Canadians is that the more money one has, the better one is able to influence the outcome of a bureaucratic or governmental decision. That is an important consideration in the issue of transparency of lobbyists and knowing how much it costs, how much is paid, how much changes hands, and for what. It is important to know what is being discussed and who is involved, because it could constitute a form of extreme prejudice to the rest of the population of ordinary Canadians who cannot mobilize these huge sums of money. This is one example of the application of a particular approach to charging clients to obtain goals on their behalf.

If we are going to have legislation to make lobbying transparent, it is self-evident that we should know what fees are changing hands. We should also be aware that if the size of a contract determines the fee, it will introduce the kind of bias and motivation to make as much as possible at whatever cost.

Contingency fees should be banned and we should ensure that we know what fees are being charged so that we do not create a situation in which wealth, even more than now, will determine a business' ability to gain an appropriate response from government.

Others have spoken about the artificial division between Tier I and Tier II. Tier I constitutes consulting firms such as GCI and PAI. The purpose of this artificial division is to create a loophole so vast as to provide all the room necessary for another scandal, which the Government needs desperately. We have a crazy situation in which the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association can spend all the money it wants and hire a former Liberal Minister for all kinds of money to do nothing but lobby while calling her a vice-president. She would not be included in this legislation.

Mr. Keeper: Who is it?

Mr. McCurdy: I would not mention names because that would be unparliamentary and impolite. This former Liberal Minister, in the face of purported Liberal opposition to Bill C-22, was suddenly hired as a lobbyist, with the title of vice-president of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association of Canada. Surely her activities and activities like those should be registered in the same way as those listed in Tier I. That is elementary.

Since this legislation creates an artificial division, excluding from effective registration employees who function as lobbyists, it is an essential waste of time. This legislation is more rhetoric than substance, and therefore it fails.

There are other shortcomings in addition to those which I have already enumerated. This legislation is so deeply flawed that it should be rejected on that basis alone by any rational person who wants to make lobbying as transparent as it should be. The Government wanted to pass the test of honesty and fairness. I am happy to join my colleagues in voting against this legislation until something better comes along. We know that it will not come with this Government. We will have to wait until more rational and principled heads take power.

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows that I think he is intelligent. He, along with his colleagues, is being a little more than self-righteous about these matters. What would be their reaction if we brought to the House Conservative Party resolutions that were sponsored by Joe's Diner, the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, or General Motors?

I have noticed lately that his Party has resolutions from certain locals of unions. I believe the Canadian Auto Workers Association can introduce motions directly at his Party's semi-annual conventions. How can he to pretend for one moment that he is acting in the interest of his ordinary constituents, young, old, and of all incomes? In fact, the joke is often made that Bob White runs his Party. I do not think it is a joke; I think it is a reality with respect to the trade issue.

• (1720)

How is it that the Hon. Member can pretend that he is so virtuous and speaks for ordinary people when in fact members of one particular interest group can introduce motions and have them passed at his Party's conventions?

Mr. McCurdy: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to get a question from a colleague whose intelligence, which I also respect, is indicated by the frequent occasion he has to criticize the shortcomings of his own Party. However, there is that Tory flaw. The Hon. Member asks how we can talk about lobbying when UAW, the Womens' Incentive Centre of Windsor, or the farmers of Kent County can bring in resolutions that become a party policy. That is exactly the point.

Any policy initiative of the New Democratic Party is derived from a clear identification of source, and those who join our Party have the right and responsibility to determine what the policies of our Party will be. It is easier for the Hon. Member. His Party does not do that. Its policies are made in that chair right over there, and I suppose even the Hon. Member wonders where they come from, he has questioned them so frequently.

Of course, my eminent colleague across the way, intelligent as he is, seems to have missed the point. We are not talking about the processes which occur at the conventions of political Parties. We are talking about those activities that occur in respect to elected officials and the bureaucracy in their official functions as members of the Government. It is our concern that because of the way in which the Conservatives arrive at their policies, secretively and without identification of source, that GCI, PAI, and the like will spread the loot around to create party policy for the Conservatives. This policy will not have the UAW, the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, or the name of Conrad Black written under it. It will be secret, at least to the extent that we can measure untoward influence in this House. This legislation should do something about that, and this legislation has failed.

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Hon. Member did not catch my point. My point was how this gives credibility to his Party. I hate to say anything good about the Liberals, but in the two other Parties, an individual man or woman but not a member of a group, a lobby group or a union, can go to our conventions and introduced resolutions. How does it help his Party to act in the public interest when one can pick up its list of resolutions, as I am sure the Hon. Member has, and find that a good percentage of them are sponsored not by men and women as individuals but directly by the Canadian Auto Workers Union or local this and local that?

I hope the Hon. Member will agree with me, when he rises to give me the answer to that question, that it will be a better day when the only resolutions of his conventions will be sponsored by flesh and blood individuals rather than by unions.

Mr. McCurdy: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member must have said that in jest. Individual members come to the Conservative conventions and move resolutions that are forgotten about. New Democratic Party members, whether through unions or through local constituency associations, have not simply bought their membership cards the day before nomination meetings, subsequently to be forgotten about. They have joined the Party and they have responsibilities. One of those responsibilities is to go to riding association meetings and convince the associations to support their resolutions.

I am not surprised that the Hon. Member does not understand the principle. It is democracy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Order made Thursday, July 21, 1988, the recorded division stands deferred until six o'clock this day.

SITTING SUSPENDED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House will suspend its sitting until six o'clock p.m.

At 5.27 p.m. the sitting of the House was suspended.

[*Translation*]

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 6 p.m.

INCOME TAX ACT AND RELATED ACTS

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed, from Thursday, July 21, 1988, consideration of the motion of Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) that Bill C-139, an Act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Frederal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, 1977 and certain related Acts, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee, and on the amendment of Mr. Garneau (p. 17724).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being 6 p.m., pursuant to order made Thursday, July 21, 1988, the House will now proceed to the deferred recorded division on the amendment of the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau) concerning Bill C-139.

Call in the Members.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Garneau) which was negatived, on the following division:

• (1810)

[*English*]

(*Division No. 492*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Althouse
Angus
Boudria
Cassidy
Copps
Dingwall
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Finestone
Garneau
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Grondin
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Kaplan
Keeper
Manly
McCurdy
McLaughlin
Mitchell
Murphy
Nystrom
Orlikow
Penner
Robinson
Rodriguez
Tardif
(Richmond—Wolfe)—29

NAYS

Members

Andre
Belsher
Bernier
Binns
Blais
Blenkarn
Blouin
Bourgault
Bradley
Browes
Cardiff
Chartrand
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clinch
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Desjardins
Desrosiers
Domm
Dorin
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Friesen
Hardey
James
Jelinek
Jepson
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Jourdenais
Kelleher
Kempling
Kilgour
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mantha
Martin
McCuish
McDermid
McKenzie
McKnight
Minaker
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Plourde
Price
Ravis
Reimer
Ricard
St. Germain
Sparrow
Stackhouse
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tremblay
(Lotbinière)
Vankoughnet
Vincent
Warner
Wilson
(Swift Current—Maple Creek)
Winegard—72

• (1820)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, you will find that there will be unanimous consent to apply the vote previously taken to this motion.

Some Hon. Members: Reversed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is unanimous consent to apply the vote in reverse order to the motion.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)), which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 493*)

YEAS

Members

Andre
Belsher
Bernier
Binns
Blais
Blenkarn
Blouin
Bourgault
Bradley
Browes
Cardiff
Chartrand
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clinch
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Desjardins
Desrosiers
Domm
Dorin
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Friesen
Hardey
James
Jelinek
Jepson
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Jourdenais
Kelleher
Kempling
Kilgour
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mantha
Martin
McCuish
McDermid
McKenzie
McKnight
Minaker
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Plourde
Price
Ravis
Reimer
Ricard
St. Germain
Sparrow
Stackhouse
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tremblay
(Lotbinière)
Vankoughnet
Vincent
Warner
Wilson
(Swift Current—Maple Creek)
Winegard—72

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Althouse
Angus
Boudria
Cassidy
Copps
Dingwall
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Finestone
Garneau
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Grondin
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Kaplan
Keeper
Manly
McCurdy
McLaughlin
Mitchell
Murphy
Nystrom
Orlikow
Penner
Robinson
Rodriguez
Tardif
(Richmond—Wolfe)—29

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs.

* * *

BROADCASTING ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Miss MacDonald that Bill C-136, an Act respecting broadcasting

and to amend certain Acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunication, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall I dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 494)

YEAS

Members

Andre
Belsher
Bernier
Binns
Blais
Blenkarn
Blouin
Bourgault
Bradley
Browes
Cardiff
Chartrand
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clinch
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Desjardins
Desrosiers
Domm
Dorin
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Fontaine
Friesen
Hardey
James
Jelinek
Jepson
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Jourdenais
Kelleher
Kempling
Kilgour
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mantha
Martin
McCuish
McDermid
McKenzie
McKnight
Minaker
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
Oostrom
Pennock
Peterson
Plourde
Price
Ravis
Reimer
Ricard
St. Germain
Sparrow
Stackhouse
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tremblay
(Lotbinière)
Vankoughnet
Vincent
Warner
Wilson
(Swift Current—Maple Creek)
Winegard—72

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Althouse
Angus
Boudria
Cassidy
Copps
Dingwall
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Finestone
Garneau
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Grondin
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Kaplan
Keeper
Manly
McCurdy
McLaughlin
Mitchell
Murphy
Nystrom
Orlikow
Penner
Robinson
Rodriguez
Tardif
(Richmond—Wolfe)—29

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

• (1830)

LOBBYISTS REGISTRATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Andre that Bill C-82, an Act respecting the registration of lobbyists, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on Bill C-82.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 495)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Andre
Belsher
Bernier
Binns
Blais
Blenkarn
Blouin
Boudria
Bourgault
Bradley
Browes
Cardiff
Chartrand
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clinch
Copps
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Desjardins
Desrosiers
Dingwall
Domm
Dorin
Edwards
Ellis
Fennell
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Garneau
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Grondin
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Hardey
Hopkins
Isabelle
James
Jelinek
Jepson
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Jourdenais
Kaplan
Kelleher
Kempling
Kilgour
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Mantha
Martin
McCuish
McDermid
McKenzie
McKnight
Minaker
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oberle
Oostrom
Penner
Pennock
Peterson
Plourde
Price
Ravis
Reimer
Ricard
St. Germain
Sparrow
Stackhouse
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
(Richmond—Wolfe)
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tremblay
(Lotbinière)
Vankoughnet
Vincent
Warner
Wilson
(Swift Current—Maple Creek)
Winegard—87

NAYS

Members

Althouse
Angus
Cassidy
Epp
(Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Keeper
Manly
McCurdy
McLaughlin
Mitchell
Murphy
Nystrom
Orlikow
Robinson
Rodriguez—14

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declared the motion carried.

Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being 6.35 p.m. this House stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at eleven o'clock.

The House adjourned at 6.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, July 26, 1988

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to petition Nos. 332-4794 and 332-5020 to 332-5027 inclusive.

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

* * *

[*Translation*]

STRIKING COMMITTEE

PRESENTATION OF SIXTY-SEVENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Gabriel Fontaine (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the sixty-seventh report of the Striking Committee.

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

* * *

• (1110)

[*English*]

PETITIONS

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to the House today petitions from Duncan, Mill Bay, Cobble Hill and Shawinigan Lake, British Columbia, signed by over 680 people who petition Parliament to prepare legislation immediately to the effect that all human beings from the moment of fertilization until natural death be protected in the Charter of Rights, with the only exception being where medical procedures are necessary to prevent the death of the mother.

PROTECTION OF ROUGE RIVER VALLEY WILDERNESS AREA

Mrs. Pauline Browes (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to present a petition from the residents of Scarborough, who join thousands of others working to protect the Rouge Valley in Scarborough as a unique and precious natural area.

Protecting the endangered wildlife and wilderness areas in this Rouge Valley is in the national interest, so we join with the federal Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan), Save the Rouge Valley System, and the Coalition of Scarborough Community Associations in expressing support for saving the valley, and call on the Government to work with the Government of Ontario to establish the Rouge River Valley as a Canadian heritage land or a provincial park.

[*Translation*]

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Édouard Desrosiers (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of presenting a petition from my constituents and from other residents of Canada, who humbly pray and beseech Parliament to pass legislation giving full protection to the human foetus, from conception to birth, to take the necessary measures for this law to be respected and for adequate services to be put in place to come to the assistance of pregnant women in difficulty.

There are 10,000 names on the petition I am presenting.

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I have the duty to table another petition from Canadians regarding the Mulroney-Reagan trade agreement.

The signatories to this petition say that the Mulroney Government has sold Canada without getting anything in return; that Canadian industries are still not protected from American trade laws; that the United States has got everything it wanted in the important sectors, particularly agriculture, energy, trade, the automobile industry, financial services, investments; that thousands of Canadian jobs are threatened; and that the Conservative Government has not provided for any assistance to help Canadian workers adapt.

For these reasons, the petitioners humbly pray Parliament to censure the government for having signed the Mulroney-Reagan trade agreement.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I suggest that all the questions stand over.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

RAILWAY SAFETY ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT—CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENT

Hon. Bill McKnight (for the Minister of Agriculture) moved the second reading of, and concurrence in, the amendment made by the Senate to Bill C-105, an Act to ensure the safe operation of railways and to amend certain other Acts in consequence thereof.

Motion agreed to, amendment read the second time and concurred in.

* * *

CANADA GRAIN ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-112, an Act to amend the Canada Grain Act and other Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): There are two motions in amendment on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-112, an Act to amend the Canada Grain Act and other Acts in consequence thereof, both standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo).

Motions Nos. 1 and 2 are admissible and will be debated and voted on separately.

I shall now put Motion No. 1 to the House.

Mr. Gauthier: The Member is not here.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): We will proceed to Motion No. 2. I will listen to the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) on a point of order.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if the House would give its consent I would gladly move Motion No. 2 in the place of the Hon. Member who proposed this motion to the House. However, I could not do so with Motion No. 1. That is why I did not rise to suggest it at that point. Perhaps one of his colleagues could move the motion for him.

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (for Mr. Hovdebo) moved:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-112 be amended in Clause 35 by striking out lines 38 to 40 at page 15 and substituting the following therefor:

"35.(1) Section 2 shall come into force January 1, 1990.

(2) Section 4 shall come into force January 1, 1990.

(3) All other provisions of this Act shall come into force on a day or days to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council."

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate on the motion introduced by the Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) for the Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo).

The purpose of Motion No. 2 proposed by the Member for Prince Albert is to ensure that Clause 2 and Clause 4 of the Bill do not come into force at the present time but that the application of those two clauses be delayed until January 1, 1990.

The House may ask why the Hon. Member for Prince Albert would want these two clauses of the Bill to come into force on January 1, 1990. I know the Hon. Member would want me to respond. Clause 2 of the Bill states:

> There shall be a Commission to be known as the Canadian Grain Commission consisting of three commissioners to be appointed by the Governor in Council to hold office, during good behaviour, for a renewable term of up to seven years.

The old section in the Act states that there shall be a commission to be known as the Canadian Grain Commission consisting of three commissioners to be appointed by the Governor in Council to hold office during pleasure. Notice the difference. Why does the Government want a seven-year term of office for members of the Canadian Grain Commission? The Hon. Member for Prince Albert quite ably pointed out why. My distinguished colleague, the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster), during the debate on second reading and during committee proceedings also very eloquently pointed out that what the Government wanted to do in this case was to provide a sinecure, as in patronage, for one of its members to sit on the Canadian Grain Commission.

• (1120)

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservative administration made a number of promises to the Canadian people. You will remember that the Conservatives told the people of Canada that patronage was wrong and that the preceding Government, which had appointed 19 people prior to the last election to various boards, agencies and the Senate—all positions which existed, mind you—was wrong. Upon

coming into office the Conservatives went whole hog at patronage, and I use the words "whole hog" quite appropriately, I think. They fired people who had sat on various boards and agencies. They fired members of the Canadian Grain Commission, another agency of the Government.

I say to the Hon. Member opposite to pay attention because some day he may be one of those appointees, if the Government does not get defeated first. I say to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Western Economic Diversification (Mr. McKnight), who seems to be taking notes of my remarks, that what the Conservatives did after they came to power, firing people as they did, taking away the livelihoods of these people, was for the mere purpose of replacing them with their Tory friends.

The Government in its wisdom, and I use the word loosely, has now decided that if it appoints a Conservative Member of Parliament to sit on the Canadian Grain Commission, the Liberals, when they are in power—which will be whenever the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) has the nerve, I will not use the words "intestinal fortitude", to call the election—may choose to fire that particular former Member of Parliament for Lisgar (Mr. Murta) from the Canadian Grain Commission. In order to avoid that, the Government has proposed a Bill which would have the effect of ensuring that the Member for Lisgar, in his incarnation as a member of the Canadian Grain Commission, will not be fired. In other words the Government wants to provide a sinecure for the Member for Lisgar.

All these Tories opposite might think I am cooking this up because they are far too partisan, but I know, Mr. Speaker, you would not believe that this is something I have cooked up. However,but let me read from an article in *The Toronto Star* of July 5, 1988. It is a very reliable source. It is a Canadian Press release and you can always believe the Canadian Press. It reads:

> Progressive Conservative MP Jack Murta, a former cabinet minister, will give up his House of Commons seat and accept a position with the Canadian Grain Commission, a newspaper says. Sources told the Winnipeg Free Press that the Manitoba MP will be appointed a commissioner with the federal grain-regulating agency, at a salary of $70,000 to $80,000 a year, within five weeks.

What is happening here is that the Government wants to appoint this Member of Parliament to that job. The Member of Parliament wants the job, but he feels it is too risky to accept because he could be turfed out later. Therefore, the Government in turn is trying to provide that protection for the Member of Parliament. I am not suggesting that the Liberal Government, when it is elected very shortly, will turf out the Member for Lisgar.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Boudria: I see I woke up a few Tories. That makes it all worthwhile. I am not saying the Liberals will turf this person out. But the rules are there, that people who sit on those commissions are deemed to be appropriate. If the Conservative Leader thought it was appropriate to fire everyone just because they did not happen to be Tories, why should Parliament now give the Conservative administration any special powers to protect a Member of Parliament of its own persuasion?

There is an article in the *Manitoba Co-operater* of February 18, 1988, by Sprinkler Sam. He writes:

> Hear ye, hear yea. The bed is being feathered for one Tory MP Jack Murta even as we speak. We have finally uncovered the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, on how Murta will become chief commissioner of the Canadian Grain Commission. (Have I ever lied to you before?).
>
> But follow carefully, for Murta's path has more curves and dips than the slalom ski run at Calgary this week.
>
> Apparently Charlie Mayer and Murta have agreed for some time that no one was better qualified than the Lisgar MP to head the grain commission. But there was one obstacle.
>
> CGC commissioners are employed "at the pleasure" of the reigning government. In other words, a new government could turf Murta out as fast as you can say Beth Candlish. Checking the polls, Murta told Mayer, uh-uh.
>
> On the other hand, Canadian Wheat Board commissioners are appointed to terms based on "good behaviour." That is, the government must show just cause in order to fire them. It makes a big difference.
>
> So? So in the House of Commons last week Mayer introduced amendments to the Canada Grain Act. Oh, nothing major. Just a bit of tidying up, we're told. A few odds and ends. Except for one amendment that will make CGC commissioner posts fixed seven-year terms based on "good behaviour".
>
> Murta goes to the commission, Klassen over to the wheat board, and both are safe if the Tories lose the next election. You're welcome.

Now you will understand, Mr. Speaker, why the Hon. Member for Prince Albert moved his amendment. It is a very good amendment, and I suggest to all Conservative Members of this House who may have made speeches on patronage during the last election campaign, that now is the time to put their money where their mouths were.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt—Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for just a moment on Motion No. 2 which proposes to amend Bill C-112, which is an amendment to the Canada Grain Act. The proposed Bill would give the Government the ability to appoint up to six persons known as assistant commissioners to hold office during good behaviour with a renewable term of up to five years. In other words, an appointment is good for 10 years, one five-year term and a renewable five years. The old Act, I think, was quite adequate. It dealt with the phrase "for good behaviour" and also mentioned "at the pleasure of the Minister". The Canadian Wheat Board is appointed at the pleasure of the Minister as is the Canadian Grain Commission, and this will be the case until this Bill comes into effect.

The reasons for this amendment were made quite clear by my Liberal colleague from those three points southeast of Ottawa. He correctly pointed out the suspicions running throughout the western grain community that this particular amendment is designed to keep the retiring Member of Parliament for Lisgar (Mr. Murta) in an appointed position long enough to live out his working career and retire. That was not the original intention of the Canadian Grain Commission.

The original intention of the Canadian Grain Commission was to find the best people with the best backgrounds in the grains business.

• (1130)

I do not have any strong objection to the background of the Hon. Member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta) to fill the position. However, I think that it is not necessary to make it a sinecure, which is the effect of this particular amendment.

There have been a few political appointees to the Canadian Grain Commission before. Generally, they were defeated candidates appointed by previous Liberal Governments and by previous Conservative Governments. It has become a sort of Senate of the western Canadian grains industry. Yet, for the most part, those appointees have been people with adequate background to do a good job of serving on the commission. There was no need prior to now, and I think there is no need now, to make those sinecures unassailable for at least five years and, upon good behaviour, a reappointment for a further five years.

George Leith was a former Member of the Legislature in Saskatchewan under the Thatcher Liberals. I believe he was a cabinet Minister for a brief time. He served honourably and well on the Canadian Grain Commission.

Years ago Forrest Hetland, who is now a member of the Canadian Wheat Board, served on the Grain Commission. He was considered to be something of a political appointee although I do not believe that he ever sought office. It was his father who had served as a Member of Parliament.

The tendency of Governments has been to appoint supporters to the commission. The recent appointment which went in reverse was a Diefenbaker appointment. I refer to the former Member of Parliament for Swift Current—Maple Creek, Mr. Frank Hamilton, who was a defeated candidate and who got his appointment that way. He then came back into politics and served as a Member of this House until his retirement at the end of the 1984 Session of Parliament.

The tradition of political appointees is not what we are opposed to in this particular motion, although I cannot particularly condone it, as long as the appointees are people who know the business. However, I think it is going a little too far when one ties the hands of all future Governments and future Ministers to the tradition of making those appointments at the pleasure of the Minister. To my recollection there has not been a practice by Ministers of the Crown to dispose of these appointees to the Grain Commission immediately upon taking office. Their appointments, if they are competent people, are relatively secure. I see no need for this particular amendment that the Government has put into these amendments to the Canadian Grain Act which would permit its appointees to hold the office during good behaviour, for at least five years.

I support the motion moved by my friend from Prince Albert which would delay the coming into force of this particular amendment until January 1, 1990, which is just beyond the longest possible mandate that this Government can have. Since we have been unable to have the clause deleted entirely, that would be the second choice.

Mr. Geoff Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I wish to oppose the motion that has been brought forward by the Hon. Member. I do so as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Agriculture which, over the past several weeks, has studied these proposals in detail and made recommendations to the House.

The essence of the Canada Grain Act is that we have a set of commissioners whose responsibility it is to ensure the integrity of the grading system and the sampling system in Canada, and to ensure that Canada's reputation as a supplier of quality wheat and quality grains to the rest of the world remains intact.

A number of responsible farm organizations in the western Prairies have suggested to me, and I am sure to other members of the committee, that the best way to ensure the integrity of the grain commissioners is to give them a modest term of, say, seven years, in order that they have some security of tenure. In this way if they will be going to the expense of moving their families and setting up house in Winnipeg they can be reasonably assured that the job would endure for that length of time. Therefore they would be more independent and not subject to the whims of, perhaps, a particular Deputy Minister, or to a particular political pressure of the day. They would in fact have the independence required of such a responsible position in order to carry out the thrust of the Act which, after all, is to maintain the quality and integrity of Canada's grains and its reputation in the world market.

I cannot let the words of the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) pass unchallenged. Only a Liberal could stand in this House and make the sort of ridiculous representations that he made. Only a Liberal would have the nerve to do it. The last time there were any substantive amendments to the Canada Grain Act was in 1971 when the then Liberal Government changed the Act. At that time and prior to it commissioners were appointed for a 10-year term which, in fact, may be too long. I believe that a period of five to seven years is probably about right. But the fact is that the commissioners were appointed for 10-year terms and the Liberal Government of the day brought forward legislation to eliminate that 10-year term and change it to "at the pleasure" for the specific reason of getting rid of Frank Hamilton, to whom the Hon. Member for Humboldt—Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) referred.

Mr. Hamilton was an expert in the grains field. He belonged to the commission for some eight years and was summarily dismissed by the Liberal Government as a result of its having played politics with the legislation and overturning it. I think that the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell and

Members of his Party have a lot of nerve to stand in this House and talk in terms of political manipulation of this Bill.

I simply want to say that I can think of no better guarantee to ensure the independence of the members of the commission than to give them a reasonable term of office. I think the suggestion of seven years is a reasonable and adequate one, one which I believe is supported in the main by responsible farm organizations and producers on the Prairies.

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the two motions briefly. First, Motion No. 1, which has been moved by the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) on behalf of the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) is opposed to requests on the part of the commission that it be enabled or be given the authority to delegate certain responsibilities. During the course of the committee hearings the relevant authorities made it very clear—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would just like to say that Motion No. 1 was not put because there was no one in the House to put it. We are on Motion No. 2.

Mr. Clark (Brandon—Souris): I misunderstood, Mr. Speaker. I thought that it had been put by the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt on his entry into the House.

With respect to Motion No. 2, I would like to echo the comments made by the Chairman of the committee, the Hon. Member for Swift Current—Maple Creek (Mr. Wilson). I wish to point out that what the industry is seeking in its recommendations is that a length of term be established for grain commissioners, as has already been suggested, to secure some continuity. The Grain Commission is largely responsible for Canada's reputation which the Canadian wheat industry has achieved throughout the world. In times of difficult markets we have always been able to sell. The quality of our grain and reliability has never been in question. That is largely due to the work of the Canadian Grain Commission and those who represent the Government of Canada in that regard.

• (1140)

Many regulatory bodies are staffed by individuals who have a specific term, whether it be five or 10 years. What is suggested here is a compromise position that individual grain commissioners be put in position for a specific term of seven years, and assistant grain commissioners for a slightly lesser term. As has already been suggested to the House, we are anxious that people of quality be appointed. We are also anxious that people be protected in their appointments to the extent that it makes it worth-while for them to relocate to Winnipeg from Saskatchewan or Alberta. For example, with respect to assistant grain commissioners, one of the decisions made in recent months was that a position should be moved from Winnipeg to Brandon. People who accept such positions need to know that they will be there for a reasonable period of time if they are to accept that type of responsibility.

The suggestion that there should be a specific term is an appropriate one. It is consistent with other types of regulatory appointments that the House has made in the past. It should be stressed and sought by all Members that some assurance be given that those who are appointed to those important positions be well qualified individuals who are prepared to act on behalf of the industry, and indirectly on behalf of the Government of Canada. Since the Government came into office in 1984 it has built into the system a provision that such individuals can be called before a committee of Parliament to be questioned, if anyone should have any reservations whatsoever about the quality, qualifications or integrity of the individuals who are appointed.

In my opinion this amendment will strengthen the Grain Commission. It will encourage people with the appropriate qualifications to accept appointments if they are offered in the future. Quite frankly, it is in the long-term benefit of the industry, and that is why I hope at this stage the House will reject Motion No. 2.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question? The question is on Motion No. 2. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

Motion No. 2 (Mr. Hovdebo) negatived.

Hon. Frank Oberle (for the Minister of State (Grains and Oilseeds)) moved that the Bill be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): When shall the Bill be read the third time? At the next sitting of the House?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

WESTERN GRAIN STABILIZATION ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-132, an Act to amend the Western Grain Stabilization Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): There are two motions in amendment on the *Order Paper and Notices* for report stage of Bill C-132, an Act to amend the Western Grain Stabilization Act. Motions Nos. 1 and 2 are acceptable and will be debated and voted on separately. I shall now put Motion No. 1 to the House.

Mr. Vic Althouse (for Mr. Hovdebo) moved:

Motion No. 1.

That Bill C-132 be amended in Clause 19 by striking out line 14 at page 20 and substituting the following therefor:

"man and four other members to be".

He said: I proposed this amendment, the effect of which is to provide an executive committee of a chairman and four members instead of an executive committee of seven members, to make it simpler to operate.

Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain briefly to the House why the Government prefers that the Motion No. 1 not be approved, and why the Government proposes that there be full and regional representation. The Government proposes that there should be eight members in total on the committee rather than five, as the motion moved by the Hon. Member for Humboldt—Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) on behalf of the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) would provide for.

We are seeking the opportunity to ensure that there be as full a regional representation as possible on this advisory committee. The opportunity to have eight members instead of five would enable us to add one additional member from each of the three prairie and grain producing provinces.

Therefore, we hope that the House would give us the authority to enlarge the committee because we believe that greater representation on the part of the industry is in the interests of the industry. The more opportunity we provide the industry itself to be directly represented the better it will be for the industry as a whole.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

Motion No. 1 (Mr. Hovdebo) negatived.

Hon. Frank Oberle (for the Minister of State (Grains and Oilseeds)) moved:

Motion No. 2.

That Bill C-132 be amended in Clause 26 by adding immediately after line 16 at page 22 the following:

"(7) The provisions of the said Act enacted by this Act, other than those in respect of which subsections (1) to (5) apply, shall be deemed to have come into force on July 31, 1988 and, for greater certainty, the following provisions of the said Act shall apply in respect of the crop year ending on that date, namely:

(a) the amendments to subsection 2(1) of the said Act, set out in subsections 1(1) to (3);

(b) subsections 4(2) to (4) of the said Act, as enacted by section 2;

(c) the amendments to paragraphs 8(4)(a) to (c) and subsections 8(5) and (6) of the said Act, as enacted by section 3;

(d) the amendments to paragraphs 10(1)(b) and (1.1)(b) and subsection 10(2) of the said Act, as enacted by section 4; and

(e) section 12 of the said Act, as enacted by section 5."

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to explain why Motion No. 2 has been introduced at this particular point. The difficulty that has arisen is that Bill C-132 may not be enacted into legislation as early as we had anticipated. This amendment would ensure that once Bill C-132 is proclaimed, it will take effect as of July 31, 1988, and shall be deemed to have come into force on that date. Therefore, it shall apply retroactively to the entire 1987-88 crop year.

During the committee stage of the Bill it appeared that there was a reasonable possibility that the Bill would not be proclaimed until sometime in August, assuming passage through the House and the other place. The purpose of this amendment is to make it very clear that the Bill shall be deemed to have come into effect on July 31, which is the last day of the crop year, and it shall apply retroactively to the entire 1987-88 crop year.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt—Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have no negative reaction to this particular proposal. I regret that the Government had worded it in that manner to begin with.

• (1150)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea?

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion carried.

Motion No. 2 (Mr. Mayer) agreed to.

Hon. Frank Oberle (for the Minister of State (Grains and Oilseeds)) moved that the Bill be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): When shall the Bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. Frank Oberle (for the Minister of State for Grains and Oilseeds) moved that the Bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes to indicate my Party's support for the technical amendments provided for in Bill C-132. We know, of course, that the Bill provides for the write-down of some $750 million of the Western Grain Stabilization Fund under the Western Grain Stabilization Act. We know that the provisions of the Bill are to permit and encourage farmers to participate in stabilization and that this would be enhanced if the Bill were passed by July 31. Our Party indicated its usual full co-operation with the Government in assisting the Minister and his Parliamentary Secretary by consenting to immediate third reading debate rather than the customary wait of one day that was imposed. We were glad to participate and to accommodate the Government in that way. We want farmers to be able to participate this year, and that will be possible with the passage of this Bill now.

I just wanted to state as well that we welcome the fact that the Government has this commitment to the Western Grain Stabilization Act. We know that that commitment to the Act was not always there on the part of Conservative Members. We remember the fine work that was done in that area by the then Minister, Otto Lang. I want to reiterate the good wishes to Mr. Lang for his fine work and, of course, to the excellent Parliamentary Secretary that he had at the time, Ralph Goodale. Ralph will very shortly be the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan. We wish him well. I know that all Hon. Members, particularly the Conservative Members who are now such fans of stabilization, will want to pay homage as well to Ralph Goodale. I thought that I would mention that to ensure that all Members of Parliament were aware of the excellent work done in that regard.

[*Translation*]

So, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the Liberal Party, on behalf of my colleague the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster), on behalf of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Gary (Mr. Axworthy), I would like to express our consent to this government measure. We are happy to see that the Conservative Government has finally come round to favouring western grain stabilization. This hasn't always been a Conservative policy, as you know, because at a certain moment the extreme right of the Conservative Party had some difficulties with the idea of a stabilization program. It was seen by yesterday's Tories—I say "yesterday's", but some of yesterday's Tories are still with us today, and we call them the dinosaurs—it was seen by yesterday's Tories as some kind of socialist measure. That is not the case. We know this system is good for the agriculture sector, and we also know that governments intervene in agriculture in almost every country in the whole world.

[*English*]

So we know that there is government intervention in agriculture in most countries of the world, and that the Government has a moral duty to assist Canadian agriculture.

The stabilization program is an example of a system which can benefit farmers during particularly bad years—such as the one that the grain sector is going through right now—bad years that are caused in large measure by the war of subsidies between the United States of America and the European Economic Community. Canada is standing in the middle of this war of subsidies and money and is being bombarded on both sides. Our farmers have had a very low return for their crops.

It is interesting to note that the United States—and I have said this previously—chose to adopt the U.S. Farm Bill, the United States Food Security Act 1985, at the same time as it was going through this trade deal between our two countries. In other words, they were negotiating to end subsidies, to end all kinds of trade-distorting measures between the two countries, yet at the same time the Government of the United States was imposing what is by far the most offensive piece of legislation that it could have ever aimed at Canadian agriculture. I suppose it was not directly aimed at Canadian agriculture; it was aimed at European agriculture. When you are

standing in the crossfire, it is very small comfort to know that when you are shot, it is really someone else that they wanted to shoot, but you are still shot. That is in fact what happened to Canadian agriculture. It has received a severe blow from those subsidy wars. I hope that a solution is found to that in the near future so that Canadian farmers, particularly grain farmers, can start receiving income which is more reasonable than what they have been subjected to over recent years, particularly, I might add, last year.

This year there have been other problems, with the drought and everything else. All those situations combined have caused many Canadians to pause and to reflect on the necessity of supporting our agriculture.

I received a number of interesting phone calls, some from my constituents right here in eastern Canada. They contacted me a few weeks ago and asked the following: "We see our brothers and sisters in western Canada affected by this drought. What can we do to help as easterners?" I thought that was fascinating. It demonstrated an element of goodwill from constituents and from citizens outside my constituency but nevertheless around the general area that I represent in the House of Commons, and I was glad to see that kind of a reaction.

I indicated to them the plans that the Government had and the fact that opposition Members in the House were encouraging the Government to go even further in assisting our agricultural sector and that we would continue to do that and, as Members of the House, we would give every assistance to the Government to ensure that help was forthcoming to that sector of Canadian life, mainly western Canadian agriculture. I was glad, and I thought that I would take a moment to express that, in order to see the reaction of some of the people that I represent. I think that it is a very healthy sign when we see our citizens paying for a long-distance phone call to contact Members of Parliament to express their wish to help fellow citizens who live 2,000 or 3,000 miles away from them. That, for me, was very heart-warming. It is far better to see that than some of the divisions which we have experienced from time to time in Canada.

That being said, I want to give my support to this Bill and hope that the House will pass it very shortly. I think that after we pass this Bill we may find time to deal with another agricultural issue if the Parliamentary Secretary wishes to seek our consent for it. I will let him address that later.

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a few moments at third reading to describe the amendments to the Western Grain Stabilization Act, which I think all Members of the House know has been a very, very important part of the income support program in western Canada.

• (1200)

I might note in passing that there are a variety of support programs. Eastern Canadian producers are able to participate in the agriculture stabilization program, but at recent meetings which took place in Toronto and which I had an opportunity to attend with the federal Minister and his provincial counterparts, there was increased interest in the possibility of creating some sort of national stabilization program. Some talks are being held along that line, but in the meantime it is extremely important to the agricultural well-being of western Canada that the Western Grain Stabilization Act be as effective as it possibly can be. These amendments are designed to achieve that, and I appreciate the supportive sentiments of the Hon. Member who just spoke.

This legislation is part of a long-range program. I guess all of us in this House are conscious of the fact that we must respond to the crisis of the moment in an ad hoc fashion, but I think we all believe that the ideal solutions are long-term solutions, and this legislation is part of that umbrella which has played an important role these last three or four years.

As you will recall, in his meeting with farm leaders last December, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) announced that some changes to this Act would be proposed as part of a comprehensive agricultural policy to assist producers in financial need primarily as a result of the trade war which has been going on between the European Community and the U.S. Unfortunately, we are very much victims of that war.

Some of the things we have done have been very important. I would refer just in passing to the Special Grains Program No. 2 which of course injected $1.1 billion into the hands of all grain producers. Then there were fuel tax rebates and other programs. However, the legislation before us today addresses what has probably become the most important income support program available to western Canadian producers. During the course of this last year alone the participants received some $1.4 billion. That was of tremendous benefit to the 135,000 western Canadian farmers who are part of the program.

However, we are concerned about the fact that not all farmers chose to participate, for a variety of reasons. Certainly a number of farmers disliked the program when it was originally created, some for philosophical reasons, some because they feared it would not be productive to join. Now that we are in a situation where a lot of the income support made available to western farmers is provided by this program we are troubled by the fact that an estimated 15 per cent of western farmers are not participants. These amendments are designed to encourage a significant percentage of that group to join and benefit.

As a result, the 10 per cent penalty for rejoining has been removed. The deadline for participation in the 1987-88 crop year will be extended so non-participants can rejoin. More crops are being covered. I think that is appropriate because western agriculture is becoming more diversified and a number of crops such as mixed grain, sunflower seeds, safflower seeds, buckwheat, peas, lentils, faba beans and canaryseeds, to name just a few, have been added. Payments for rejoining and conditional participants has been increased.

In addition, we are trying to put the program on a solid financial footing, of course. Unfortunately, we are now looking at a $2.2 billion deficit. If this program were operating without strong federal government support it would probably no longer be in operation, as my hon. friend suggested. The deficit must be addressed sooner or later, and as announced last December we decided to try to address it sooner and ensure that it be viable and that those who participate understand its viability and are encouraged to continue to participate.

We hope to address the deficit in three ways. The debt write-down of $750 million in this legislation will, apart from the obvious, further reduce the deficit by virtue of the fact there will be a reduction in interest charges levied against the account. In addition, there will be an appropriate increase in the Government and producer share of the levy. It is only fair that mechanism be reformed to make it more responsive to the fund's condition. Unfortunately, in the past, when the fund was in a surplus position, the levy seemed to be rising. When it moved into a deficit the levy seemed to be declining. That did not make any sense and that is why the amendments are before us.

Without the $750 million deficit write-down we believe that any increase in producer levies which would have been necessary would have been so prohibitive as to have discouraged participation and therefore would have reduced the effectiveness of the program. As I say that, I am conscious of the fact that there is a significant group in western Canada, the so-called committee of non-participants, who appeared before the legislative committee and made representations. We are hoping that upon reflection they will see there are some advantages for them in the amended program and many will be encouraged to participate.

As a result of increases for this crop year and next, producer levies will be increased from 1 per cent to 4 per cent. The Government's share will be increased from 3 per cent to 6 per cent. The federal Government will of course continue to pay in the bulk of the fee, and I for one have suggested in the past that the provinces at some point might wish to join and make this a tripartite program, but it may be no surprise to you if I were to say that there has been no provincial stampede in that direction as yet.

The federal Government believes we must maintain the effectiveness of this Act because it is the only program which automatically makes payments to western grain farmers when their income drops. We do not believe we can depend on *ad hoc* approaches even though they are sometimes necessary. We believe we need long-term programs like this. We believe it has proven its effectiveness, particularly in these last three or four years. There were many doubters, but we believe these amendments will strengthen the program and broaden the farm safety net by encouraging more producers to join. Therefore, we hope the Bill will be supported by the House.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt—Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Bill C-132, amendments to the Western Grain Stabilization Act. This Act has always represented a bit of a dilemma for western farmers. In its original form it did not go far enough. It did not look to the income needs of individual farmers. Instead, it paid attention to the cash flow in the total region. We had disparities and odd situations occurring with the pay-outs that were generated, such as in 1977 when I, as a farmer and member of the program, received a payment although I had one of my best income years ever. I took that payment and paid a big chunk of it back to Revenue Canada as income tax. I think it would have been much more useful to the region had we been able to target it in parallel with crop insurance so that those who had an income requirement would have reaped the benefit of the program.

I have some reservations about the over-all direction of the program because I think we will find it will have to be changed and perhaps replaced with something else because it is not available to all farmers unless they apply. The program cannot be applied to individual income needs and the ups and downs of a particular crop production. It does not run parallel with crop insurance so it does not do much to address income stability on the individual farm. There is no disaster component in this program nor is there a disaster component in the crop insurance program. I think that three successive droughts in the last five years would show us that something like that is needed in any future income stabilization program.

• (1210)

As well, the fact that it has been a regional program has, to some extent, been a problem. It becomes a problem when we end up, as we have now, with a deficit of close to $3 billion in this program.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, having gone through the original debate, the arguments about whether or not the premiums were set properly. Mr. Whelan, in the last days of his administration, fiddled with the formula so it would trigger a pay-out during an election. With the advent of this administration, the formula was further fiddled with so it would pay a much larger pay-out. In short, the result has been a deficit of approximately $3 billion.

That 15 per cent to 18 per cent of farmers who are still outside the program are facing a real dilemma. They do not know if they should rush in and take this last payment that is now open to them with this window of opportunity before August 1 and then be responsible for premium increases of 400 per cent, the premiums moving from 1 per cent to 4 per cent, immediately upon joining the program. At the same time, the Government's share of the contribution will drop. It now pays $3 for every producer dollar, and that amount will drop to $6 for every $4 producers put in.

Some of the producers who are outside the program are asking themselves if they should join now only to be responsible for paying off the $3-billion deficit. The Government has responded with a bit of a carrot by saying that $750 million of that deficit will be written off by some of the amendments

presented in this Bill and therefore the deficit will be only $2.2 billion. However, this still does not solve the dilemma facing those people.

Over the last five years, the program has been changed to the point where it is no longer on a financially sound footing. The combination of amendments made by the former Minister, Mr. Whelan, and by the current Minister, has changed the position of the program from having a net figure of just over $1 billion in the fund to having a net deficit of something in the order of $3 billion. In the short time of just five years, it has paid out approximately $4 billion more than it has taken in. To me, this points out that recent amendments have made this a very shaky financial institution for the stabilization of grain incomes on the Prairies and sets the stage for a complete revamping of the stabilization attitude to grain production that exists right across Canada. It gives any future Government, a Government which my Party may form, an opportunity to introduce a new concept of income insurance that would in fact provide stabilization to individual farmers based on their production and their income, and would have a disaster component built into it in the event of the kind of drought or hail storms that occur on the Prairies or some of the local disasters that can occur in the rest of the country.

It is a great opportunity to see the program's failings as they exist. These amendments are an attempt to make the best we can out of a bad piece of cloth. It is a badly made coat which we are trying to wear to keep some of the rain out. With the experience we have had since the early 1970s, we can now see ways of making a much better income stabilization program for farmers, and I hope that we can have the opportunity to present such a program after the next election.

At this time, I have no major objection to the Government's attempt to make this badly fitting garment somewhat more waterproof. I hope we can therefore allow the Government to go through with the amendments, even though they do not correct the over-all problems that have existed with the western grain stabilization program from its inception right up to this time.

Mr. Geoff Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief point of clarification. The Hon. Member who just spoke referred to producers joining before July 31 of this year, before the end of the current crop year. It is important to point out that the Bill has in fact provided for an extension of that deadline so that current non-participants would have a chance to join retroactive to August 1 of 1987. They will have, as I understand it, 60 days after proclamation of this Bill in which to join, which, as a practical matter, should run the deadline up to approximately October 1, and producers can rest assured that they will receive plenty of notice as to the actual deadline.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. Clark (Brandon—Souris): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you may find that there is a unanimous disposition on the part of Members of the House to consider Bill C-112 for third reading at this time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is there such unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

CANADA GRAIN ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Frank Oberle (for the Minister of State (Grains and Oilseeds) moved that Bill C-112, an Act to amend the Canada Grain Act and other Acts in consequence thereof, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Parliamentary Secretary would have wished to speak first. If so, I would gladly give my place, and if not, I will make my remarks now. Perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary can summarize, after having heard what other Hon. Members have said.

Mr. Nickerson: Let's get through with it.

Mr. Boudria: I think the Hon. Member across is not aware that we have had discussions in order to co-operate by giving the Government unanimous consent to proceed with third reading of this Bill today. This just goes to show that when it is reasonable to do so, the Opposition always co-operates with the Government. Sometimes we cannot co-operate with the Government when it is too unreasonable, but when it is reasonable, the Opposition can be reasonable as well, and I am sure that Canadians are noting the consent we are giving to the Government.

Bill C-112 is a Bill about which we have reservations because of a provision in the Bill. Nevertheless, we have conceded to giving that unanimous consent. That just goes to show the kind of co-operation that can exist.

The précis of the Bill provided by the Government to Members of the House states that the amendments to the Canada Grain Act provide for clarification and standardization of terminology used in the Act. That is true, of course, and we recognize that. It provides for the authority to establish by regulation, subject to Governor in Council approval, time limits for the deferral of pricing, the storage of grain in elevators and payments for grain by licensed elevators and grain dealers. That is true as well. It provides for the limitation of protection of securities posted within the commission to actual producers holding cash purchase tickets and the clarification of which documents are to be issued by licensed elevators for grain dealers. It provides for the consolidation of authority to establish and change grades by regulations of the commission subject to Governor in Council approval, the

flexibility to package and certify specific qualities of grain and, finally, specific terms of office for commissioners and assistant commissioners.

• (1220)

You will notice the way in which the Government worded that last part. It is just a little less than accurate to say, "to provide for specific terms of office for commissioners and assistant commissioners". As I indicated previously, that really means that the Government has decided to provide for a guaranteed seven-year term of office for one of its colleagues. The Member for Swift Current—Maple Creek (Mr. Wilson) was all upset a while ago because I dared to raise this issue in the House of Commons. The Member was so successful in his representation that I was not going to speak on this issue again. However, since he raised it again I thought that I should mention it once again myself just to remind Canadians of what is going on.

In his remarks the Member for Swift Current—Maple Creek said that only a Liberal could say that this issue is inappropriate, implying—if you can believe it—partisan motives on my part. I know that you do not believe that either, Mr. Speaker. However, do not think for one minute that I am the only one concerned about this. In fact, a very well respected newspaper, *The Toronto Star*, has raised this as an issue of concern.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Boudria: I see that a few Tories wake up whenever you talk about *The Toronto Star*. Well, if the Tories will cool down for a minute I will give them other sources almost as factual as *The Toronto Star*. The *Manitoba Co-operator* was of the same opinion as I on this. Tories sometimes believe that everyone in the media is out to get them. I suppose they can believe whatever they like, however inaccurate it is.

I will remind you of a letter sent by Prairie Pools Inc. I ask the Conservative Member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Belsher) to pay attention to this because it is important and we may ask questions later. Prairie Pools Inc. sent a letter to the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Agriculture who happens to be the Member for Swift Current—Maple Creek. The letter is dated July 18. This letter was not written by myself as an opposition Member of Parliament but by Prairie Pools Inc. It says:

> In regard to Bill C-112, the three Pools support the authority of the Canadian Grain Commission in establishing and maintaining standards of quality for Canadian grains and oilseeds and regulating grain handling in Canada . . . PPI believes that it is imperative that appointments be made on the basis of relevant background and requisite skills to ensure continuity and effectiveness within the CGC. PPI also has some concerns with the length of the renewable term of appointment contemplated in the legislation of up to seven years.

I did not cook this up. I certainly did not tell Prairie Pools Inc. to include this in the letter it sent to the Government. Even if I had tried, I doubt that I would have had much influence in causing it to do so because it is, of course, a pretty independent-thinking group which says what it wants based on what it believes is correct.

Prairie Pools Inc. says that the Government has failed by not indicating specific qualifications necessary to do this job and by providing for a seven-year term of appointment.

Mr. Althouse: Renewable.

Mr. Boudria: Yes, as the Member for Humboldt—Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) has just indicated, a renewable seven-year term.

I just wanted to express those concerns to the House. We do agree with the other provisions but I have strong reservations about that clause. My colleagues, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Gary (Mr. Axworthy) and the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) have expressed those concerns in the House. The Member for Algoma even moved an amendment at committee. I expressed those same reservations at report stage earlier today.

I hope that the representations we have made have convinced government back-benchers to take a second look. I know that deep down inside some of the Tory back-benchers who will not be getting such a sinecure are probably wondering why this Member should be getting such a sinecure when they will not. When the Member for Nipissing (Mr. Mantha), who is seated over there, is defeated shortly no one will give him a juicy job at $80,000 a year, much less a juicy job renewable for two seven-year terms.

I remind Members of that and remind them to be free and independent thinkers because the Government will not take care of them in that way. Conservative Members of Parliament should not opt for a system which provides for appointments in such a manner.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, this concludes the remarks I wanted to make at third-reading stage of Bill C-112, and I venture to hope that the House will pass the Bill today, even if personally I have to express my reservations about the clause in the Bill that allows Commissioners to be appointed for seven years, a new formula not found in the existing Act.

[*English*]

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks at third reading stage in support of Bill C-112. This legislation is long overdue. It has been 17 years since there have been any substantial changes to this Act. The Government is very committed to consulting with the industry, and the amendments before us today are a by-product of that consultative process.

The Canada Grain Act provides a framework for the very important work of the Canadian Grain Commission. It is exceedingly important that we in this House affirm our support for the Canadian Grain Commission because, as I said

earlier today, to a very large degree the integrity of our reputation in international grain markets is directly a result of the activities of the Canadian Grain Commission. We certainly want to reaffirm our commitment to the commission and to the quality of product which it ensures is made available for sale throughout the world by the Canadian Wheat Board. Those high quality standards in the regulation of the grain handling system are an integral part of our entire marketing process. The well-being of Canadian agriculture depends on the success of this committee.

I would like to address briefly the issue of the length of service which Canadian Grain Commission members will provide as a result of these amendments because that is of some concern to Hon. Members in the Opposition. At one time we in this country, as in most other democracies, used to have a civil service which was largely, perhaps even essentially, politicized. One of the reasons for that was the fact that all members of the civil service were appointed at the pleasure of the Minister and, consequently, were subject to dismissal by a Minister at any give time.

Canadian legislators who came before us very wisely decided to reform that system. One of the ways in which they did it was by ensuring that those who had appointments in the Public Service were guaranteed the opportunity to function free of political interference. We moved toward a non-politicized civil service by moving in the direction of permanent appointments. That was an important and necessary direction which was established some time ago.

In my opinion, the proposed amendments which will give assistant grain commissioners and commissioners a specific term of office is a step in that same direction. We are hereby ensuring that those individuals will be free to act irrespective of even the displeasure of their superiors. They will be free to do what is necessary to maintain the integrity of the Canadian grain industry. I believe that these proposed amendments are very much in the continuing tradition of a non-politicized Public Service and I believe they have the good support of the industry throughout the country.

• (1230)

We are striving to make the Canada Grain Act more efficient. These amendments essentially involve two categories: to improve the administration of the Act and to provide for more flexibility in grading and in standards.

The first category of amendments improve the administration of the Canada Grain Act by including amendments that adapt to new grain handling and information processing techniques.

There are also amendments which define the specific terms for those who hold the important offices provided for in the Act.

The second category of amendments provide for more flexibility in developing grades and grade standards. For example, in the future the commission will be able to package and certify specific types of grain according to what buyers want. It is a changing market and something we have discovered is that the grains standards and labelling we have employed in the past are not necessarily totally consistent with what buyers in different parts of the world are seeking today.

We believe that the new flexibility provided for by these amendments will permit us to tap into new markets. That is extremely important in a very competitive international market.

The third category of amendments are those which clarify the financial protection operative of the Canada Grain Act. They were dealt with before in the committee.

The Canadian Grain Commission has helped Canada maintain a very solid reputation as a reliable supplier of high quality grain and grain products. The amendments we are proposing today will make it easier for the commission to operate. We think that is good news for all those who are dependent on the Canadian grain industry.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I believe there is unanimous consent to call it one o'clock?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock this day.

At 12.33 p.m., the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, this morning the National Action Committee on the Status of Women said that the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement is like an iceberg. There is much more

to it than what appears. In other words, this is not just a trade agreement but an agreement which threatens Canadian independence with respect to our resources, our water, our energy, the environment, social policy and regional development.

We in the Liberal Party are not opposed to freer trade, but we are opposed to this agreement. Unfortunately, many Canadians are confused by this complex deal and want time to examine it at greater length. This Bill will change the nature of Canada and make us a quasi colony of the United States. It is for this reason we must have an election before the trade Bill is passed.

Let Canadians decide if they want this deal or not. What is the Government afraid of? Call an election!

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE SENATE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, the Senate is an institution that costs $34 million a year and does not benefit Canada. Rather, it is an obsolete body that must be abolished.

Canadian democracy, as we would like it to be, has no place for this second chamber which intervenes in a partisan way without any mandate to do so.

The Canadian provinces have only one legislative body, made up of elected representatives who have had to go through the democratic process. The political development of the provinces is not endangered by having a unicameral legislature.

If the Liberals continue to intend to use the Senate to block the passage of the Free Trade Agreement and to insist that Canadians vote on this issue in the next election, we too can ask Canadians to speak out for the abolition of the Senate.

* * *

[*English*]

FUR TRAPPING INDUSTRY

CHANGE IN TRAPPING METHODS URGED

Mr. Roland de Corneille (Eglinton—Lawrence): Mr. Speaker, not many Canadians condone the use of the brutal leghold trap in the fur industry. It is obvious the European Community believes that no one should make their living by the inhumane suffering of animals. An animal caught in a leghold trap endures tremendous suffering for a considerable amount of time. It has been documented that animals have chewed off their own legs to escape the pain caused them by these traps.

Alternate trapping devices do exist and they are more humane than the leghold device. A motion passed by this House on July 20 even states that Canada is a world leader in humane trap research. However, while this motion is aimed at maintaining the livelihood of many Canadians, it is really only a stop gap mechanism, falling far short of providing a solution to the controversy.

If the fur industry is to continue, then those involved in it must change their trapping methods forthwith. They must understand that using the leghold trap will always bring about a public outcry and will lead to the elimination of the fur industry's domestic as well as overseas markets, and even an end to the fur industry itself in Canada.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

DESTRUCTION OF PLANET'S RAIN FORESTS

Mr. John Oostrom (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, the destruction of our planet's rain forests will lead to environmental disaster. Scientists have predicted the Amazon Basin which contains the world's largest great rain forest, covering an area the size of Western Europe, will be destroyed by the end of the next decade. Rain forests in other parts of the planet have similar futures. With that destruction there will be a sharp increase in the level of carbon dioxide.

As carbon dioxide levels increase, so does the warming of our planet, which creates the greenhouse effect. Our planet is already experiencing its effects now. The present drought in North America and last year's unpredictable winter in Europe are examples of what we can expect. We in the developing nations must do whatever is necessary to reverse this trend while at the same time providing these nations with assistance so that they have viable economic alternatives.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SHIPYARDS

CONSTRUCTION OF MINESWEEPERS—ANNOUNCEMENT MADE BY MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Government has started to repeat what it did in the 1984 election, namely make promises that it will not keep.

We had the best evidence of that yesterday, when the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Beatty) was in Quebec City to lead the people of the Lauzon, Sorel and Vickers

shipyards to believe that the Government would build 12 minesweepers.

After Quebecers were cheated on the frigates, after the Ministers and Members from the region had promised spinoffs, we see the Minister of National Defence again trying to lull Quebecers.

Mr. Speaker, the people at the shipyards in Lauzon, Sorel and Montreal will not make the same mistake of believing this Government. They want elections so they can beat this Conservative Government.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—POSITION OF LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. Gabriel Desjardins (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, Quebecers will never forgive the Leader of the Liberal Opposition (Mr. Turner) for working hand and glove with the Senate to block the will of Canada's elected representatives. The Francophone press in Quebec has severely criticized the Liberal Leader's strategy. On July 22, Claude Masson wrote in *La Presse* about the undemocratic nature of a decision he qualified as inconceivable and unpardonable. Paul-André Comeau, in an editorial in *Le Devoir* of July 22, under the heading "A desperate wager", asked the following question: "Is the Liberal Leader playing Russian roulette, with bullets in every single chamber?"

Mr. Speaker, this new blunder by the Liberal Leader shows once again that he doesn't understand the people of Quebec. Most Quebecers think the Senate is useless and costs too much money, and they will never have any sympathy for a politician who hides behind the skirts of this institution. In the next federal election, Quebecers will make the Liberal Leader pay a very high price for this underhanded manoeuvre which reveals a lack of the most elementary leadership!

* * *

• (1405)

[*English*]

THE ADMINISTRATION

CRITICISM OF POLICIES

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, I sense cynicism and skepticism off this Hill because of a lack of balance for fair economic policy coupled with fair social policy. Conservative scales of justice are tilted by a market-driven philosophy for its own sake.

Seniors see through the Government's hypocritical language to the fine print realities of living in this Tory land, seniors and middle-income earners who understand they are bearing the brunt of this Tory-vision world.

What an unfair, hidden, tax-ridden destiny, seniors tell me have been foisted on them. Yet the Government thinks Canadians are stupid. After taxing hundreds of dollars from each of our pockets since 1984 it thinks that we are fooled and will say thank you for putting back a few dollars in this month's pay-cheque. We are not deceived.

Does it think us so senile that we cannot remember its attack on fixed incomes through a sneaky attempt at deindexing our pensions, or for even considering a food tax? Shame on the Government for deindexing the tax table, for removing the $1,000 pension investment income deduction, for discriminating in allocations of spousal allowances, for attempting cuts in our New Horizons programs, and particularly for calling its trade deal free when it is a total sell-out of Canada.

There is no integrity out there in Tory-land. Seniors will never trust a Conservative Government again.

* * *

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

INCREASED FEDERAL FUNDING

Mr. Don Ravis (Saskatoon East): Mr. Speaker, the federal Government stands firmly behind the Farm Credit Corporation. That is good news for Canada's farmers.

The $400 million in support announced last week by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) will ensure that the FCC continues to assist the agricultural community. This is a first step toward financial recovery for many Canadian farmers.

To ensure total financial recovery for the FCC, additional funds will be provided as needed over the next three years. The corporation will be able to continue to provide long-term credit to farmers at competitive rates. Farmers with outstanding debt to the FCC will continue to be treated fairly.

Saskatchewan farmers are carrying the largest FCC debt load. This announcement is very good news for the farmers in our province.

* * *

ATLANTIC CANADA OPPORTUNITIES AGENCY

REPORT OF CANADA EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, the tabling of the report by the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council on the employment needs and policies for Newfoundland and Labrador is welcomed.

The Advisory Council's report has supported the recommendations put forward by the New Democratic caucus on the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, and on the need to concentrate on the traditional industries of Newfoundland, such as the fishery, as a source of future employment and prosperity.

On ACOA, the report supports the New Democratic caucus proposals to have board members of the agency include representatives of business, labour, and social organizations, which proposals were rejected by the Government. The council supports the New Democratic Party's proposal that ACOA funding be allocated to Newfoundland on the basis of its economic disparity, rather than to be treated as if its needs were the same as the other maritime provinces. It supports the long-held view of this Party that it is time for Canada to adopt a policy of full employment for our young people based upon the Swedish model.

Newfoundland and Labrador will need 80,000 new jobs between now and 1995 in order to meet their needs. Only 18,000 are ever likely to be created under current policies.

Hibernia is not the answer, and never will be for the unemployed of Newfoundland. New approaches are needed.

I call upon the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mrs. McDougall) to announce immediately that she will implement the proposals and recommendations of this committee so that the unemployed of Newfoundland will have some hope for the future.

* * *

[*Translation*]

• (1410)

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—POSITION OF LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Beauce): By asking the Senate to block the free trade legislation, Mr. Speaker, John Turner has acted irresponsibly. This partisan manoeuvre sets a dangerous precedent. By using their majority of non-elected representatives in the Senate, the Liberals are short-circuiting the parliamentary decision-making process to oppose the will of a majority of Conservative Members, who were elected as a result of the clear desire for change indicated by Canadians in the election of 1984. This was a desperate gesture on the part of the Liberal Leader. According to the polls, most Quebecers and Canadians are in favour of free trade. There are so many benefits—

Conscious of the fact that his Party will go down to defeat, the Liberal Leader has attempted this manoeuvre before the election to dramatize the debate. This goes against the economic interests of Canadians. Formerly, federal Liberals in Quebec were considered as brothers by the provincial Liberals. Subsequently, the climate changed. No longer brothers, they became cousins. But today, federal Liberals in Quebec have definitely become the enemies of the provincial Liberals in that province. By opposing an agreement that would be highly beneficial for Quebec, Mr. Speaker, John Turner's federal Liberals have dug their own grave.

Mr. Speaker, the ones who are being manipulated are the non-elected senators. As Mr. Masson pointed out in *La Presse*: "They are taking part in a highly irregular, outrageous, blasphemous and anti-democratic manoeuvre". Shame on the Senators who let themselves be manipulated!

* * *

[*English*]

RAILWAYS

RAIL SAFETY TASK FORCE REPORT

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Bouchard) has now received a report from the federal Rail Safety Task Force, and as we have learned from one of the task force members who issued a minority report a few weeks ago, the charge was that the task force was biased in favour of the railway lobby and that a plan to relocate rail lines for dangerous goods transportation away from the Metropolitan Toronto area, and other urban centres, to less populated areas, was only recommended for further study based on the question of economics. I beg to differ.

The question of relocating railway lines and slowing down railway speeds should not be settled on the basis of economics but on the safety and viability of communities living along those railway lines. Various neighbourhoods in my own riding of York West are already burdened and frustrated with the noise levels and vibrations and the de-evaluation of their properties because of these railway lines. They do not need another threat of dangerous spills in their community.

I ask the Minister, in preparing a response, to take a lesson from the mishaps that have already occurred and to establish that the fact of safety must be the first, the foremost, and the undisputed priority for this Government to consider.

* * *

PRAIRIE FARM REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

JURISDICTION OVER IRRIGATION PROJECTS

Mr. Geoff Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, the PFRA has for some 50 years developed and managed water reservoirs, irrigation projects and other works in southwestern Saskatchewan. Current PFRA patrons

appreciate the expertise of the PFRA and express their satisfaction with the job that PFRA has done. The patrons are therefore opposed to any transfer of irrigation projects to provincial management under the Saskatchewan Water Corporation.

The Palliser Triangle is a unique area of Canada, a low rainfall area beset by periodic drought, an area wherein water management and conservation are of critical importance. The farm families who utilize the irrigation system appreciate the competence and expertise built up by PFRA over the past six decades. They therefore reject any suggestion of transfer of their projects to the Saskatchewan Water Corporation. They are unanimous in requesting that the federal Government, through the PFRA, continue to operate and manage the District Three southwestern Saskatchewan irrigation projects.

* * *

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

CLOSURE OF STEAM PLANT IN WINNIPEG

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make which I hope will be brought to the attention of the Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp), who is the Government's pointman with respect to the redevelopment of the CNR east yards in Winnipeg. It has to do with the fact that the old CNR steam plant is being closed down and a new steam plant is being built under the auspices of VIA.

The concern is that the employees who now work at the CN steam plant are not being given an opportunity to transfer over to the new plant, to the VIA plant, in the way that many other CNR employees have been given such opportunities over the years, as various jobs have gone from CN to VIA Rail. I would call on the Hon. Member for Provencher to look into this and to see if some justice can be done, if these CNR employees can be treated in the same way as previous CNR employees have been treated when there has been a transfer of jobs to VIA.

* * *

• (1415)

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

RIDEAU RIVER POLLUTION

Mr. Barry Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the Rideau River at Mooney's Bay is a polluted mess. When storm sewers run off into the river—and it is raining today here in Ottawa—the fecal coliform count in the river rises to unacceptable limits and the beach is closed. For all intents and purposes there is no industrial pollution going into the river; it is strictly from domestic animals.

On the weekend I visited the marina at Mooney's Bay with my three children. As we walked around the kids looked at me and said: "Dad, you aren't going to go into that water, are you?" I said: "No, I'm not". They said: "It looks rotten." The youngest, the five-year old, said: "It looks brutal". I told them that I was not going to go in it, but that many people do: boaters do, canoeists do, and water skiers do.

If you are ever out there water-skiing on Mooney's Bay, Mr. Speaker, and you fall in, you may become so polluted that you will have to go to hospital to be injected with something.

The river is a mess. It has to be cleaned up, with co-operation from the federal Government, municipal governments, and particularly the Ministry of the Environment in the Province of Ontario. I pledge myself to the people of Ottawa South to work closely to clean up the river so that we can all enjoy swimming in it.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—WATER RESOURCES

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, last week, Mel Clark, a former GATT negotiator for Canada, and Don Gamble of the Rawson Academy of Aquatic Sciences, informed the committee studying the trade Bill that the proposed federal water Bill would not really stop water exports and diversions because all Acts of Parliament will be overridden by the trade legislation.

In addition, they pointed out that even an amendment to the trade Bill would not protect Canadian water from being exported and diverted to the United States. Clark and Gamble insist that the trade agreement itself must be amended if we want, with certainty, to exclude water from the trade Bill. We in the Liberal Party have also said so.

Evidently, since the trade deal as proposed will not stop water exports and diversions, it is clear that only Canadians will be able to stop the trade deal with their vote in the next election, and hopefully that will be soon.

* * *

CHILD CARE

CRITICISM OF GOVERNMENT PLANS

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, despite Conservative boasts, the child care crisis in our country continues to worsen. The Conservative Government claims to be working for accessible, quality child care, but it has not specified national objectives and standards in its plans. The

funding it advances so grudgingly will not be adequate to the need.

In Thunder Bay the city provides 165 subsidized spaces in its excellent municipal child care centres, but at least 320 children are left out in the cold or in whatever arrangements their desperate parents are able to make.

Canadian children need child care arrangements and a national strategy that meets all the needs with the type of high quality care that they deserve.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—MEDIA RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, the free trade agreement will not affect senior citizens' pensions, medicare, or water, and the agreement can be cancelled by Canada at any time on six months' notice. You know that, Mr. Speaker, I know that, and Liberal Senator van Roggen knows it too. That's why he publicly supports the free trade agreement. Even our Canadian dollar knows it because its value drops every time the Opposition threatens to rip up the agreement.

The Opposition has a duty to criticize and spread fear, if possible, about the free trade agreement and everything else the Government does regardless of the merit of its argument. However, the press and media have a duty not to spread fear but rather to report the free trade agreement and all news in a fair and balanced manner. I hope that they will bear that in mind.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—REQUEST FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister for International Trade. Yesterday the American President sent the final form of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement to the U.S. Congress for ratification. With that particular piece of legislation the United States has gained substantial new powers against Canadian exports. Included within the Bill is a brand new set of procedures to harass Canadian exports. The Government finds itself with a much tougher set of U.S. trade laws now than when it began the negotiations two and a half years ago.

Considering that Canadian exports will now face an additional form of scrutiny and harassment that no other country will face, how can the Government put the Canadian people at such a disadvantage? Would the Minister not agree that it is important now to have an election to allow people to decide, before this country agrees to additional new U.S. trade laws that will provide substantial new protectionism against Canada?

• (1420)

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, that sounds rather peculiar coming from a member of the Liberal caucus. He wants the people to decide. I thought the Senate is to decide, the unelected Senate.

Yesterday the President of the United States delivered to an elected Senate the proposed U.S. legislation. It is not a Senate made up of appointees, 15 of whom were appointed in the last few weeks of the mouldering term of former Prime Minister Trudeau and the few weeks term of then Prime Minister Turner. That is the difference between the two systems.

I notice that Manitoba Liberal Leader Sharon Carstairs says she has some concerns about these tactics. She has reservations about the constitutionality of them. There is some danger of a backlash. She thinks it is an incredible gamble that could be very badly misinterpreted nation-wide. She is exactly right.

With respect to the legislation introduced yesterday, I am glad to report that several of the offensive provisions of the draft legislation have been removed, including—

Ms. Copps: Get the hook!

Mr. Crosbie: Apparently the hon. lady is not interested in listening to what is in the legislation. They are not interested in listening here. They do not want Senators to examine and listen to what is in the legislation. Why would they be concerned about the U.S. legislation?

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, it is very simple. If the Minister is concerned about democratic choice, then why don't you put it to the ultimate test, which is an election? Put it before the people of Canada. That is where the real choice lies.

Mr. Speaker: I know the Hon. Member will want to address the Hon. Minister through the Chair. If we can keep our minds on the rules we will get along just fine.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to address the Minister in kind by simply saying that if he wants an election, call it today, we are ready to go. Don't worry about the Senate.

TERMS OF U.S. LEGISLATION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, the U.S. President and his administration, and now Congress, are bringing in legislation to implement the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. That legislation will include further powers of scrutiny, further powers of monitoring,

further powers of harassment, and further powers of retaliatory action. With all those new trade powers, is it not true that the result of these negotiations has been improved U.S. protectionism against Canada? Under those circumstances let us have an election and let the people decide who is right or wrong.

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the position is that the hon. gentleman's Leader has now shown that it does not matter whom the people of Canada elect to form a Government. It is an unelected Senate, which will have a majority of Liberal Senators until the year 2008 if they all live to be 75, which is going to be making the important decisions for Canada.

For the first time since 1913 a Member of the House of Commons has called on the unelected Senate, the 50 appointees of former Liberal Prime Minister Trudeau, to stop the House of Commons, the elected body, in its tracks.

Where were they when Prime Minister Trudeau got elected opposing wage and price controls and then came into office and put wage and price controls into effect? Where was the Senate then? Where was the Senate when the Auto Pact was introduced in the House? Where was the Senate when GATT was introduced in the House? The Senate is the unelected Government of Canada and the people of Canada are going to have to decide that issue in the next election.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. Minister bursts from an excess of gas, why does he not simply call the election and be relieved of his discomfort and pain? That is the best way of dealing with it.

Mr. Speaker: That, of course, was a question but I would ask the Hon. Member to put his question directly to the Minister.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I suppose you know we will probably never get a straight answer from that Minister.

The U.S. Congress now has a Bill in front of it which it can amend and which includes additional powers to monitor Canadian imports to determine if they have subsidies, and the right to take retaliatory action. It is a Bill that gives United States Congress legislation full superiority over the trade agreement, compared to the fact that our trade Bill puts all our legislation subservient to it. All those measures create major discrimination, discrepancy and disadvantage for Canadians. Under those circumstances, is it not only proper, right and responsible for this Government to call an election and let the Canadian people decide? That is the real democratic choice.

• (1425)

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, what feeble logic. Why does the hon. gentleman not call on President Reagan to call an election? Why did he not call on President Reagan to resign his seat and run again, using the same demented logic that he is using today?

The hon. gentleman has nothing to depend upon but the senatorial lemmings in the Senate. The Leader of the Opposition is now leader of the senatorial lemmings, and he is going to have an election. When the election comes, it will be decided by the Prime Minister in accordance with the Constitution, not by the hidden Government, not by Senators crawling out of their crevices in the Senate and then trying to force elections. The Constitution provides for a democracy here in Canada and that is what we are going to have.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DAY CARE CENTRES

DAY CARE SERVICES—ACCESSIBILITY FOR ALL CHILDREN—MINISTER'S POSITION

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Yesterday the Government tabled its Bill on child care. We looked at the Bill and found that our forebodings about this Bill were correct, namely that access to daycare for all children in Canada is not guaranteed and will depend on the choice the provinces will make. The provinces have a choice between two programs: the CAP which prioritizes lower and middle-income families, and the new legislation tabled yesterday which makes no specific mention of these families. Why didn't the Minister specify these groups in his legislation so that all children in this country would have access to day care?

[*English*]

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I remind the Hon. Member that in all areas of social policy which fall within provincial jurisdiction, former Liberal Governments when they received agreements, whether on health care, on medical care or on the Canada Pension Plan, just to name three, and as recently as the Canada Health Act, attempts were made by the former Minister, my predecessor, to bring in national standards but the Government did not get national standards because of constitutional requirements.

Therefore, the Hon. Member should not think that, just because provinces have jurisdiction in the area of social policy, there will not be standards that will be acceptable to the public or that the provinces are recalcitrant in establishing standards. When the legislation is passed, we will have federal-provincial agreements with the provinces. In each and every case where there is an agreement, it will reflect not only the Bill but also the agreement between the federal and provincial Governments.

I say to the Hon. Member very clearly that if she is asking that standards be imposed by the federal Government, that was done neither by her Government nor by any other Government. They were national objectives—

Ms. Copps: False, false.

Mr. Epp (Provencher): The Hon. Member for Hamilton East is as uninformed on this issue as any other issue on which she has been uninformed.

Mrs. Pépin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Minister that I was discussing accessibility for all Canadian children, and the former Minister of National Health and Welfare got five national standards.

MINIMUM STANDARDS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is addressed to the same Minister. We still have no answer as to what will constitute the minimum standard of care in this so-called child care program. There are no guidelines in the law. There is an obvious abdication of responsibility as to what aspects, if any, of child care will have to meet minimum standards, whether it will be the training of child care workers or merely administrative skills.

• (1430)

How can the Government guarantee these minimum standards without specifying in the law what aspects of child care will have to meet such standards? Will the minimum standards be left entirely to negotiation with the provinces? Is that the Minister's vision of a fair public policy for our children?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is wrong. There are not national standards in the Canada Health Act. There are five objectives. In fact, if she will talk to former Cabinet Ministers in her Party she will learn that the former Minister of Health tried to get standards and was not able constitutionally to do so. Therefore, we are left with the situation of having objectives rather than standards in the Canada Health Act.

Second, we have principles. We have the principles of 200,000 spaces, and a cost-sharing arrangement, as well as the agreements with the provincial Governments.

Finally, the Member says that there should be national standards with respect to training. I point out to her that teachers, lawyers, and pharmacists hold provincial licences. She knows that as does every Member of the House. She is trying to score a political point which does not exist constitutionally in Canada.

We will have agreements with the provinces and I trust that the provinces will want standards which meet public criteria.

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—PLYWOOD EXPORTS

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a question with the Minister for International Trade who last month indicated that he and his Government had protested the plan of the United States to stop plywood exports going into that country despite the terms of the trade deal which had been signed.

The United States administration has now put its Act before Congress and that Act contains precisely that attempt to stop our plywood exports unilaterally.

What does the Minister intend to do in response to this slap in the face to the Canadian people and to himself personally?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, as usual of course, is exaggerating the situation. I did not hear the hon. gentleman announce that he was pleased by the fact that several changes had been made in the U.S. legislation. For example, an obnoxious provision that the Canadian provinces should be looked to for their concurrence with the agreement has been removed. An obnoxious provision which requires that lobsters comply with U.S. size requirements has been removed.

There have been several improvements, but the hon. gentleman always looks on the gloomy side. He cannot see anything good in life at all and I feel sorry for him in that respect.

With regard to the plywood situation, it is an attempt by the Americans to get better access for their plywood in Canada. It is not the other way around. Unfortunately, there has been a disagreement between us as to whether U.S. plywood meets the requirements set by CMHC. CMHC did an evaluation with which the United States is not satisfied. We have set up a panel of experts to test Canadian and U.S. standards to see whether they can come to an agreement on whether U.S. and Canadian standards should or can be the same.

In the meantime the U.S. is proceeding in a way which, in our view, would be a violation of the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement once it goes into effect. If that is the case, when it goes into effect we will proceed either to withdraw concessions or to dispute resolution in connection with that.

Mr. Langdon: So in fact, Mr. Speaker, we will start this great new era of trade relations with the United States with a trade war. What nonsense, what absolute nonsense.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

REQUEST THAT MINISTER PROTEST

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, now is the time to protest. Now is the time to start shouting at Americans, not at Canadians. Now is the time to try to get

some action. What action is the Minister prepared to take now to protest and counter this insult to him and this country?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, imagine the hon. gentleman talking about a trade war. This is the representative of a Party whose Leader, if elected as Prime Minister, is going to go to Washington and tell the President, "I'm down here to tear down the free trade agreement", as compared to the Leader of the Liberal Party who is going down to tear up the agreement.

Following that the President will say to new Prime Minister Broadbent, "Too bad, Mr. Prime Minister, I just tore up the Auto Pact". Then we will see what kind of a trade war there is.

Mr. Broadbent: You've already done it. You've already torn it up.

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, it is Tories who go to Washington to pass messages. Any message we pass would be from Ottawa to the United States.

[*Translation*]

AMERICANS' AMENDMENTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, there are many changes in the U.S. Bill which are not in the free trade agreement. Will this Government proceed with its Bill despite these unilateral changes?

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman talks about changes. What about the New Democratic Party message? Last Wednesday the Leader of the New Democratic Party gave the message that he was saying aye, aye to the Leader of the Liberal Party, that the Senate should be called in in an undemocratic way to stop the free trade legislation which might be passed by a majority in this House.

Then on Friday the message from the Leader of the New Democratic Party was that that would be totally undemocratic, and the New Dinosaur Party is never undemocratic.

Those were two different messages in three days from the Leader of the New Democratic Party, and the hon. gentleman has the gall to criticize the Americans for not being consistent. Go look in the mirror!

* * *

[*Translation*]

ENERGY

QUEBEC—GASOLINE TAXES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister.

An analysis of documents from the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources proves beyond a doubt that Quebec drivers now pay 2.5 cents more per litre of gas, compared with November 1987. The reason is not the increase of 23 cents per gallon, which the Conservatives introduced. It isn't the escalator tax either. It is simply because the multinational oil companies failed to pass on the drop in the price of oil per barrel, which in November was selling for $26.20 and is now selling for $19.57.

My question is: Would the Deputy Prime Minister ask the directors of Petro-Canada to do its Quebec shareholders the courtesy of reducing the price per litre in Quebec by 2.5 cents, so that Quebecers will get a fair deal?

[*English*]

Mr. Jack Shields (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Member for his question but I think he has his facts all wrong.

An Hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Shields: You might listen and learn something.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

• (1440)

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary.

Mr. Shields: The prices that the hon. gentleman is talking about are the very stable gas prices in the Montreal area as compared to the volatile prices that have existed in Toronto and western Canada, where price wars have been going on for the past six or eight months.

If the hon. gentleman would look at it fairly, he would understand that the average does not come out properly because of the price wars in western Canada and the volatility in the Toronto market.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF PETROLEUM COMPANIES

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary does not know what he is talking about. So I will direct my supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

Since all oil companies in Quebec seem to be in agreement not to lower the price of gasoline at the pump, while the price of crude oil has greatly decreased, and since there seems to be collusion among the various oil companies in Quebec to overcharge Quebec drivers 2.5 cents a litre, is the Minister prepared to ask his Department, which is responsible for anti-trust cases, to investigate why Quebecers are unfairly treated?

[*English*]

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, if there is a cartel and the companies are getting together to fix prices, they are committing a criminal offence. I would ask the Hon. Member to pass that

information over to the Director of Investigation Research of my Department who will certainly be interested in seeing that evidence, if the Hon. Member has any.

In the meantime, the Department has a group that monitors petroleum prices. If there is any evidence of collusion, or trying to fix prices, the Director of Investigation Research will certainly take action.

* * *

CHILD CARE

NATIONAL OBJECTIVES—FUNDING CRITERIA

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Unfortunately, the child care Bill that was tabled yesterday is as flawed as the Conservative child care strategy. For example, the Minister will know that the preamble to the Bill mentions the need to improve the availability, affordability, quality, and accessibility of child care services. Yet the Bill does not include these as national objectives.

We agree that standards are a provincial jurisdiction. However, why has the Government refused to establish national objectives for child care in the body of the legislation, with the requirement that the provinces and territories must adhere to these to qualify for federal funding? Is it because your restrictive funding mechanism makes it impossible to meet these objectives?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, no, that is not the case. If the Member looks at Bill C-144, she will find that the objective for availability is to increase subsidized spaces over the next seven years with 200,000 spaces. If she looks at affordability, she will find that the provinces that are spending below the national average and have less revenue than the national average will have more generous funding arrangements under this plan than the Canada Pension Plan or other cost shared arrangements.

When she talks about quality, she will find clearly that the provinces themselves, as well as in the negotiations we are having, want to increase the quality. We can build that into the federal-provincial agreements.

I appreciate her comment about the quality aspect to any arrangement relating to licensing being provincial jurisdiction.

If she looks at accessibility, there is an increase of 100 per cent in subsidized spaces in seven years. That will obviously increase accessibility.

The Government has responded exactly to those principles in the preamble.

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT POSTPONE PASSAGE OF LEGISLATION

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, how can the Minister talk about accessibility when an average of 30,000 new spaces a year that he talks about will not even meet the needs of Metro Toronto, much less the needs of two million working families across Canada? He should know from the research that has been done that the funding for of profit operations will not ensure quality.

Since the Government's child care strategy is destined to fail dismally in meeting Canada's need for child care and, if proceeded with, will set child care back across the country rather than establishing a program of which we can all be proud, will the Government hold back this Bill until after the next election and let Canadians have the final say?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): No, Mr. Speaker. If the Hon. Member looks at the very question she asks, she will know that their policy has been based on 1.4 million children needing day care. That has not been proven. They want a policy that will cost at least $11 billion a year. They want a policy in which parents do not have choice. They want a policy in which they will dictate to the provinces how to run provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. Broadbent: All not true.

Mr. Epp (Provencher): All true. We will pass this legislation and take it to the people. They will then decide.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DELEGATION OF MEMBERS FROM THE GUATEMALA CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker: I wish to draw to the attention of Members the presence in the gallery of a delegation of Members from the Guatemala Congress.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

APARTHEID

TENNIS TOURNAMENT—PARTICIPATION OF WHITE SOUTH AFRICANS

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. It concerns the South African athletes who propose to participate in the Player's Tennis Tournament in my riding in August. In July, 1985, the Conservative Government put out a policy which can only be called racist because it backtracked on the Commonwealth Gleneagles Agreement on sporting contacts with South

Africa, by condoning the participation of South African individuals in sporting events if they were not purporting to represent their country.

The Government knows well that in the real world these athletes do represent their country. Last night it was reported that the Minister of State for Amateur Sports was asking Tennis Canada to ask the athletes to withdraw voluntarily from the tournament. I ask the Government directly to change its 1985 policy and make it clear that South African individuals and teams are not welcome in Canada, and to take steps to ensure that these athletes will not participate in the Player's Tennis Tournament in August.

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I believe the House is well aware of the position of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Prime Minister, and the Government on the system of apartheid in South Africa, and of the many steps we have taken in the last four years to show our abhorrence of that system. They are steps that were not taken by the predecessor Government which we never heard from in that context when it was in power.

With respect to the particular tennis question, our policy on sporting contacts with South Africa accords with the 1977 Gleneagles Agreement between the Commonwealth heads of Government, and the 1982 Code of Conduct adopted by the Commonwealth Games Federation in Brisbane.

In addition, the Secretary of State for External Affairs initiated a review of these policies several weeks ago. That review is under way now. Changes will be made that we are sure will more than suit what is needed in the near future.

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): But if the Government really wants to prevent these South Africans from participating, why does it do so indirectly behind the scenes, as was reported last night? Why not go about it directly? Is the Government at last afraid of South Africa?

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, that question is so jejune, so feeble that it does not require any answer. The Secretary of State for External Affairs was Chairman of the Commonwealth Committee on this subject. The Prime Minister's record at the Commonwealth and other conferences has been outstanding in this area. I am not going to get disturbed or cross at such a weak-kneed suggestion.

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

SIGNING OF AGREEMENTS WITH PROVINCES—MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Gabriel Desjardins (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for the Secretary of State Department and Official Languages. The Minister has just signed agreements to promote official languages with Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island. I would like to ask the Minister if he is prepared to sign similar agreements with other Canadian provinces, like Alberta, Ontario or even Quebec?

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Secretary of State of Canada): Mr. Speaker, we have indeed negotiated and concluded agreements with Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan in an effective and favourable manner, I believe; these agreements will certainly benefit the francophone minorities. We are now negotiating other agreements, in particular a subsidiary agreement on community colleges with New Brunswick and an agreement on health and social services with Quebec. We are also holding discussions with the Government of Alberta. In the next few days, I will meet the Education Minister of that province and I am confident that by using the co-operative, dynamic, open-minded approach we used recently in other cases, we can negotiate an extremely satisfactory agreement with that province to provide real benefits, especially in the field of education, for francophones in that province.

* * *

• (1450)

[*English*]

APARTHEID

SPORTS—CONTACTS WITH SOUTH AFRICAN ATHLETES

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed once again to the Acting Prime Minister. It concerns the selective application of the Gleneagles Agreement by this Government which allows two tennis players to come into the country because they are entrepreneurs, but prevents the provision of a visa to a black South African softball player who is not even here to play softball. Will this Government act, as it has so far failed to act, and implement the Gleneagles Agreement, with a complete ban of all involvement of Canadian athletes, in Canada or outside, with South African athletes, black or white?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, and repetition cannot change the facts, we have adopted and followed the Gleneagles policy. The difference between the tennis players and the other gentleman referred to by the Hon. Member is that one is an official representative and therefore comes clearly under the

policy, while the others are not official representatives of any sports body, nor have they any connection with the South African Government.

We will continue with our vigorous policy of opposition to apartheid in ways that are effective about the world and in the Commonwealth, as I have said just a few minutes ago. The Secretary of State has also initiated a further review of this situation to see what changes might be necessary in the particular regulations as they apply to sports. He is doing this in co-ordination with the Minister of State for Youth.

GLENEAGLES AGREEMENT

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, this vigorous application of the Gleneagles Agreement has led to more South African athletes being admitted into Canada since this Government came to office than previously. The Government continues to apply the policy of the previous Government that allows certain athletes such as tennis players and golfers to come into the country as entrepreneurs, but excludes a South African softball player who came merely as an individual observer and not a representative. I ask the Minister again if this Government will now implement in its policy the entirety of the Gleneagles Agreement and ban access by all South African athletes to this country, as the world demands?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting at sometime if the hon. gentlemen could be factual in their questions. The suggestion in this question is that more South African athletes have been admitted to Canada, presumably to play at their particular sport, in the last four years than in the previous four years.

Mr. McCurdy: Three.

Mr. Crosbie: He wants to narrow it to three. Let's have some facts from the hon. gentleman. I do not think what he alleges to be fact is fact. Our policy is clear. Our policy is in accordance with other Commonwealth countries. The Secretary of State for External Affairs is reviewing it now, and when he has finished his review we will see whether he thinks changes are needed or not.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

ACQUISITION OF ALL-TERRAIN TROOP CARRIERS

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence who has found an excellent election tool in the Department of National Defence.

The Minister and some of his colleagues were really grasping when they dashed out to Calgary last week to announce the building of 820 all-terrain troop carriers at a greatly inflated cost, and the company will not even begin to retool its plant until 1992. Two elections could be over in Canada by that time.

The damning thing about the Government's action was the ignoring of the tendering process on defence contracts in Canada. Why was no other company in Canada given the chance to bid on this contract? Why was a Request for Proposal not sent out to other potential bidders? And, simply, why was there no tender whatsoever on this whole $420 million defence contract? You are not protecting the taxpayers of this country.

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, if the Department of National Defence has become a good election vehicle for the Government, it is because it was ignored for 20 years by the Liberal Government of the time.

What we are doing is keeping a promise that was made to the men and women serving in Canada's Armed Forces to re-equip the Armed Forces of Canada after 20 years of neglect.

The Canadian Forces already have over 100 of these vehicles. These vehicles are used by our allies with whom we would have to be working in Norway. They are used as well by our ally, the United States, in Alaska. No other existing vehicle is for sale in Canada which meets the requirements of the Canadian Forces. If we were to ask that some be designed, we would have to start from scratch at considerably greater cost. That would result in orphaning the existing vehicles which are compatible and interchangeable with allied equipment, and we would drive up the cost to the Canadian taxpayers. If that is what the Hon. Member is suggesting, let him say so directly.

COST OF VEHICLES

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, that is rather odd. Maybe the Minister could explain why he is paying almost triple the cost for the same vehicles he bought between 1984 and 1987? Why the greatly inflated cost if this was all so handy, with no added expenses?

The Minister is going to need vehicles for the militia training centres in Canada. The Government has suggested that it may go sole source for those purchases as well, which means no tendering. When is this Government going to stop ignoring the tendering system and put some integrity and fairness back into the defence purchasing of this country instead of using the same old slogans? The Minister stands up on his feet and uses his rhetoric instead of telling the taxpayers of Canada why their money is not being well spent under the tendering system for defence projects.

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, do I understand correctly that it is the position of the Liberal Party of Canada that we should break this agreement with Canadian Foremost Ltd. of Calgary and say that the contracts should be given to somebody else? If that is the

position of the Liberal Party, let it say so honestly and directly to the people of western Canada.

The Hon. Member is incorrect when he suggests there has been a tripling of the costs of these vehicles. The average cost of the vehicles purchased by the Department of National Defence was $140,000 in 1984 dollars. The vehicles we are contracting for now in 1988-89 dollars are about $170,000 a piece. The difference is the difference in the exchange rates and the inflation during that period.

This is a very good deal for the taxpayers of Canada. It is exceptionally good for the militia of Canada who have been neglected for so long and will finally be getting the equipment they need to do their job of serving the people of Canada.

* * *

NATIONAL PAROLE BOARD

APPOINTMENT OF MINISTER'S FORMER EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. Since 1984 the Conservative Government has been packing the National Parole Board with faithful Tory supporters, including former Tory MPs and former constituency assistants to Tory MPs. Now, however, the ultimate has happened. The Solicitor General has appointed his own executive assistant, Nancy Stableforth, to the board.

How can the Minister possibly justify this blatant pork-barrelling appointment of his own executive assistant to the National Parole Board?

Hon. James Kelleher (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, one of the things this Government has been trying to do since it came to power is to raise the quality of the appointments.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Kelleher: I notice there is no criticism of the qualifications of this particular individual who had a very distinguished career as a lawyer in private practice. She has served the Public Service well, and I do not think a person should be disqualified for having worked for this particular Minister.

• (1500)

REQUEST THAT APPOINTMENT BE RESCINDED

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are becoming—

Mr. McDermid: Whom would you appoint?

Mr. Crosbie: What about Stephen, your little buddy? He was okay. What about the other guy who went to Ireland? He was all right. What was his name?

Mr. Mazankowski: Dennis McDermott.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Burnaby has the floor.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that they are a little sensitive over there about this appointment.

Canadians are becoming increasingly fed up with the failure of our parole system and with the National Parole Board in particular. Given the appalling record of Tory patronage appointments to the Board and the public's loss of confidence in the parole system, will the Minister rescind immediately the appointment of his former executive assistant and faithful supporter, Nancy Stableforth, and bring in a new appointment process for the Parole Board, one that operates on the basis of merit and ability, not on faithful service to the Conservative Party of Canada?

Hon. James Kelleher (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I think that this Government has an excellent record of appointing people from all political Parties and all sectors of the Government as well as the private sector. If the Hon. Member has some problem or question with respect to the qualifications of this individual, instead of smearing people such as this in public he should come forward to tell me what is wrong with the qualifications of this particular person.

Mr. Riis: Absolutely no experience!

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, when I speak to senior citizens in my riding they ask me if the free trade agreement is going to affect their pensions, whether it will affect their medicare, and whether it will affect our water.

Some Hon. Members: Yes!

Mr. Redway: I tell them absolutely not.

Mr. Harris: Is this a question?

Ms. Copps: What are you asking a question for if you already know the answer?

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member will put his question, please.

Mr. Redway: Mr. Speaker, I was pleased today to hear that Liberal Senator van Roggen agrees with me. When the senior citizens in my riding pick up a Toronto newspaper day after day they see that all of these things are going to be wiped out.

I want to ask the Minister for International Trade—

Mr. Riis: He hasn't read it yet.

Mr. Redway: —whether Senator van Roggen and I have this all wrong. Who is right, Mr. Minister?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Cochrane—Superior.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: When am I going to be allowed to answer?

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Cochrane—Superior.

Mr. Axworthy: That's the best answer you've given all day, John.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member for Cochrane—Superior.

* * *

ABORIGINAL RIGHTS

DENE AND MÉTIS LAND CLAIM

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane—Superior): Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand yesterday's edition of *Hansard*. In reply to a question I posed regarding the status of the Dene and Métis land claims in the Northwest Territories the Acting Prime Minister said as follows:

> There are a couple of outstanding items still. These are being negotiated . . . and those negotiations and discussions are continuing.

That is encouraging and reassuring news. I want to ask the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development if he could clarify the nature of those continuing negotiations. Can he tell the House what steps he is taking to ensure that progress will continue?

Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification): Mr. Speaker, the reply by the Acting Prime Minister yesterday is accurate. There are, as the Hon. Member knows, opportunities for clarification of the Dene-Métis claim. There was a negotiation which led to a negotiated AIP which should be signed.

The opportunity for clarification can be discussed and is being discussed by the Dene-Métis with officials. But I am prepared to sign the agreement in principle that was negotiated. I think that is something that is known to the Dene-Métis leadership. The clarification that may be necessary can be explained and explored by the officials, as it is being done now.

REQUEST THAT MINISTER MEET REPRESENTATIVES OF CLAIMANTS

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane—Superior): Mr. Speaker, the Dene and the Métis have accepted 90 per cent of the proposed agreement. On the remaining outstanding items on which there is a difference of opinion they have asked for a meeting with the Minister in order to explore all possible options, leading to a possible settlement of this important claim.

Is the Minister prepared to meet with the Dene-Métis? When will that meeting take place? Will he keep the door open so that those remaining items can in fact be settled in a way that is just and equitable for the Dene and the Métis of the Northwest Territories?

Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification): Mr. Speaker, the agreement in principle that was negotiated is just and fair to the Dene-Métis. It is just and fair to the Government and people of Canada. It is a just and fair agreement in principle.

The agreement in principle that has been negotiated is there. I am prepared to sign that negotiated agreement in principle.

If there is clarification that may be needed as to certain points, as I said before that clarification can be explored and examined by the Dene-Métis with officials prepared to clarify it for them at any time.

There have been negotiations which led to an agreement in principle. That agreement in principle was a negotiated, fair and just agreement in principle. I am prepared to sign that agreement in principle.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

CORRECTION TO STATEMENT

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to make a brief correction to the record.

A few minutes ago I had a question with regard to costs of the BB 206. I indicated that the simplest vehicle, which was the cargo variant of the BB 206, cost Canadians $140,000 in 1984. I was incorrect in the second figure I gave. The announced program costs allow for $175,000, not $170,000, in 1988-89 dollars for the same vehicle. Other variants, obviously, would cost different costs. But the difference is the difference in inflation and exchange rates.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

DISPOSITION OF RESOLUTION ON ABORTION

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions

among the Parties. I believe Your Honour would find agreement with the following consent order. I would say that some people have copies of this consent order since it was widely distributed. However, there is a change from what is in front of everybody which takes place in Clause 8.

I move:

That, notwithstanding the Standing Orders and usual practices of the House, the following procedures be in order with respect to proceedings on Government Business No. 36 (Motion respecting abortion):

1. Any Member may give notice of an amendment to the main motion by filing such notice with the Clerk no later than 6 p.m. on Wednesday, July 27, 1988;

2. The Speaker, in a manner similar to the practice at the report stage of Bills, will have power to select, group and determine the voting procedure for all such amendments, with his statement and ruling on such selection, grouping and voting (consistent with Part (8) of this Order) to be made to the House when the debate is first resumed on the main motion on Thursday, July 28, 1988;

3. No amendment or sub-amendment to the main motion will be receivable or in order during debate on government business No. 36 except as provided for in parts (1) and (2) of this order;

4. Debate on the main motion will be, following adoption of this order, the only order of business for the House today, until any Member present and wishing to speak in debate has spoken, after which time but no later than 6.00 a.m. Wednesday, July 27, 1988, the Speaker shall adjourn the debate and the House until 2.00 p.m. on Wednesday, July 27, 1988;

5. The provision of part (4) of this order shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, on Wednesday, July 27, 1988, at the end of which sitting the Speaker shall adjourn the debate and the House until 11 a.m., Thursday, July 28, 1988.

6. No Member who has spoken in debate on the main motion before the Speaker's statement and ruling (as per part (2) of this order) may speak again subsequently in debate;

7. Quorum may not be called during debate on government business No. 36, and no 10-minute periods of questions and comments will be provided for;

This clause is changed somewhat. It reads:

8. On Thursday, July 28, 1988, following the Speaker's statement and ruling, (pursuant to part (2) of this order), the House will suspend its sitting for one hour, when the Speaker shall put all questions necessary to dispose of every amendment selected according to the groupings and voting procedures set out in the Speaker's statement and ruling, and to dispose of the main motion, following which the House shall stand adjourned until 2.00 p.m. on Wednesday, August 10, 1988.

Provided

(a) That, if necessary, at the request of the Government, Mr. Speaker shall fix a time for the purpose of the giving of Royal Assent to any Bills that have not been given Royal Assent;

(b) That after the giving of Royal Assent to any such Bills, the House shall stand adjourned to the time and day stated in this order;

(c) That during any such adjournment of the House, the provisions of Standing Orders 5 and 68(3) and (4) shall apply; and

That when the House returns on Wednesday, August 10, 1988, or at an earlier date, except for the giving of Royal Assent, as the case may be, the provisions of the order of the House adopted on Monday, June 20, 1988, shall apply.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the order. Is the House in agreement?

• (1510)

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the order accepted.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ABORTION

PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Supreme Court of Canada having declared that the provisions of the Criminal Code relating to abortion are inconsistent with the provisions of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and are therefore of no force or effect, the government should prepare and introduce legislation, consistent with the Constitution of Canada, including the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which reflects the fundamental value and inherent dignity of each human being and the inherent worth of human life, and which achieves a balance between the right of a woman to liberty and security of her person and the responsibility of society to protect the unborn; and

Such legislation should prohibit the performance of an abortion, subject to the following exceptions:

When, during the earlier stages of pregnancy: a qualified medical practitioner is of the opinion that the continuation of the pregnancy of a woman would, or would be likely to, threaten her physical or mental well-being; when the woman in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner decides to terminate her pregnancy; and when the termination is performed by a qualified medical practitioner; and

When, during the subsequent stages of pregnancy: the termination of the pregnancy satisfies further conditions, including a condition that after a certain point in time, the termination would only be permitted where, in the opinion of two qualified medical practitioners, the continuation of the pregnancy would, or would be likely to, endanger the woman's life or seriously endanger her health.

Mr. Speaker: Before commencing debate, and I will recognize the Hon. Minister of State (Mr. Lewis) in a moment, I believe that it is appropriate for the Chair to make the following comments. First, I want to reiterate that I have not only listened very carefully to the motion, but have given it as much careful consideration as I can in the few minutes available to me. I also want to say that the motion has been adopted by the House by consent.

As your humble servant, I am charged with doing everything that I can to make sure that the consent of the House is adhered to. However, I do point out that it is an unusual order, and I know that all Hon. Members, on the government side, in the Official Opposition, and in the New Democratic Party, will co-operate with the Speaker if, during the process of this debate I may have to call upon the House Leaders, at least under some circumstances, possibly to give the Chair some further guidance. I am quite sure that, in view of the consent that we have received in the House, the Speaker will be able to take us through this debate. If I need some help, I will be very quick to call for it.

We are now entering debate. I recognize the Hon. Minister of State.

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, I want to start off my remarks by thanking my colleagues opposite for their co-operation in coming up with the consent order which was just passed by the House. I believe that it will facilitate debate without restricting debate or the ability of Members to either put their comments on the record or vote as they wish. I am sure that all Members will co-operate with the spirit of the order, and if there are any glitches as we go along, they can be worked out.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and the privilege of tabling a motion that will open the debate in Parliament on a most sensitive issue, namely abortion.

In recent years, many Private Members' Bills and motions have dwelt on this important topic, and there was also a great deal of discussion during the hearings on the Constitution and the debate on the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1981 and 1982. These discussions took place at a time when abortion in Canada was still subject to Section 251 of the Criminal Code.

Section 251 prescribed the conditions under which abortion could be practised. This section had been in effect since 1969.

[*English*]

On January 28, 1988, the Supreme Court of Canada struck down Section 251 of the Criminal Code on the basis that it offended the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Actually, this decision left a void in terms of the law of our land with respect to abortion. Some will argue that there should be no more requirement than the fact that the abortion be performed by a qualified medical practitioner. Others will argue that abortion should be restricted by law, and that is what this debate is all about. Abortion is a sensitive, moral issue which touches every one of us deeply. Viewpoints on the issue cut across social, economic, cultural, religious and political backgrounds. For that reason, we decided that we would take a sense of the House before we drafted legislation.

• (1520)

Furthermore, we decided that government Members would be free to vote as they wish. I will expand on that comment later. I want to deal, if I may, with the sense of the House. Our Government has many achievements to its credit, and two of them should be mentioned within the context of this debate. First of all, it is a willingness to tackle tough issues and, secondly, it is a dedication to parliamentary reform. By engaging in this debate, we are demonstrating our commitment to both.

An Hon. Member: You have no guts.

Mr. Lewis: Abortion is an issue which deserves to be debated in Parliament prior to the legislation being passed. Members should have the right to put their views on the record, for themselves, for their constituents, and as part of the input to provide it to the Cabinet and to the legislative drafters.

True parliamentary reform means that when issues such as abortion are raised, Governments recognize the value and input of every Member. Normally, that takes place within a caucus, from a government caucus to Cabinet. In this case, because of the nature of the subject, we are giving all Members of the House an opportunity for that input.

There are very, very few issues which have the depth and scope of the abortion issue and can therefore demand that attention. I submit that that is a further demonstration of our Government's commitment to parliamentary reform.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: There are those who argue that we should present a Bill. That argument is there to be made, and I am sure that it will be made during the course of this debate.

We decided instead to take the sense of the House rather than proceeding immediately with legislation.

[*Translation*]

Initially, we tabled a motion overruling certain rules of debate and providing for a vote in the House on a motion with two amendments which reflected the tenets both of pro-choice and the moderate pro-life movement.

The Government caucus reached a consensus on this motion.

The motion was then transmitted to the Leaders of the Opposition in the House for presentation to their respective caucuses.

The motion was rejected by the Liberal caucus and the New Democratic Party caucus, without amendments being proposed.

[*English*]

Nevertheless, we placed our motion on the Order Paper for public scrutiny on May 25, 1988. We were pleased with the general reaction to our efforts. The public and the media recognized that we were dealing with a complex and sensitive moral issue. The motion rested on the Order Paper for some time, and we announced our intention to debate the procedural acceptability of the motion on Monday, July 11.

Over that preceding weekend I had an opportunity to review, in detail, the arguments of the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) and the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), which they made on May 25, 1988. I respect the views of those gentlemen. They have both been Members of Parliament for a long time, and it behooved me to pay attention to what they said. They argued that the motion that was on the Order Paper was faulty on a procedural basis: (a)

because it restricted debate; (b) because it did not provide for amendments; and, (c) because it placed a multiplicity of questions before the House at one time. I was convinced that we could meet the first two arguments: (a) the motion could be amended; and, (b) we were providing more time for debate than is normally allowed on a Bill, because Members are only allowed a 20-minute speech during the first eight hours of debate on a Bill.

I did agree, after much reflection, that a procedural point could be made for the case that the House should not be presented with a multiplicity of questions without the unanimous consent of the House. If the opposition Parties had agreed on consent, there would have been no problem. However, in the absence of consent, which it was in their right to withhold, there was a problem.

We did not want a sensitive, moral and religious issue debated after an acrimonious procedural debate. We felt that we should be debating the issue and not the procedure. That is the reason that I decided not to proceed on Monday, July 11, 1988. It was not the happiest day of my life and it is not the happiest decision that I had to make, but that is the decision that was made and that is why it was made. So we regrouped and decided to go with this present motion.

The preamble refers to the Supreme Court decision and suggests that the Government should prepare and introduce legislation consistent with the Constitution of Canada, including the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which reflects the fundamental value and inherent dignity of each human being, and the inherent worth of human life, and which achieves a balance between the right of a woman to liberty and security of her person, and the responsibility of society to protect the unborn.

The scope of the legislation proposed by the motion is—

[*Translation*]

Such legislation should prohibit the performance of an abortion, subject to the following exceptions:

When, during the earlier stages of pregnancy: a qualified medical practitioner is of the opinion that the continuation of the pregnancy of a woman would, or would be likely to, threaten her physical or mental well-being; when the woman in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner decides to terminate her pregnancy; and when the termination is performed by a qualified medical practitioner; and when, during the subsequent stages of pregnancy: the termination of the pregnancy satisfies further conditions, including a condition that after a certain point in time, the termination would only be permitted where, in the opinion of two qualified medical practitioners, the continuation of the pregnancy would, or would be likely to, endanger the woman's life or seriously endanger her health.

[*English*]

I understand that there was some discussion, after this motion was put on the Order Paper, by the opposition Parties. I think it was helpful. I had some other remarks, but in view of the consent order I am not going to pursue them at this time. I would say that I understand that the motion has been criticized by both the leaders of the pro-choice side and the pro-life side. If that is the case, we have achieved our purpose, because we sought to favour neither side but to present a motion which could be the basis for debate. If both sides find fault, we have done our job. We did not seek to favour either side. We sought to frame a debate on an important issue. We sought a sense of the House.

The House will know, the public will know, that we have made certain changes to the normal rules. They are made on consent, and the debate will go forward in accordance with those rules.

I want to return to one point, if I may, and that is to point out that by moving by way of a motion we do provide every Member of the House with an opportunity to spend 20 minutes putting his or her view on the record. If we had proceeded by way of a Bill, only those Members speaking during the first eight hours of debate would have had the opportunity for a 20-minute speech.

I suggest that we have expanded the opportunity for debate.

An Hon. Member: We could have consented to more time.

Mr. Lewis: I want to deal with the tone of debate. The Members will know that a little over a year ago this House debated the controversial issue of capital punishment. At that time we suggested that each Member owed to society and to this House to debate that issue on as high a level as possible. That was not thought possible, and in fact some Members ridiculed the possibility. I suggest to you that the capital punishment debate was carried out without excessive acrimony and division, and I would suggest that the same guidelines apply to this debate. We owe it to each other, we owe it to the issue and we owe it to our constituents, to be both passionate and dispassionate in this debate—passionate as we present our point of view and dispassionate as we consider the viewpoints of others.

The time frame is set. We will extend hours to allow Members to speak, both tonight and tomorrow night. So the debate is set. I want to speak briefly, if I may, to the question of a free vote. Members on the government side will be free to vote as they wish on the motion and any amendments or subamendments. I think this is an issue, as was capital punishment, which demands or dictates a free vote. As I said before, it is a highly sensitive issue, a moral issue, a religious issue, and cuts across Party lines. Therefore, it is the essence of parliamentary reform when we say that we believe Members should be free to voice their own opinion as they speak and to vote as they wish on this issue.

• (1530)

In conclusion, I regret that my role in this debate does not permit me to speak to the issue, because I have very deeply

held convictions. However, in the final analysis, I am proud that we as a House of elected representatives are to debate this difficult issue at the end of a long session. I say to you that I am sure the House and its Members will be equal to the task.

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, in opening my remarks for the Official Opposition, I want to indicate right at the outset that we have decided that for our Party this will also be regarded as a free vote. It was an option that we had reserved in the expectation that the Government might propose a very one-sided, extreme motion which we would want to deal with as a Party. One cannot characterize the motion before us as extreme other than to say that it is extremely vague, to the point of being meaningless.

I have something to say about that but I want, first, to respond to the Minister's lecture on procedure. I think Canadians ought to note that absolutely nothing was said by the Minister on the subject of abortion.

[*Translation*]

All we had was a lecture on procedure. Personally, my conclusion is that no resolution will be forthcoming as a result of the motion that is before the House for the rest of this week. I expect, despite the efforts of individual Members of the House to get a consensus one way or another, that a resolution, with or without amendments, will be rejected by a majority of the House. And I want to point out that the Government is to blame for this procedure.

If the Government had tabled a Bill, we could have come out of this with some kind of legislation.

[*English*]

I think the failure of the Government to show leadership on what Members opposite delight in characterizing as a fundamental issue, an important moral issue, is going to result in a failure to have legislation. While Members opposite may want to go into the election, as the Minister said, saying, "We have tackled the tough issues", and that was his expression, I ask Canadians to notice, and I am making a prediction here, that there will be no result of this debate. There will be no legislation. The Government will have produced an abortion environment by default. We will have no legislation governing abortion at all.

While Members opposite will want to blame anyone but themselves, the fault for such a result is their own. They are taking sides in this debate by failing to show leadership, by failing to bring forward legislation.

Nearly six months ago, on January 28, the Supreme Court of Canada determined that Section 251 of the Criminal Code which regulated abortion in Canada violated the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. They struck Section 251 down. In so doing, they invalidated a law which had been on the statute books of our country for nearly 20 years. The law was introduced by the man who is the Leader of our Party in the House of Commons, the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Turner). That invalidated law, when it was introduced, was regarded as a better social alternative to the then existing situation.

I want to talk for a moment about that situation because it may be relevant again. There are Members who are proposing that we move to a situation in which virtually all abortions are illegal. What I would like to say to those Members is that this is not a new alternative. I invite them to look back at the situation that existed before the important reform introduced in 1969 by the man who is now the Leader of the Official Opposition in the House of Commons. That provision, and ironically it is still in the Criminal Code although of course it was amended in 1969, provides simply that everyone who, with intent to procure the miscarriage of a female person, and I am summarizing here, or who uses any means for the purpose of carrying out his intention, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for life. That is the law that was replaced by Section 251.

I think there are a lot of us here, and a lot of Canadians across the country, who will remember why the reform was important and what we achieved by that reform. There are those of us who will remember the humiliation and danger that Canadian women were subject to under the legislative regime that existed until 1969 when the attempt to obtain any abortion was a criminal act. Low standards of health, poor medical facilities and unqualified practitioners were the order of the day for women who were driven by circumstances to decide for themselves that an abortion was required.

For the last 20 years I think we have been relatively well served by the law that was introduced in 1969. I recall this because I know it is fashionable to criticize Section 251, and I wanted to remind Hon Members that that law, when it was brought in, was a great humanitarian reform and was much appreciated. It was supported by the majority of the House, by Members from all Parties, made a lot of sense, and on top of that, it worked. When it was discredited and rejected by the Supreme Court of Canada, it was on the basis of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

I am going to talk about that in a moment, but it could have been rejected on another very important ground. It could have been rejected because, after 20 years of living with it, it no longer was working. I know there are those who say, let's bring back Section 251. After all, the Leader of the Official Opposition brought it forward and it worked. It worked for a time but it stopped working several years ago. It stopped working in some important respects of which I want to remind Members now, although I think perhaps all Members are aware of them.

In the first place, the statute relied on the following expression of the criterion, that the pregnancy or the continuation of the pregnancy should be, and I quote, "likely to endanger the life or health of the woman". No expression in the Criminal Code got kicked around more than the expression "likely to endanger life or health". In every hospital and in every doctor's office in our country it had a different meaning.

You cannot have criminal law that depends on a statute that imposes a penalty and has a definition that is that vague. As I say, it worked at the beginning, but on that count alone, Section 251 needed to be replaced.

• (1540)

There was another problem with Section 251, and that was that even when an abortion was authorized or would have been authorized, in many parts of Canada there was no procedure for a woman to have a lawful abortion pursuant to Section 251 of the Criminal Code. Whole provinces had excused themselves from the application of Section 251. That is unacceptable in a country as broad and wide as Canada with its diverse regions. If the Criminal Code is to be respected, if women are to be put through a procedure and come out entitled to an abortion, that service has to be available. Otherwise, there is no point in saying that there is a law on the books with which we should try to comply.

My third observation about Section 251 is that when an abortion was not justified and when an abortionist who performed an abortion was charged with a violation of Section 251, juries in various parts of Canada would not convict. There were cases of judges in effect telling the juries that they had no alternative but to convict the abortionists for the offences that had been proven beyond a reasonable doubt before the courts, and the juries refused to convict. That is obviously another important shortcoming in the legislation.

We already know about the pre-1969 situation, a tough criminalization of all abortions. We also know about the problems of living with Section 251, whether or not we had a Canadian Charter of Rights. It is time for us as a Parliament to deal with the issue. The Supreme Court of Canada, in the case that went before it, provided us with the opportunity that was needed to deal with the question of abortion under the law of Canada.

I would like to turn now to the resolution introduced by a Government which is determined to get the credit for tackling the tough issues of our day. The Supreme Court of Canada made its judgment on January 28. On January 29, my Leader was up on his feet in this place making four points. In particular, he demanded that the Government act with urgency to take up the challenge the Supreme Court of Canada had put by introducing legislation which would be valid.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn), who has not had the courage to speak in this debate and who, to my astonishment, was not the first speaker for the Government, rose on January 29 to say that we have responsibilities. I do not want to read the whole tortured paragraph, but he concluded by saying that we will be dealing with this matter on an urgent basis.

For six months we have had nothing of substance from the Government on the commitment that was made by the Minister of Justice the day after the Supreme Court made its decision. We still do not have anything from this Government in the way of leadership or in the way of legislation. The Government is revelling in its decision not to take a position on this important issue.

I would like to deal with one particular government commitment on the subject. On January 29, my Leader was persistent. He wanted to be certain that the Government would not throw out the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms by introducing an abortion law validated by a notwithstanding clause under the Constitution, making it apply in spite of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. He said:

> Can I have a guarantee from the Minister of Justice that his Government will rule out using the *non obstante* clause to get around the Supreme Court of Canada decision?

What did the Minister of Justice say in answer on the same day? He said:

> What I can tell the right hon. gentleman is that I do not contemplate the use of the *non obstante* clause on the part of the Government with respect to this issue.

A funny thing happened in the last six months. Even from that very minimal commitment, the Government has backed away. The resolution brought before us does require a *non obstante* clause in order to be translated into legislation, at least that is the way it appears to me. I will show how it does in a moment. The Government has indicated that there are no holds barred on the debate, so that this commitment made on January 29 is thrown out of the window.

I would like to turn now to the resolution. The resolution divides a pregnancy into two periods. In the latter period, the consent and authorization of two doctors is required, and I will talk about that later. During the earlier stage of pregnancy, it is provided in the Government's resolution that a qualified medical practitioner must be of the opinion that the continuation of the pregnancy of a woman would or would be likely to threaten her physical or mental well-being. In other words, if a woman wants an abortion, according to this resolution she still has to have a doctor agree that a continuation of the pregnancy would or would likely threaten her physical or mental well-being. That is precondition on her right to an abortion as defined by the Supreme Court of Canada. I think the only way that condition can be imposed is by having the Government propose to violate what the Minister of Justice said on January 29 by introducing a notwithstanding clause.

I will turn now to the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada. The judgment of Madam Justice Bertha Wilson quotes the judgment of the Chief Justice which was concurred in by Mr. Justice Lamer. Three of the members of the Supreme Court of Canada, a majority of those who made the decision, are of the view that legislation would be invalid and would violate the Charter which based its decision on "criteria entirely unrelated to the pregnant woman's priorities and aspirations". That was a portion of the Chief Justice's judgment which was quoted with approval by Madam Justice Bertha Wilson. This means that the woman herself decides. Madam Justice Bertha Wilson went to on to say that Section

251 violates a woman's right to liberty by deciding for her something that she has the right to decide for herself.

What have we gotten from the Government? I understand that this resolution has been put forward as a middle position. A pro-life position would lie to one side and a pro-choice position would lie to the other. However, this resolution in itself can only be translated into legislation if a notwithstanding clause is introduced. That makes this resolution unacceptable to those of us who agreed with the Minister of Justice six months ago when he said that it was important that we not put aside the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms for the sake of this abortion issue.

I have other difficulties with the resolution as well.

An Hon. Member: What would you suggest?

Mr. Kaplan: I will make a suggestion. The first thing I would suggest is that if we want to put forward a middle position which I personally would support, it would be a position in which a woman's rights as enunciated by the Supreme Court of Canada are recognized in the early period of a pregnancy and the rights of the foetus are given recognition in balance with the woman's rights in the later portion of a pregnancy. That should be put forward in a resolution that purports to be in the middle of the two extremes.

• (1550)

The Minister rejoiced and claimed credit for having brought forward a resolution that both the pro-life and pro-choice people, as he put it, rejected. I have news for him. He has a resolution which not only the two extremes but the people in the middle as well reject because it does not respect the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms as interpreted by the highest court of the land, the Supreme Court of Canada, in its decision.

The resolution has many other problems, and I want to go over some of them. I mentioned earlier the difficulty with the expression "life and health" under Section 251. This resolution has the same difficult expressions. It talks about the physical or mental well-being of a woman. What is meant by that? What type of precision will be attached to that? Later it talks about the woman's life or health, again the same words that appear in the discredited Section 251. What is that supposed to mean? I submit that the Government owes the Canadian people and this Parliament more than a resolution as ambiguous, difficult, and self-contradictory as that.

I predict, as I said a moment ago, that there will be a lot of conflicting amendments. We wish the Speaker well in trying to put them in order and will co-operate with him. More will be rejected than will be accepted. I predict, although it is not my intention, that the resolution will be defeated. I am hoping that there will be some kind of resolution for which I can vote. It will be up to the Government to bring in legislation.

We are now in the fourth year of the mandate of a very discredited Government and it will be very difficult for the Government to bring forward legislation which will be taken seriously and addressed by this House. However, from what the Government has said about the subject of abortion and about this resolution I predict that nothing will be done.

I am very critical of a government decision and an undoubted government policy which will lead to having no abortion law in effect in Canada at all. Public opinion will be extremely polarized, and in the coming election, abortion, which is not a partisan issue, may, in the result, have far more attention than some of the other issues in which there is a partisan aspect involved and on which it is very important that Canadians speak and express themselves in choosing the next government.

I will not be introducing any amendments myself. I have indicated the areas with which I am dissatisfied, but I do not want to add to the very low credibility of this resolution by suggesting that merely amending it will make it okay.

I want to talk for a moment about the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Sometimes people think of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which, after all, is only six or seven years old, as a fringe or frill produced by a country which lived for 100 years without it. It is thought of as sort of a fringe benefit of having been here and having been governed by the rule of law for such a long time.

I want to emphasize how important I think the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms is, particularly in the context of a country which has evolved tremendously over the last 100 years and has become far more complex than anyone might have realized in the mix we have achieved. The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, in its short life, is becoming a road map for how Canadian society is going to hold together, how a multicultural, pluralistic society with very diverse values is going to be able to survive and become ever stronger.

It is a trite observation that a multicultural and pluralistic society presents to the Canadian people a variety of customs and values. It is a part of Canadian political life to recognize this essential fabric of Canada and, indeed, to celebrate our variety and diversity. It is enriching to experience variety in life. Very often in the great variety of Canadian life differing values fit together and we tend to enjoy and celebrate the fact that within our great diversity there is a tremendous amount of positive similarity and compatibility. We do this by noting that in all the human societies and cultures which make up Canada there are basic shared values, even in our variety.

From the point of view of the members of any particular cultural group there is a great deal of satisfaction in bringing their values into the larger Canadian society. We have watched multiculturalism as a policy evolve. We encouraged groups to express and develop within their groups, their cultures and their values and have moved to the point where the greatest pleasure of a minority cultural community in our country comes from presenting its values to the whole of Canadian society and seeing the values of the group resonating, finding favour, being understood, and being appreciated by fellow Canadians.

More and more we try to develop opportunities for taking the values of particular groups to the larger Canadian community. We think of each of these efforts as a contribution by a cultural community to Canada as a whole. This applies to a food which a cultural community brings into Canada which Canadians enjoy and buy, as well as to a moral precept which comes from a community such as respect for plant life and animal life, greater respect for the aged, methods of raising children, or different ideas for relationships between spouses. These are all enriching Canada, and individual communities enjoy bringing these ideas forward and sharing them.

I do not think I trivialize the debate by putting this as the context within which I want to talk about the very fundamental values on which our ideas about life, death, and abortion are based. I think I am justified in talking about those important values in the same context as the pluralistic other values that exist in the diverse Canadian society.

Abortion is one of the fundamental issues that exist in the diverse Canadian society. Abortion is one of the fundamental issues that relates to the meaning and value of human life. Merely saying this does not make it clear how the criminal law should treat it.

Some religions offer a categorical approach. The Catholic view, as I understand it, is that life begins at the moment of conception and that abortions are morally wrong and should not be condoned. I can say, as a Canadian of the Jewish faith, that that is also the view of orthodox Judaism.

It is the moral responsibility of believers in these religions to carry their message, not only to members of their community but to members of the world. If we have a way in our community, whether Catholic, Jewish or whatever, of looking at the world, it is part of an understanding of Canadian life and also a religious commitment to bring that value forward, to explain it to people, to try to earn respect for it, to try to have our ideas and values adopted and spread.

It is the moral responsibility of believers to carry their message to the world. However, if this debate on abortion, which has been raging for six months and even longer, shows anything it is that that view of abortion is not a consensus view. It is a view held by many Canadians, but not a view totally shared across Canadian society. That reminds us of all the views of Canadian communities which are not always compatible. Conflicts develop among values. While we prefer in Canada to emphasize the positive, we must also deal with the fact of values in our society which are not compatible.

• (1600)

I want to suggest in all seriousness that it does not strengthen a pluralistic society to entrench or enshrine one group's morality in the law of the country, unless it has the broadest possible consensus. To take a value of a group, however large, or of a number of groups, however numerous those groups are, and insert it in the criminal law of our country is not a way of strengthening a pluralistic society.

In my opinion, this is where the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms comes in. The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms takes a very fundamental view about the individual in Canadian society and that view, which is part of our law, settles at a fundamental level the issues on which our laws and practices can be founded.

At the highest level of our judicial system, the right of a woman to determine her own priorities and aspirations in relation to a pregnancy in the early period has been recognized, not by one judge, but in one way and another by a majority of judges who spoke. In the later stages of a pregnancy the responsibility of society is recognized to legislate in the interests of the foetus.

I want to call on the Government to bring in legislation that reflects this decision based on the Charter of Rights. It has failed the Charter and it has failed the Canadian people in not doing so.

As I indicated, the only way in which the resolution before us could be validated, or in which more onerous pre-obligations on a woman's right as recognized by the Supreme Court of Canada could be validated, would be to use the notwithstanding clause which is enabled by Section 33 of the Constitution and thereby put aside Charter guarantees.

For all the reasons I have given about the viability of a pluralistic society, about the need and our interest in strengthening our pluralistic society, I would urge those who oppose this fundamental freedom not to seek to impose their view through legislation. Certainly, their ideas should be put forward. Certainly, their ideas should be explained. They should seek to convince Canadians of their point of view, but to enshrine a position in legislation in my submission is to diminish the viability of the pluralistic society which is Canada.

A parliamentary debate on abortion in a multicultural society should not be an argument about which conception of life is right, about when life really begins, and about what the consequences should be of that determination. Such a debate would be important and valuable, but it would be theological or philosophical. We would not be debating an issue which could be settled by the will of the majority. That is the kind of issue that we debate in Parliament. They are issues that can be settled by the will of a majority.

When we want to talk about a theological or philosophical issue, we must recognize that truth does not depend for its validity on the number of people who proclaim it. Therefore, the truth of the question of life is not an issue to be settled by parliamentary debate. We are not here to determine the truth by relying on the will of the majority. What we are here to settle is how we should live together as Canadians with an issue on which there is no broad consensus, on which there are those whose morality opposes abortion on one side of the debate but others whose morality opposes compelling a woman under any circumstances to carry and bear an unwanted or

unloved child. I think that is the issue and the basis and the decision-making process that should be exercised in this place.

When we talk about the conflict which exists on the fundamental question of abortion, it is often forgotten that right across the board, wherever a group or individual stands on the question of abortion, there is much common ground among all participants. No one values an abortion. No one considers it to be a good or desirable alternative. Abortion is undesirable. What we all recognize on all sides of the debate is that abortions can be substantially reduced and should be substantially reduced because I believe there is the national will to reduce them.

Everyone recognizes that abortions can be avoided in almost every case by better sex education. When I speak of better sex education, I am thinking about parts of our country even having some sex education. There are many parts of Canada where there is none. There must be a national will to change that because that is the method of reducing what everyone recognizes as being undesirable, namely, the number of abortions.

They can be reduced by better planning. They can be reduced by a greater sense of responsibility on the part of women and on the part of men in their individual sex lives. They can be reduced by improved programs for pregnant women. They can be reduced by improved programs for new babies and by enlightened adoption policies.

We can take steps in this country and show leadership in this place to make women feel more comfortable with their pregnancy, more comfortable with the idea of bearing a child. We can assist them to have healthier children. We can do more on this than we have in the past.

I regret that this debate is not seized by the Government as an opportunity to bring forward a policy which would reduce abortions, a policy which would cover some of the bases I just described.

[*Translation*]

This Government has failed to table concrete measures for debate in the House, measures that it is in a position to promote, to reduce the number of abortions in our society. Personally, I regret that the Government has failed to act and has failed to draft a policy to reduce the number of abortions with the exception of those allowed under the Criminal Code.

[*English*]

We should all fight against abortion. I think all Canadians know that a foetus cannot be regarded the way tonsils or gallstones are regarded. There are greater implications of which all Canadians are aware. What is required is a government commitment to do something about it, a commitment which has not been expressed in this place. There must be an encouragement for provincial Governments in their responsibilities which has not been given by this Government.

I conclude by observing for myself that while I would like to see legislation brought in along the lines that I have described, I would not be able to vote for the resolution before us in its present form. I indicated at the outset and want to reiterate that this is a free vote. Members of our caucus will be voting without the whip being imposed. I know that many of my colleagues are looking forward to participating in the debate. I regret very much the failure of the Government to participate in the debate on the substance of the issue of abortion.

• (1610)

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): I suppose it is with some trepidation, Mr. Speaker, that I rise to speak to this resolution. I think the danger in front of the Canadian people today is the fact that they think we are dealing with an abortion issue. That is sheer hypocrisy. What we have in front of us is a resolution. We do not have any legislation. This resolution is particularly vague. It talks about the early stages of a pregnancy when an abortion would be allowed and the later stages when there would be more restrictions. We do not know what the stages are. Are we supposed to make a decision about the stage at which a child is viable? What is it we are supposed to be dealing with?

We heard the Minister say after the Supreme Court decision that it was now time for leadership, that there was an urgency to bring forward legislation. Six months have passed without any legislation, and I think it is really important we recognize that the number of abortions in Canada have not increased. We have to look at what is in front of us and what this Parliament is going to do. We know this Parliament is sitting in its last stages. We know it can only go for another year at most and probably not. We know that whatever the resolution of this marathon debate we are entering into today, it will certainly not bring forward any legislation.

I think it is sheer hypocrisy of the Government to pretend it is doing something when it knows it will be another Parliament that will have to deal with it. I really take exception to that because if we as politicians want to reduce the amount of cynicism about politics in our country today, we have to be accountable and upright with the people. That is not what we are doing today with this resolution.

The Supreme Court has made the decision that it will hear the Borowski case in another three months. That will be a decision which will certainly affect what kind of legislation, if any, will be brought forward. It seems to me that is just another reason this resolution should not be in front of the House today. I think the crass hyprocrisy of the Government is something the people of Canada have to be aware of.

It is not the case that we are afraid to deal with any legislation. If the Government wants to bring a Bill before us, we will deal with it and decide whether it is good, bad or indifferent, proposing or not proposing amendments. What we are being asked to do here is to put forward amendments on a resolution that is vague. We do not know when those early

stages are. That is not right. It is crassly political. The Government is pretending it is doing something when in fact it is doing absolutely nothing.

As far as the New Democratic Party is concerned, we have taken the position for a very long time that there should be a choice. That does not mean that the New Democratic Party is pro-abortion. What we are saying is that women should have some rights to choose. People who feel very strongly that abortion is wrong and would like to see the number of abortions reduced are the ones who should be dealing with public policy as our Party has been doing for a very long time. I think women have to have access to services. I do not know any woman who has lightly made the decision to have an abortion, and as a public health nurse I have dealt with many. It has never been an easy decision. Very often, if there were other alternatives, they would decide not to have an abortion.

We do not have child care, we very often treat women as sex objects and refuse to put services forward, and then have the gall to say they have a choice. Very often they do not have a choice. The New Democratic Party would like to see real choices for women.

I have heard for a long time many people talk about the fact that we do not value children, and we do not value children in our society. Certainly, this Government, which has put extra tax measures on families is not valuing children. We examined a reform Bill last week that actually increased the taxes on families, with two children rather than on a couple with no children. What kind of hypocrisy is that? If we really want to talk about a loving and compassionate society, we have to start putting in services to prevent the need for our women to make a decision to have an abortion. What has happened with the family planning programs? One-third of its funding was cut by this Government.

How can the Government want to have a more restrictive law and at the same time cut back on family planning? I think it is important that we look at the realities of some of the countries where there is liberalized abortion laws. Norway and Sweden made it compulsory to increase the education in sexuality in all the schools, and they found there was a dramatic reduction in the abortion rate in those countries. One country I know of which has rigid abortion laws is Brazil. It is totally illegal to have an abortion in Brazil, but there are over one million illegal abortions taking place in one year. There were 100,000 maternal deaths and over 10,000 abnormalities because of unsuccessful abortions.

When we talk about our ability to implement these laws, let us be realistic about it. I know there are a lot of people in this House who feel very powerful because they are going to be very rigid about this legislation. They are going to keep these women in line. They will force these women to carry the children they are unable to care for. I think it is really important to look at the numbers of women who are battered in our society. We know for a fact about one in eight women are battered. I would like to hear those same people talk about services for those women. People who are afraid to put in a comprehensive child care program are saying they want to see a very rigid law on abortion. Those are the kinds of things we want to talk about if we want to reduce the number of abortions. I certainly do not accept the fact that by putting in rigid laws, or no laws at all and pretending something is going to be done, is an effective way to deal with the problem.

I think many of us in this House have looked at the kind of things that have happened and have decided that this is really a moral issue.

[*Translation*]

One hundred years ago, the Catholic Church declared that in the case of a baby of the male sex, abortion was allowed at 40 weeks of gestation and in the case of a baby of the female sex, after 80 days. Which means that there has been a lot of discussion on the subject. For years, people speculated on sex and age, but the only real issue that must be dealt with is: How can we reduce the number of abortions in our society? That is the only sensible question that has been asked here in the House. The next question is, what measures must be taken until a Bill is forthcoming?

[*English*]

The kinds of policies we need are positive public policies. We do not need policies that are more restrictive, that really do force decisions on people, that make women become again the victims of the back alleys. We must recognize that our society has had literally no effective law concerning abortion in the last six months. The Province of Quebec has not implemented it since 1976. Yet I hear people saying there is a terrible urgency, that we really have to deal with this issue very quickly, that it is a very chaotic situation we are in. I think that is an irresponsible kind of approach to this subject. It is irresponsible because it is attempting to fear monger.

I do not think that is what we want. We as a Party were quite willing to deal with this subject in a comprehensive way and be responsible and accountable to the Canadian people. We have not had the opportunity to do so in this House because the Minister speaks out of one side of his mouth saying it is urgent that we have some kind of law and at the same time brings forward only a resolution. As my Leader said last week, we had a three-headed monster in front of us and now we have a one-headed monster in front of us. It is non-specific. The motion does not give us any sense of where we are going.

• (1620)

As we look at it we recognize that we certainly do not want that to continue in the country. We do not want to see Canadians thinking that they are getting action and not getting it. That very hypocrisy is something that is an affront to the House of Commons.

As Members of Parliament we have been asked to be accountable. We have been asked to be responsible. Instead of that what we get is a Gallup poll in the House of Commons. I

do not think that that is the kind of thing that Canadians are looking for.

I have heard a great deal of discussion among members of the public ever since the Supreme Court decision came down. After the decision came down there was a great deal of speculation with respect to what would happen. What we saw was a variety of types of services delivered across the country.

As a woman, as a New Democrat, I would like to see the same type of services available to all Canadian women so that they will be able to have equal access. I would also like to see them have the types of services that would enable them to make a choice decision. It would be very nice if we knew that women were not any longer earning 64 cents for every $1 that a man earns. It would be very nice if we knew that there was safe, quality child care available for every woman who has a child. It would be very nice if we knew that women had access to health services where they could have pap tests and mammary examinations, as well as contraceptive information, all easily accessible to them. That is not easily accessible in the country right now.

It would also be very nice if we saw all our mother led families in adequate housing and living above the poverty line. When I hear people telling me that they are worried about the children in the country, and I realize that 40 per cent of the clients of the soup kitchens in the City of Toronto are children, I say it is a scandal and a disgrace. For us to pretend that children are a priority to us is absolute nonsense.

If we really want to start treating each other as dignified human beings with quality care, with relationships of quality, if we want to look at life and value it in the true sense of the word, then what we should be looking at is public policies that give us the ability to give each person a sense of dignity. It would give each person the ability to have access to education, nutrition, and the types of things we think are so important. It is certainly not the type of thing that we need to do by having a Gallup poll conducted in the House of Commons to decide whether or not we will have legislation, knowing very well that this Parliament will never implement any.

If we were being honest and if the Government felt very strongly that there was a vacuum which needed some legislation to fill it, then it would have brought legislation forward. Because it cannot come to any consensus in its own caucus, what it has really done is say: "We will use the House of Commons to conduct a Gallup poll".

If Members of Government want some Gallup poll information, I have some here dated April 13. At that time 69 per cent of people thought that the decision whether to have an abortion or not should rest with the woman in consultation with her physician. If the Government wants the results of Gallup, we can give it to it without it bringing it to the House of Commons.

I can probably find other figures which are far different from that. The Government can pick out whichever ones it wishes. But, please, Mr. Speaker, do not use the Members of the House of Commons to do this Gallup polling. The Government is here to govern. It is not here just to try out a resolution. It is disgraceful that what we are being asked to do right now is to pretend that we are doing something that will never happen in this House of Commons.

We know that in the next election, sure, there will be a lot of discussion. But I will be very comfortable to go out on the campaign trail to say: "You thought, maybe, that the Government was doing something about this question, but it was doing absolutely nothing. What it did was try to raise the expectations of Canadians about how seriously it was taking this subject and what it was really doing was making a sham of it". That is totally unacceptable. It is the kind of thing that as New Democrats we resent very much. I think that the women of Canada should resent it as well.

They do not know into which crack they have to fall since at this point in time there has not been a great deal of chaos. Services are being delivered. The number of abortions has not increased. The ability for Canadian women to make responsible decisions is there. The ability for our medical profession to deliver adequate care is there. Those are the types of decisions that are being made now. There is not that terrible vacuum that some Members are referring to which claims that there is a chaotic society. We are not living in chaos. If we really do care about what the future of this country will be, we will start to look at comprehensive, public policy that respects the dignity of men, women, and children.

That is the type of law that I would like to see in front of the House. That is the type of society in which I would like to live. I hope that the rest of Canadians feel that way. I think that after the next election we will find that they do.

Mr. Gus Mitges (Grey—Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, as all of us are fully aware, on January 28, 1988, the Supreme Court of Canada struck down Section 251 of the Criminal Code which governs abortion.

January 28 was the day on which the sanctity of human life was decreed to be of inferior value to personal convenience. The Supreme Court judgment also forced people to wake up from the mistaken notion that righteousness automatically rules. We have been startled to see that darkness prevails when good people do nothing.

If the Supreme Court judgment has shocked us into recognizing that if we want to influence the laws and rules governing our society, we who believe in the sanctity of life of the unborn have to be in the fight and learn to fight smart, then perhaps it has served a useful purpose. It also reminds us not to rely solely on legislation to solve our problems. Legislation may control actions but it does not change attitudes. Influencing public opinion, changing hearts, are part of the fight as well.

While striking down Section 251 of the Criminal Code dramatically illustrates the new power of the courts under the

Charter of Rights and Freedoms, it by no means prevents Parliament from using its criminal law to restrict abortion. If this were the case, it would be all too convenient for elected representatives to avoid the controversial issue of abortion by insisting their hands are tied by the Supreme Court pronouncement.

The question as to whether an unborn child is a human being has been pondered, it has been considered, it has been discussed, and the decision arrived at by the medical profession and others is, yes, the unborn child is indeed a human being from the time of conception.

If this is a human life, then we are faced with a question, one that says yes or no to the entire abortion question. Should we give legal protection under the law to every human in this nation from the beginning of his or her life until each individual's natural death, or should we discriminate fatally under the law against entire classes of living humans?

For two millennia in our western culture, written into our Constitutions, specifically protected by our laws, and deeply imprinted in the hearts of all men and women, there has existed the absolute value of honouring and protecting the right of each human to live. This has been an inalienable and unequivocal right. The only exception has been that of balancing a life for a life in certain situations, or by due process of law.

Never in modern times, except by a small group of physicians in Hitler's Germany, and by Stalin in Russia, has a price-tag of economic or social usefulness been placed on an individual human life as the price of its continued existence. Never in modern times, except by physicians in Hitler's Germany, has a certain physical perfection been required as a condition necessary for the condition of that life. Never in modern times, has a state granted to a citizen the absolute legal right to have another killed in order to solve her own personal, social or economic problem. Yet, if this is a human life, the Canadian Supreme Court decision, as well as the permissive abortion laws in other countries do all of the above. They represent a complete aboutface, a total rejection of one of the core values of western man and an acceptance of a new ethic in which life is only of relative value. No longer will everyone have a right to live simply because he or she exists. Man will now be allowed to exist only if he measures up to certain standards of independence, physical perfection, or utilitarian usefulness to others. This is a momentous change that strikes at the very root of western civilization.

• (1630)

Last year more than 60,000 unborn babies were legally "terminated" in Canadian hospitals. This means destroyed for no offence at all. Abortion is an extreme form of child abuse inside the womb. It violently destroys a unique young human being. Some people claim that abortion is a woman's right. What is more, they insist that we should all be forced to pay for it with our taxes. They call themselves "pro-choice". There is no freedom of choice for a child destroyed by abortion. Its every instinct is to live. As the pro-choice people use the phrase, a women's right to choose is really a right to destroy life.

Can anyone honestly claim this right? If it is wrong to kill timber rattlesnakes in some countries, how can it be all right to destroy helpless human beings? Don't we have a right to oppose this? All human life, before and after birth, has a right to protection; not just the strong, the whole, the well connected, but also the weak, the handicapped, and the unwanted.

You do not solve human problems, Mr. Speaker, by destroying human life. To place the issue of human abortion into its proper context, we must first know why abortions are being performed. Today there are only two primary medical indications for abortion: cancer of the cervix and womb and ectopic pregnancy. If the cancer is detected early in pregnancy, treatment of the mother would likely cause the loss of her unborn child. The other is with regard to ectopic pregnancy. In this situation, the child is developing in the Fallopian tubes instead of the womb. In this case, the unborn child would have to be removed to protect the life of the mother.

Such cases represent such a small number of actual abortions it becomes evident that the vast majority of Canada's approximately 60,000 yearly abortions cannot properly be called therapeutic. Section 1 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms states:

> The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be justified in a free and democratic society.

In 1969, when the Criminal Code was amended to permit abortion under certain therapeutic circumstances, the intent was to maintain the basic rights of the unborn child while at the same time set reasonable limits to allow for therapeutic abortion in cases such as I have mentioned.

Since that time we have seen an increasing abuse of this law, to the point that we now have a situation in which abortion in Canada is undertaken primarily for socio-economic reasons. The clear intent is no longer to heal but to destroy the unborn child because he or she is supposedly unwanted and inconvenient. The wording in the Criminal Code addressed the seriousness of this act when it could not be justified on therapeutic grounds by a select committee of physicians.

Section 251(1) of the Criminal Code states:

> Everyone who, with intent to procure the miscarriage of a female person . . . uses any means for the purpose of carrying out his intention is guilty of an indictable offence . . .

It is evident that Members of Parliament never intended to provide a loophole to legalize abortion on demand and thus remove all lawful protection from the unborn child.

Section 15(1) of the Charter prohibits discrimination based on age, and yet we continue to destroy 60,000 unborn babies every year for reasons of convenience. Is this not discrimination on the basis of age, because they are so young and not yet

able to express themselves fully? Scientifically, the process of birth is simply a change in residence for one who has already been living and interacting with his or her protective environment for nine long months.

The fact is that each new human life begins at conception and proceeds through stages identified as embryo, foetus, infant, child, adolescent, and adult. The Charter requires that every human being from the very young to the very old, especially the helpless and defenceless, must be afforded equal protection. Anyone whose rights or freedoms as guaranteed by the Charter have been infringed on or denied may apply to a court to obtain such remedy as the court considers appropriate and just in the circumstances.

Obviously the Charter made these provisions to assure that those who felt their rights being denied were given a fair hearing. Further to this guarantee of the right to life, Section 12 states:

> Everyone has the right not to be subjected to any cruel and unusual treatment or punishment.

Today we constantly see new evidence that points to the pain experienced by the unborn child during an abortion. The suction abortion, used up to 12 weeks, disembowels and dismembers the child alive. There are no survivors. The saline abortion, used in the second trimester, consists of the removal of some of the amniotic fluid from the womb. This is then replaced with a saline solution. During the next several hours this slowly kills the child: it burns the eyes, the lungs, and the skin. The mother goes into labour and gives birth to a dead child. Some babies have been known to survive such a procedure. They are simply left to die, unattended and alone.

The issue of foetal pain has become very prominent in the last few years. Medical science doctors confirm that when the lives of the unborn are snuffed out, they often feel pain, pain that is long and agonizing.

Twenty-six physicians, including two past presidents of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists have affirmed foetal pain. Their response stated in part: "The ability to feel pain and respond to it is clearly not a phenomenon that develops *de novo* at birth. We all have sympathy and empathy for our fellow man, and even animals that show outward signs of pain and suffering. Surely, if animals can be protected from inhumane killing techniques, the unborn child should have the right not to be subjected to this kind of cruel and unusual punishment".

With the advent of technology such as amniocentesis, we now see abortions being done to assure parents that a child of desired sex is obtained. Most often these sex selection abortions result in the retention of the male and the destruction of the female.

More and more people are beginning to recognize that women themselves are victims of abortion. Women are often not told the facts concerning the unborn child. Women are often not told about the physical and psychological problems which can result from abortion.

That is why we need and we must have a tremendous increase in services for pregnant women, so that the thoughts of contemplating abortion would be nullified by the thought that good support programs, moral support, and financial support are readily and amply available for women during pregnancy and for some time after the birth of the baby. This is imperative. All of us, including those of us in public office, must work together to make more of these services a reality. I know that the cost for such services would be tremendous, but how can one equate that cost with the present holocaust of killing some 60,000 unborn babies annually? There is no comparison. That is why we must push forward for an increase in these services.

Women today are not given the type of support that is necessary at such a vulnerable time. Decent and reasonable alternatives are often withheld. Some are forced to abandon further education or employment. Then society politely offers abortion and calls it the "women's choice". More and more women are realizing that they are being terribly exploited by our selfish abortion-oriented society. This is discrimination against women and against the very nature of womanhood. I support women's rights, but individual rights top when they affect the rights of another. No man or woman has the right to take the life of another individual in or out of the womb.

In summary, I have just reviewed how many Canadian unborn children are denied basic rights as other rights are supposedly pursued. They have no recourse to be heard on the denial or infringement of rights; they have been deprived of the most fundamental right, the right to life; and they are subjected to cruel and unusual treatment. They are discriminated against on the basis of age, and they are discriminated against on the basis of handicap. We have seen that women are discriminated against as they are not protected from abortion. They are manipulated by society to do the most unnatural thing in the world, to kill their own tiny child.

To have a Charter of Rights and Freedoms is commendable, but how can we say that we will respect and even guarantee basic human rights to every individual and then proceed to devalue and dehumanize an entire segment of our human community? Such thinking is unscientific, immoral, and unacceptable.

• (1640)

I have spoken about the plight of the unborn in Canada today. Surely these abuses go far beyond the respectable intentions of the Charter. I hope that you can see, from this very brief outline, that the plight of the unprotected unborn child and his mother is especially pitiful when we consider what a caring and loving society could do for them. As a just, compassionate and humane society, we must extend to these little ones and their mothers the equal respect, the protection, and the benefit of the law.

It was not that many years ago that people in Canada generally had a very high regard and a high respect for the unborn child and there were very few abortions. In the past abortions were provided for truly therapeutic reasons, and they were carried out to save the life of the mother.

Today we have abortion for reasons of convenience, and abortion is the solution that is given to women to solve their problems. Granted, it would take more effort on the part of society to meet the needs and the requirements of these women than it would to pay for an abortion.

I stress again that more support is needed to provide assistance to women who are pregnant and need and want support. When these women come forth for counselling and are offered the kind of love, the kind of compassion, and the kind of services that will meet their needs, they will very rarely opt for abortion. Time and time again they will go on; with assistance, with help that is being offered to them, they will go on and carry their children.

Whether or not the law on abortion is changed in the near future, our attitude to it can change. After all, smoking is not illegal in our society, but the attitude toward it and the formidable educational effort directed against it have led to a significant decline in smoking over the past 15 years. The same sort of result is possible with respect to abortion. All that we require is the resolve to act and the need to act.

In only 16 years from 1970 to 1986, some 907,351 unborn Canadian children were wilfully and painfully put to death by abortion. This is tragic, to say the least, and must be stopped. We must stop this carnage.

Thomas Jefferson once said: "The care of human life and happiness and not their destruction is the first and only legitimate object of good government". He did not say the unwanted or those who do not measure up to certain standards are to be excluded from protection.

The public is being informed that because some lives are deemed to be inferior, they need not be afforded the privilege of life. An expression that is commonly heard today is "quality of life". While "quality of life" is certainly a good thing to which all aspire, the term, as currently used, has meaning beyond this universal desire, and it is the new meaning that makes it so foreboding. The elimination of the unborn who are unwanted, retarded, or handicapped is presently practised because of this new ethic.

Past history tells us that a society that does not respect all human life begins with the killing of the most helpless of victims and then proceeds to the handicapped and others who are considered to be below standard. The ultimate question is: "What is the value of human life and individual human beings?" For thousands of years our Judaeo-Christian tradition has upheld and valued life. Civilization has always been measured by a view of mankind that affirms the worth and dignity of each person. We were born to love, and it is our expression of love that binds us together and elevates our level of humanism.

Canada's challenge today is making firm a future in which free men and women are enabled to live in a society which preserves and promotes the equality, worth, and dignity of every human being. The care of human life and happiness and not their destruction is the first and only legitimate object of good government. It is the duty of all of us as legislators to protect those human beings, those unborn babies who cannot speak for themselves, who cannot defend themselves, and who cannot protect themselves.

The sanctity of human life is too precious for any arbitrariness and compromise in this very important question that we are dealing with today in this Parliament. It is imperative that we take positive action and whatever that action requires to protect the lives of all unborn children from the time of conception.

At this time I would like to file the following amendment to this motion. My amendment would delete all of the words following "Such legislation should prohibit the performance of an abortion, subject to the following exceptions". This amendment is seconded by the Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm). The following will be substituted therefor: "When two or more independent qualified medical practitioners have in good faith and on reasonable grounds stated that in their opinion the continuation of the pregnancy would or would be likely to endanger the life of the pregnant woman."

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane—Superior): Mr. Speaker, I take the view that it is essential for Parliament to have this debate. I believe that Canadians have a right to know what and how their legislators are thinking about this vital issue. It has been said that living itself is life's most complete treasure. We all know that there are many kinds of violence in our society, violence that robs life of that treasure of living. There is war, highway traffic accidents, dreaded diseases of many kinds, murders, and suicides, but it is chilling for me to realize that the most violent place in Canada today is not some dark side street in a decayed section of an inner city; it is, rather, the human womb.

Each year in Canada there are more than 60,000 abortions performed. I want to say that in no way can abortion be considered as merely an elective surgical procedure. It is, as former Prime Minister Trudeau once said, and I quote: "The very frightening moral decision of killing something which is living inside a person". Even Madam Justice Bertha Wilson admitted that abortion was not just a medical decision. She said that it was a profound social and ethical one as well. This was part of her recent decision that struck down the legislation on the statute books of Canada. She also said, and again I quote: "The precise point in the development of the foetus at which the state's interests in its protection becomes compelling I leave to the informed judgment of the legislature".

It will be noted that Justice Wilson recognizes that there is a state interest in protecting the foetus. Her only question is: When does that obligation commence? That is her question. She does not indicate, either, by what means this protection can be granted and guaranteed. She leaves that to us. She leaves that to the Bill which will eventually have to follow the motion we are debating today. I return to my first point, that it is therefore essential that we debate this subject in Parliament.

There are some who say that we must find that middle ground on this serious social and moral issue of abortion. I think the middle ground that some people are talking about is mythical in nature. It is non-existent. I wonder, how can there be middle ground? There is life and there is death.

In 1975 Hon. Otto Lang, then Liberal Minister of Justice, said in an interview with Bruce Garvey for *The Toronto Star*, and I quote: "You cannot distinguish between the life of the unborn and the born, there's no biological cut-off date". I have had the privilege to listen to distinguished physicians who have confirmed and verified that point of view.

When this Parliament, once again in a free vote, made its decision on the question of capital punishment, I, for a third time as a Member of Parliament, voted for abolition. I did so because I am pro-life and anti-violence. I am not persuaded that when the state kills felons who are guilty of murder that it makes society a better or a safer or a happier place for others.

• (1650)

On the contrary, I took the view that state executions merely add to the sum total of violence in society and perhaps even, in a certain sense, condone violence as an acceptable means to achieve a satisfactory end. I say no. It does not work that way. The means is unacceptable and the end is unsatisfactory.

Recently I read Truman Capote's best seller of many years ago, *In Cold Blood*. The savage, brutal murder of an entire family in rural Kansas by two deeply disturbed young men was a story of unprovoked, irrational violence at its worse. Yet, as Capote went on to reveal the background and personalities of those two young men, by the end of the book one did not want to see them hanged. Treatment for them, yes. Full freedom, never. But death? No.

When I voted against capital punishment I knew that a majority of my constituents thought otherwise, but I did so on the grounds of being for life, even life which is stained and marred and warped by dreadful human experiences. At this moment, however, I am grateful that on this issue of abortion I am able to be more in tune and in step with what I know to be the prevailing view in my constituency.

In being for life on the abortion question I must say that I take this stand not without some difficulty. One of those difficulties has to do with the life and the health of the mother. Thank goodness, Sir, that modern gynaecology makes it less and less likely that pregnancy can cause death or seriously impair the health of the mother. To medical science we pay tribute for that fact. Still, if there are those clear and indisputable cases where a choice has to be made between life or death for one or the other, the mother or the unborn child, it is in my view the mother without question who must live.

Of great concern to me also is the victim of rape or incest who becomes pregnant. That is among those extreme cases where an appeal from the woman in a just society would demand a sympathetic and most responsive hearing. To have children born as a result of rape or incest will do nothing to achieve quality family life and that really goes without saying.

However, an even harder case is the one involving a highly strung, harassed mother of four young children living in a remote mining town and married to a weak-willed, self-indulgent man. Her fifth pregnancy was more than she could bear and abortions at that time were illegal. Therefore, she went to a back street abortionist, got blood poisoning as a result, and subsequently died. She left behind a guilt burdened husband and four motherless children.

One of the arguments that the pro-abortionists use is that before legalization, before the Criminal Code was amended, there were thousands of such women dying every year as a result of botched up back alley abortions. I thought that, too, until Doctor T. A. Kasper, an Edmonton pathologist, noted in a letter to Members of Parliament quite recently that this argument for abortion is without any valid statistical foundation. He goes on in his letter to say, however:

> Even with legal abortions performed under the strictest control, in the finest institutions, the statistics show that the risks to the life of the mother are greater than the risks to her carrying the infant to term.

Going back to the tragic case of the harassed mother of four, I would suggest to you and my colleagues in the House that the answer to that situation was not an abortion being used as a means to solve a serious social problem. Rather, the answer was to have a more responsible husband, to live in a more caring community, with facilities to help that person, with affordable and easily accessible child care facilities, a community that had adequate counselling services.

Are you aware that there are people who live in the more remote parts of this country who, when they have a difficult and real problem, really have no place to go? There is no one to whom they can turn. There is no one who will take the time to listen. There is no one who can listen in a way that can be helpful.

I sometimes suspect that the rationale for an abortion on demand policy is basically anti-child in nature. Richard Needham, a former columnist for *The Globe and Mail*, once wrote in his own inimical and cynical style:

> The first half of our lives is ruined by our parents, the second half by our children.

Well, Sir, you know as do I that children place heavy demands on parents. Children create huge costs for society in education, child care, health and recreational facilities, yet we are not spending enough for our children. I say, Sir, that it is

better to incur those huge costs than it is to waste our money on useless war toys like nuclear submarines.

Children need and demand an extensive amount of nurturing, watching, attending, and loving. All of this conflicts so often with a consumer driven, upwardly mobile society. The ideal has become: double income and no kids. Why? So that more of the good things of this world can be accumulated and acquired.

Sir, few can have it both ways. You cannot have it all and children as well. Those two life-styles are often seen as incompatible. Children are extremely costly to raise and parental responsibilities tend to go on and on before those children become fully independent and self-supporting adults.

Having said that, the decision not to have children is entirely a personal one. However, to abort a foetus goes beyond the personal. It involves society as a whole. That point of view is supported and backed up by the recent Supreme Court decision. Thus, I contend that consumerism, materialism, and plain selfishness are possible motives which may lie in part at least behind the call for abortion on demand.

• (1700)

Those who are pro-life are not necessarily stupid and ignorant as Henry Morgentaler has charged. They may in fact be more caring, more compassionate and concerned, less ruthless and far more respectful of life in all its many manifestations and more willing to share what they have.

Morris C. Shumiacher, a distinguished and highly respected legal counsel from Regina, Saskatchewan, said in an address to the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons the following:

> There is no challenge in death—only defeat. There is no hope in destruction—only despair. Therefore choose not death but life that the world may not despair and die. Choose life—that we may live.

The Supreme Court of Canada will in due course, shortly, have to rule on the meaning in our Constitution of the phrase that stands out whenever I read it which says that everyone has the right to life. What the Supreme Court will decide in that pending case I do not know. However, for me, the right to life applies equally to the born and to the unborn. It therefore follows, again in my view, that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees that this right to life is protected "subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society". Based on that constitutional principle, there would be many, many fewer abortions performed in Canada.

The Government's motion with regard to abortion is not one that I am, in all conscience, able to accept. I am grateful for the debate. The motion, however, is not acceptable. I will, therefore, on Thursday be voting against it.

Mr. John Reimer (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, let me briefly outline some of the arguments in support of the pro-life position on abortion, a position which I have consistently and unequivocally held up throughout my tenure in public office. The case can best be put by simply allowing the biological and physiological facts to speak for themselves.

First, it is well known that all the information necessary for the development of each of us as a unique human being is contained in the genetic code that is present from the moment of conception. The colour of our eyes, the size of our feet, and the capacity of our brains have all been established in that instant. Nothing needs to be added other than food, shelter, and care.

Second, the indicators of life and development are early and dramatic. The unborn produces its own blood at 17 to 20 days after conception. Its heart begins beating at 24 to 25 days. Between the sixth and seventh weeks, the electrical activity of the brain in readable, and at eight weeks all the essential organs are present. The unborn can cry, hiccup, develop individual tastes, be startled, and feel pain. Indeed, according to Sir William Liley of New Zealand, knighted because of his pioneering work in amniocentesis, the unborn child is not a part of the mother's body but is a separate person who dictates its own growth and when he or she is to be born.

Third, apart from abortion, the medical community treats the foetus as any other patient. It is now possible to perform corrective surgery on the foetus while still in the womb or even to remove, operate on, and subsequently replace the foetus so that it may come to full term. Clearly, it cannot be and it is not viewed as a piece of tissue to be removed and discarded at will.

Fourth, remarkable developments in neo-natal technology now allow foetal viability as early as five months from conception. Witness, for example, the survival of a baby recently born here in Ottawa at just 21 weeks gestation. Yet we know that abortions are even now being performed upon foetuses above and beyond 21 weeks development and furthermore that some of these have even survived the attempts to abort them.

The fact that the unborn are now viable at increasingly early stages of development has rendered the whole question of foetal viability something of a moving target. It is forcing American legislators to reconsider their trimester approach to abortion. Why then, I ask of those of my colleagues who are in favour of a gestational approach, must we repeat the errors and ignore the lessons of the American experience?

Finally, I think it is instructive to read how, in 1975, after an exhaustive examination of the available biological and physiological evidence by 133 world renowned scientists, geneticists, and gynaecologists, the West German Federal Constitutional Court responded to the question as to when life begins. The court was acutely conscious of the events which took place in Germany between 1933 and 1945 and was therefore especially anxious to ground its judgment in scientific objectivity. Its conclusion was:

> Life, in the sense of historical existence of a human individual, exists according to definite biological-physiological knowledge, in any case, from the 14th day after conception (nidation, individuation) . . . The process of

> development which has begun at that point is a continuing process which exhibits no sharp demarcation and does not allow a precise division of the various steps of development of the human life.

I hope that the judgment of Canada's Supreme Court on the Borowski case will be equally objective and unequivocal in its estimation of the evidence.

One's position on abortion cannot be construed and thereby dismissed as being simply a matter of personal opinion or belief. Rather, in and of itself, the medical evidence is concrete. It is objective. It is compelling. Life is an uninterrupted continuum which begins at conception and ends at death. Without doubt, abortion brings about the cessation of a living human being during the process of its development along that continuum.

The performance of an abortion must contend with this incontrovertible fact. For those who value human life, it can only be justified on grounds of self-defence in those rare instances when another life, that of the mother, is in demonstrable danger, and where there is no other acceptable medical procedure to obviate that danger.

Consequently, while each Member is free to make up his or her own mind, this free vote should not be viewed as one Member's beliefs, values or opinions against those of another, with the added implication that one opinion is just as good as another. On the contrary, a Member's opinion on a matter of such fundamental significance as this can only be valid if the facts are there to support it.

Facts are facts, Mr. Speaker, whether you accept them, reject them, or ignore them. You cannot have your list of facts while I have mine. The biological and physiological evidence concerning the unborn child will simply not allow us the expedient and fallacious post-enlightenment liberal separation between the public world of fact on the one hand and the private world of values on the other.

• (1710)

The medical facts support those who are committed to the value system that upholds the unborn as a living human being deserving of legal protection. It is incumbent upon those who would argue otherwise, that is, those espousing a pro-choice or gestational approach to abortion, to supply the requisite, concrete evidence in support of their own particular beliefs, values or opinions. To refuse to do so, I submit, is pure hypocrisy and intellectual dishonesty.

Therefore, in the light of what I have sought to outline, both the gestational and the pro-choice options must be rejected as completely unacceptable to those concerned to uphold the sanctity of human life. The reasons are self-evident.

First, the pro-choice option leaves the issue of abortion to be decided by the woman in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner. Of course, this begs the obvious question as to precisely what it is the woman is being given the freedom of choice to do. The obvious answer is that she is free to terminate the life of the developing foetus. Such an action flies in the face of all the medical data concerning the foetus. Furthermore, if the growing evidence concerning post-abortion syndrome is considered, the pro-choice position does a terrible disservice to the well-being of the mother herself.

The motion before us, the so-called middle ground, is in fact a gestational approach. It would allow an abortion in the early stages of pregnancy where continuation of the pregnancy threatens the woman's physical or mental well-being. While the exact time limit to be placed upon this early stage is yet to be determined, it is unlikely that it would be much less than 12 weeks and, in all probability, it would be closer to 18 to 24 weeks. Henry Morgentaler has stated 24 weeks as his preference.

Given that Statistics Canada figures show that 89 per cent of current abortions take place before 13 weeks and that 96.5 per cent occur before 17 weeks, and given the fact that the term "mental well-being" is extremely broad in scope, the motion, as a gestational approach, effectively functions as abortion on demand in the vast majority of instances.

Furthermore, this motion would also allow abortions at a later stage in the pregnancy should the continuation of the pregnancy endanger the woman's life or seriously injure her health. This, of course, is virtually the same as the former abortion law under Section 251 of the Criminal Code and shares all of its obvious deficiencies. Why, it may be asked, would we want to re-enact legislation that the Supreme Court has recently struck down?

Consequently, neither the pro-choice nor gestational options will do. Indeed, they completely bypass all medical evidence concerning the nature and status of the foetus. They are but thinly guised legislative means of allowing the women, doctor, and legislator to abdicate their responsibility and ignore the evidence.

It has been argued by some, for example the Hon. Member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan) and the Canadian Abortion Rights Action League, that a restrictive abortion law is unconstitutional. Indeed, some have claimed that only a gestational approach or even a pro-choice direction would be acceptable to the Supreme Court.

This argument, I submit, is completely false. It is largely based upon the opinion of Justice Bertha Wilson who suggested that the commencement of Parliament's interest in the foetus, it seemed to her, "would fall somewhere in the second trimester".

Judge Dickson, however, said: "The precise point in the development of the foetus at which the state's interest in its protection becomes 'compelling' should be left to the informed judgment of the legislature which is in a position to receive submissions on the subject from all the relevant disciplines".

By way of further contrast, Justice Beetz, in giving his judgment, cited favourably United States Supreme Court Justice O'Connor's opinion in *City of Akron vs. Akron Centre for Reproductive Health*, to the effect that "the state's interest

in protecting potential human life exists throughout the pregnancy"; in other words, from conception to birth.

To anyone who affords the Supreme Court judgment on the Morgentaler case a careful reading, the following facts are self-evident. First, there is no constitutional right to an abortion. Second, as Judge Dickson indicated, it is Parliament's prerogative and responsibility to summon together all available evidence and then decide the state's interest in the foetus. Third, Parliament's interest need not necessarily require a gestational or pro-choice position. Fourth, as Judges Beetz and Estey stated, Parliament's interest need not exclude a life and health standard approach which includes the confirmation of a second, independent medical opinion. Fifth, Parliament's interest need not disallow a life and health standard which is very restrictive, even to the point of excluding first trimester abortions.

Clearly, it is both Parliament's privilege and responsibility to decide as to the rights of the foetus from conception on. I can only agree with Judge Dickson that Parliament should reach its decision on this matter after informing itself by means of all evidence at hand.

As I have argued throughout, all biological and physiological data available leads one to one conclusion only, that the foetus is an autonomous life in development. As such, the only reasonable legislative option is that which serves to protect the rights of the foetus throughout its development.

Furthermore, this right can only be abrogated, on the grounds of self-defence, in those rare instances where the mother's life is in demonstrable danger and where there is no other acceptable medical procedure to obviate that danger.

Of course, there must always be concern for the well-being of the mother, but her best interests are served only when the utmost respect is afforded all human life; that of the mother, her unborn child and, indeed, society itself.

This, therefore, is the pro-life position. I shall support any amendment before this House which gives a strong pro-life direction to the Government, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Unfortunately, the abortion debate has been construed as one of competing interests, the right of the mother to be free to choose versus the right of the unborn to live. However, surely it defies all that we hold dear about humanity to speak of a mother and her unborn child as being in competition against one another. Only a pathetically distorted sense of what is right and what is freedom could render mother and child as antagonists.

Every reasonable Canadian knows that there are necessary and legitimate limits to rights and freedoms, especially where human life is concerned. Otherwise, we are left vulnerable to the tyranny of anarchy.

As the esteemed American Judge Learned Hand has said: "A society in which men recognize no check upon their freedom soon becomes a society where freedom is the possession of only a savage few . . . (but the true) spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs (the interest of others) alongside its own without bias".

Consequently, as the philosopher Francis Schaeffer has noted, abortion is not solely a feminist issue any more than slavery was only a slave owner's issue; rather, "the fate of the unborn is a question of the fate of the human race. We are one human family. If the rights of one part of that family are denied, it is of concern to each of us. What is at stake is no less than the essence of what freedom and rights are all about".

Given all that I have said, I would like to take advantage of the unanimous agreement of the three Parties and table the following amendment. "That all of the words in the motion after the "to protect the unborn; and" be deleted and the following substituted therefor: "Such legislation should prohibit the performance of an abortion except when: —two independent qualified medical practitioners have, in good faith and on reasonable grounds, in writing, stated that in their opinion the continuation of the pregnancy would, or would be likely to, endanger the life of the pregnant woman or seriously and substantially endanger her health and there is no other commonly accepted medical procedure for effectively treating the health risk; but the grounds for such an opinion are not to include (I) the effects of stress or anxiety which may accompany an unexpected or unwanted pregnancy, or (II) social or economic considerations."

That motion is seconded by the Hon. Member for Surrey—White Rock—North Delta (Mr. Friesen). It is crucial to note that this amendment specifically defines the parameters of the term "health", which was a requirement in the Supreme Court judgment, that is, the threat to a woman's health must be, first, serious and substantial; second, such that there is no other commonly accepted medical procedure for effectively treating the health risk; and third, other than the anxiety and stress which normally accompanies an unexpected or unwanted pregnancy. Additionally, socio-economic factors may not be grounds for an abortion.

• (1720)

It is also important to realize that the distinction between this amendment and the amendment just put by the Hon. Member for Grey—Simcoe (Mr. Mitges) is a very fine one. This view is in accordance with the interpretation of pro-life medical and legal experts. For example, in my own Kitchener constituency, Dr. John Sehl, obstetrician and gynaecologist, views this amendment as extremely restrictive and has urged me to support it. He is convinced that if the medical community were to act in accordance with the wording of this amendment it would effectively allow it to perform abortions in life threatening circumstances only. The validity of this position has received widespread recognition throughout a broad cross-section of those concerned about Canada's unborn.

For example, the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops has called upon us here to "take serious account of the concern expressed by many pro-life Members of Parliament that abstention from voting, because the perfect law has not been presented, may indirectly contribute to the passage of a motion which allows for the totally unacceptable gestational approach".

Similarly, the Evangelical Fellowship of Canada, representing some 2.4 million Canadians, urges Members to vote for an amendment which "is at least pointing our society in a life-affirming direction". It adds: "It would be a tragedy if our children recorded that at a critical moment in Canadian history evil prevailed because good people did nothing".

Likewise, the Salvation Army says the following:

> It is our firm opinion, based on the Christian conviction that all human life is sacred, and borne out of our many years of experience in ministering to the needs of women, that (such an amendment as this) ... most nearly offers a civilized nation a way whereby all human life may continue to be regarded with awe and treated with utmost dignity.

It is with this view that I have submitted this amendment. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I have tabled the Hon. Member's amendment as per the agreement.

Mrs. Mary Collins (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed feelings that I rise to participate in the debate we have begun this afternoon on the motion which would give guidance to the Government as to what direction legislation should take with respect to abortion.

During the time available to me I want to talk about the issue of abortion itself, my feelings about it, the feelings that have been expressed to me by constituents and others across the country, and then to talk about the motion itself and some of the changes I believe should be made to it.

I do not believe that my position on abortion is a surprise to anyone in the House or indeed in my constituency. I have made it clear, when we have had debates formerly on Private Members' Motions with respect to abortion, that I am a strong advocate of the concept that women must have the right to choose whether or not they wish to terminate a pregnancy.

We had several debates about the former law, Section 251 of the Criminal Code. I was not happy with it, yet it seemed at that time, as it seems now, that it was difficult to obtain a consensus about what kind of changes should be made in the law. We tended to say that it is there, it seemed to work relatively well, and perhaps it should not be changed.

Of course, the situation occurred with the Supreme Court decision on the Morgentaler case which has required us now to reconsider this vital question involving so many different competing interests of philosophical, religious, and moral views about life and about the role of women. I know it is a very difficult hard decision for many people to make. Some of my colleagues have already talked about the Supreme Court decision. It struck down the old law because, in the view of the Supreme Court, it did not meet the requirements of the Charter of Rights. The requirement of the hospital committees was deemed to be arbitrary.

The decision itself and the writing of some of the judges in that decision have been important in terms of determining the kind of approach we are discussing now. Philosophically, my own view would be that we do not really need legislation. Yet I know there is a strong feeling among colleagues and many members of the public that there needs to be some statement in law about abortion, about women's rights, and potentially about the developing rights of the foetus. Indeed, some of the words that were expressed in the decision of the Supreme Court would lead us to believe that this is what they were thinking as well.

Madam Bertha Wilson's comments in that decision are the ones that I feel very close to. I think she expressed many of my own views very well. She talked in her decision about the ways in which one could balance the women's role and the women's right to choose, and the possibility that at a certain stage in a pregnancy that the role of society could come into play. She said: "There is a point at which the state interest and the protection of the foetus becomes compelling. This point is to be left to the legislature. It seems to me however, that it might fall somewhere in the second trimester".

We are not dealing, in the motion before us, with the particular point in time. That would obviously come forward with legislation, but we are dealing with a gestational concept, to try to find that balance about which I know many people feel strongly.

Although my own view is that we do not actually need this legislation, and that the decision to terminate a pregnancy should be that of a woman in consultation with her physician, I recognize that the approach put forward by the Government is one that requires serious consideration.

Let us look at the state of abortion in Canada and elsewhere. We have heard from time to time that the number of abortions are rising dramatically and that without law this might become an even greater issue.

First, Canada is not among those nations that has the most liberal abortion law. About 40 per cent of people around the world live in countries where there is basically abortion upon request, certainly in the early stages. That includes United States, U.S.S.R., China, France, and Italy. We fall in a category with about 25 per cent of the world's population which has certain constraints. They are similar in some ways to Britain, India, and Japan.

The remaining 25 per cent of the world's population lives in countries where, generally speaking, there are very tight laws with respect to abortion, countries with either strong Roman Catholic or Moslem religions which have had greater influence on public policy.

It is interesting to look at the situation, because even in those countries where abortion has been stringently constrained, when women make the decision that they wish to pursue this course of action, they will find ways to do it. Although there are tight abortion laws in Ireland, Irish women are as likely as women in the liberal Netherlands to obtain abortions. It would be a matter of going to the United Kingdom.

To some extent we find this in Canada, and this was one of my great concerns with the old law. Indeed, I knew a young woman who had to take this course. When abortions are not available in their communities, they would have to go to the United States to obtain an abortion. I do not think that was appropriate or right. I hope that situation will change.

Some people also claim that the incidence of abortion in Canada is high and disproportionate. I would argue that. According to the last statistics, 1984-85, there were in the order of 61,000 abortions performed in Canada, 99 per cent prior to 20 weeks. Only in a very few and exceptional circumstances were abortions performed after that time.

In other countries with which we often associated ourselves as having similar standards of morality, such as England, the incidence of abortion was 33 per cent higher. In France it was 30 per cent higher, in Japan it was 75 per cent higher, and in the United States it has been twice as high.

• (1730)

I do not personally believe that should this motion pass and legislation be introduced, it would have an impact on the numbers. I believe that once a woman makes that kind of decision she will find a way. We have a responsibility to ensure that she has the facilities in which an abortion can be provided safely and under proper medical conditions and that it is covered by our health care plans.

This brings me to something about which I want to comment as a woman and as the mother of three children. I have had discussions about abortion with women I have dealt with over the years. I have talked to women who have had abortions and mothers of daughters who have had abortions. I do not think women take this issue lightly. I sometimes hear from people that abortion is used as a method of birth control. There may be times when that is done, but I think it is certainly the exception to the rule. For most women, the decision to terminate a pregnancy, to have an abortion, is a very difficult and traumatic decision. It is not one that is taken lightly. I do not think that we as a society should impose further difficulties on women so that in some cases they have to suffer the possibility of further health problems or mental health problems in terms of seeking a solution.

I would like to turn to the Supreme Court decision. Bertha Wilson in her rationale of why the old law was struck down, in my mind, went to the heart of the issue. She said:

> . . . the decision to terminate a pregnancy . . . is one that will have profound psychological, economic and social consequences for the pregnant women. The circumstances giving rise to it can be complex and varied and there may be . . . powerful considerations militating in opposite directions. It is a decision that deeply reflects the way the woman thinks about herself and her relationship to others and to society at large. It is a profound social and ethical decision. Her response to it will be the response of a whole person.
>
> The old Section 251 put the decision in the hands of a committee and so takes away the decision that a woman has a right to make for herself without any state interference.

Judge Wilson goes on to say that Section 251 also violates the right to security because it treats the pregnant women as a passive recipient of a decision made by others as to whether her body is to be used to nurture a new life. I would certainly concur with the reasoning of Justice Bertha Wilson. I cannot comprehend any laws which take away my right to make a decision about my body, about my future. I just do not think that is right. I would ask other Members to think about that.

If women are faced with the situation of a pregnancy they do not wish to carry to term, they want to make that decision as quickly as possible. The evidence is clear. Only .3 per cent of pregnancies in Canada are carried out in the last trimester. Those are the truly exceptional cases. Perhaps we do not really need, then, to consider a gestational approach because that probably is not the issue. At the same time, however, there is this feeling in society that there should be some statement of protection of the developing foetus at a certain stage. I can accept that and would be prepared to accept some limitations on the right of a woman to make that decision in the later stages of the pregnancy. I will come to some suggestions about that in a few moments.

There is often a lot of statistics quoted about the public's view. A Gallup poll in April indicated that about 70 per cent of Canadians believe that a decision to terminate a pregnancy should be a matter of choice for the woman and her physician. That is certainly supported by a survey undertaken in my own riding. I asked the question in my householder this spring and received over 2,200 replies. That is a much larger response than I would ever have expected and is really very significant. The number of people who wrote comments, wanting to give me their views, was very heartening. It showed that the constituency of Capilano is very much in tune with the general views of Canadians. Only 12 per cent indicated that they would support legislation to prevent all abortions, but 69 per cent indicated that abortion should be a matter of choice between a woman and her doctor during the early stages of pregnancy.

Despite the strongly held views people might have on religious grounds against abortion, and I appreciate those views, I think we have to consider that the majority of Canadians believe that abortion, certainly in the earlier stages of pregnancy, should be a choice between the woman and her physician. Those who feel strongly on the other side of the question should have the right to promulgate their views, to try to encourage women to pursue other options. I would hope as well that they and all of us would pursue more options to encourage all people to be more responsible with respect to reproduction. We should be encouraging Planned Parenthood

and other organizations so that these women are not faced with the question of unwanted pregnancies. I think people should make their views known, but I would ask them not to constrain my right as an individual with what in my mind is a minority view that there should be a law imposed on the majority. I do not think the majority accepts that.

I want to share with the House some of the comments of my constituents when they wrote to me on this issue. I received many letters on both sides of the issue, but these are some of the comments I thought particularly interesting:

> There may be numerous instances where abortion is the only choice available for the woman involved. I feel that no one has the right to tell me what to do with my body. I am a responsible person who takes precautions at all times but if I found myself facing an unwanted pregnancy, it would be that one chance in a thousand or more where birth control fails. No one should force me to carry through with such an unwanted pregnancy.

And another constituent wrote:

> As each case is different in nature, it should be judged on its individual merits by the woman involved with advice from her doctor, not ruled by some blanket across-the-board law.

And a third constituent wrote:

> Each person has a responsibility to decide their own future. Whatever choice they make, they have to live with it.

And finally:

> Women must have the fundamental right to decide according to their own conscience on this matter. There should be no interference from those holding a particular religious view. Separate church and state, in justice to all living women.

I would like to conclude by speaking to the motion itself and to the suggestions I have already laid on the table for some amendments which I feel would substantially improve the motion. They would bring it in line with what I believe to be the opinion of the majority of Canadians. They would certainly bring it much closer to my own views.

The motion as it stands, in trying to find that very difficult and delicate balance between the right of a woman to liberty and security of her person, and the responsibility of society to protect the unborn, still provides too many constraints on that right of choice for the woman in the early stages of pregnancy. It still requires a qualified medical practitioner to be of the opinion that the continuation of the pregnancy would or would likely threaten her physical or mental well-being. It seems that that is someone else telling me that it threatens or does not threaten my life or well-being. I do not accept that. I believe it must be my choice, in consultation with my physician, as to whether I want to proceed with an abortion.

• (1740)

I have laid before the House an amendment which would delete that provision in the first part. It would mean that in the early stages of pregnancy it would be the right of the woman to choose. In the early stages of pregnancy I feel that the requirement to have two physicians is onerous. It is arbitrary. I do not believe that it would withstand a court challenge. In fact it could result in delays which could be detrimental to the health or life of the mother.

I feel it should be only one qualified medical practitioner who is of the opinion that the continuation of the pregnancy would or would likely endanger the woman's life, or seriously endanger her health. In that respect we have to be sure that health is interpreted as it is by the United Nations to include both the physical and mental health of the mother. In many cases tests are not available until later in the stages, tests which detect serious foetal abnormalities and which could have a serious impact on the woman's mental health. She would then still have the right, in consultation with her physician, to choose how to terminate the pregnancy at that point. Generally speaking, that is an extremely rare situation but we must provide for such situations as well.

I know people sometimes say that on the Progressive Conservative side of the House there are not too many of us who are strong advocates of a choice position. There is a large group of Tories for choice in my City of Vancouver with whom I have been working, as well as a group in Toronto.

The National Progressive Conservative Women's Federation passed a motion which indicated that we believe that the final decision to have an abortion during the first phase of pregnancy should rest with the woman. I want to put that on the record because, as we will see during this debate, this is not an issue which breaks down on Party lines. It is an issue which breaks down on one's own philosophical view, one's own moral view. Ultimately, for me, it is my view as to the rights of a woman.

I am asking colleagues on all sides of the House to support the amendments which I have tabled. I think that with these amendments the motion before the House could truly provide guidance to the Government. It could result in some legislation which would find that appropriate balance of the life, the security of the woman and the potential concern over the developing foetus.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I thank the Hon. Member for filing the amendment earlier today. The Chair would like to recognize the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier on debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, this debate on a motion dealing with abortion is unfortunate because it will not produce any concrete results, it will not give Canadians any firm direction, and it will not give us legislation that will satisfy anyone in this country. It is too bad the Government did not have the courage to table a Bill because of the divisions within its Party on this issue, and it is also regrettable that this is the second motion to be put before the House, a motion which I find unacceptable because it is neither hot nor cold, ignores the real issues and does not offer any kind of solution.

Mr. Speaker, when last January the Supreme Court of Canada handed down its decision in the case of the Queen versus Dr. Henry Morgantaler, Dr. Leslie Frank Smoling and Dr. Robert Scott, everyone was taken by surprise, and after giving the problem some serious thought, the Government announced, through the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) that it would react with celerity, and that it would shortly table new legislation that would meet the legal test, in other words, it would contain the kind of legal language that would stand the test of the courts. In an interview he gave on March 18 of this year,

[*English*]

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) is quoted as saying, in an article in *The Ottawa Citizen* of March 18, 1988, the following:

> The federal Government won't wait for a Law Reform Commission report before it introduces a new abortion law . . . It is necessary to act on an urgent basis.

That was some six months ago. We are now faced, after several months, with a motion which, in my view, will not satisfy anyone. It will not give Canadians that new law on an urgent basis.

I am satisfied that at least my Party, the Liberal Party, will have a free vote on this issue. I think that it is a good thing for Members of Parliament to express through a free vote their views on issues such as abortion. We expressed our views on the death penalty. On these difficult moral and ethical issues we have to stand and tell our constituents where we stand. I think that is good. People can say: "Well, my Member voted against the death penalty. He is not in favour of this motion put forward by the Government on abortion because basically he has been saying for the last 16 years in the riding of Ottawa—Vanier that he is against abortion on demand. He has said that repeatedly before every election". I am one of those who believe that there are reasons, serious reasons, to justify interrupting a pregnancy when the health of the mother is threatened, or when the individual has been violently and sometimes strongly emotionally affected by rape, or is the object of such a heinous crime as incest.

In my riding the people understand that abortion cannot be used as a means of contraception. I know that the people in my riding who hold the other view do not think that I am being very supportive of the free choice movement, but I am neither pro-life nor pro-choice. I believe that the pro-choice movement, the extreme pro-choice movement, does not represent a view which I can defend. I do not think that the pro-life movement, the extreme of that movement, represents my views either. I have said so over the years to them. In my riding I have been called the worst traditionalist there is. If being a traditionalist means standing up for certain things, then I am a traditionalist.

I want to talk about the need for legislation and why I think this motion is wrong. However, I want to talk about the difficulty that we are having in the country with the lack of leadership of the Government in terms of giving Canadians a clear and unequivocal stand on where the Cabinet sits and on what it does. That is the parliamentary system as I know it. They have been elected and chosen to administer and to make proposals to the House. The House is then supposed to dispose of them in a democratic fashion.

• (1750)

I do not think that the Government can get away by hiding behind a wishy-washy motion such as the one before us, which is procedurally correct, thank you very much. The first motion, Motion No. 25, was not procedurally correct. We told the Government that. This one is procedurally correct and, by unanimous consent, we have accepted that debate be limited, but everybody will have a chance. All those who want to speak can come into the House until six o'clock tomorrow morning—if they have the patience—and state their views. Tomorrow the same scenario will apply, starting at three o'clock until six o'clock, Thursday morning. There is the possibility for some 60 to 70 people to speak. That will be a minority of the House, but at least it will be a debate which is open to all those who want to participate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why I truly believe the Government showed a lack of courage and leadership by not tabling a Bill is that legislation would give Canadians some clear and specific parameters on the issue of abortion. In a motion, which has no force of law, it is hard to describe and define what one wants to say, while legislation, with its definitions and terms and the way it is drafted, can give us a much broader range of understanding by the way it defines those terms.

This motion, Motion No. 36 before the House today, does not provide a definition of health and does not define what the motion means when it says, in the second paragraph:

> When, during the early stages of pregnancy: a qualified medical practitioner . . .

What are the early stages of pregnancy? To be defined. And further, when we read:

> When during the subsequent stages of pregnancy . . .

What is the subsequent stage? Somebody in my riding explained: The early stages are from the beginning to the middle and the subsequent stages from the middle to the end.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, there was a very important debate in Great Britain recently on a motion to restrict access to abortion to 18 weeks, as opposed to 22 or 23 weeks. The motion was defeated. I am told that in France, women can have an abortion on demand in the first 10 weeks, but that afterwards it is rather difficult. In Canada, there is no limit, but the Government does not say what it means by "earlier stages of pregnancy" and "subsequent stages". No, it leaves that to possible amendments from Members. That is not courageous, nor is it very clear.

For example, a Bill could have made it possible to meet women's needs in more than one way. Certainly, it would have had to deal with the question of abortion as such, that is whether abortion should be allowed or not, under what conditions an abortion could be performed, and at what stage of pregnancy. This would have to be clear and explicit in the Bill. Such a Bill would have made it possible to provide alternatives to abortion, like special counselling programs, for example, with professionals who, by giving a pregnant woman psychological support, would make it possible to avoid abortion in some cases, because the woman would at least have other alternatives available to her.

For example, a program could be set up to provide clinics where competent people could give not only women but also families and couples social, cultural or financial support to help them through the difficulties facing them. There is nothing like that now throughout the country. It does exist in some centres, but not everywhere in the country. Such programs might well be successful in some cases and provide less drastic solutions than abortion.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for us to pass judgement on who should authorize an abortion or who should be entitled to have one. It is not an easy decision to make.

If the Government had assumed its responsibilities, it would have presented a Bill, as I said, that would provide a recourse and support from the community, from health professionals, by providing an appropriate, fair, understanding response to the serious needs of women in difficulty; I am sure that worthwhile alternatives could be found.

This problem is not insoluble. It is not necessarily a legal issue or strictly a health issue. It may be a moral, ethical or social issue for some. In Canada, it may also be a matter of whether one lives in a remote region that does not provide access to the same quality of health care as other regions. It is not an insoluble problem, Mr. Speaker; it is just a matter of showing leadership. You must think about it and act.

In 1988, we should think of the whole question of human reproduction; every day, we hear reports of troubling experiments on human life. And abortion is only part of this problem. It is a big issue, I admit, but it must be dealt with and solved quickly in the best interest of all Canadians.

But it is not the only part. We must deal quickly with the matter of *in vitro* fertilization. Yesterday evening, again, there was a program on the national CBC network about *in vitro* fertilization. Fertility clinics and genetic manipulation will certainly upset Canadians, men and women. The problem of surrogate mothers must also be considered. Modern technology and medicine now pose a major moral problem for us and we, legislators, must for once take a pro-active role in this.

We cannot afford to wait for the Supreme Court or other courts to throw the ball back to the politicians, to us here in the House of Commons. We must study these issues now and react immediately.

There is more and more talk about foetal tissue cultures for transplantation. This poses a serious moral problem. Will foetuses be cultivated only for their use as raw material? Can we in all conscience allow this? Will we have foetus farms, laboratories to grow human tissues and foetuses so that organs like the liver, heart or eyes can be taken from them? That may seem like science fiction, Mr. Speaker, but it is on its way. It has already arrived. We recently saw foetal cells transplanted into the brain of some people suffering from Parkinson's disease, for example. This procedure has already been developed and demonstrated.

The door has also been opened to possible large-scale organ transplants. And, Mr. Speaker, we must ask whether this is a legal question, a medical question or just a social and ethical question. I think that it is most important to discuss it.

I know that this debate does not deal directly with the abortion issue, but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the motion before us will solve nothing, because the problem is much bigger. In this debate we must state whether we are for or against the motion, and I have said clearly where I stand: I am against the motion because it falls far short of my moral or social standards, as I see it, nor does it embody the essential elements of a legislative position.

Mr. Speaker, another reason which calls for legislation rather than a simple motion is that a statute would make it possible to offer a much wider array of options than does a simple motion of principle.

I am one of those who believe that, on ethical and moral grounds, unrestricted abortion, abortion on demand is unacceptable. As I said earlier, there are circumstances where such an option can be justified. This is why I favour abortion when medical evidence indicates that pregnancy may endanger the woman's life. In such cases—and I am not qualified to make the decision—we have to rely on the opinion of the physician or the qualified medical team. Should these health professionals conclude that the mother's life is seriously threatened and recommend an abortion, then I sincerely believe we should allow the procedure.

Finally, there is a last category which I think ought to be accepted, and I referred to this ealier in my remarks. I am talking about cases where pregnancy is the result of criminal or violent behaviour. I am thinking particularly of incidents of rape and incest. From a psychological standpoint, Mr. Speaker, such situations are difficult enough to live through for both the victim and her parents, and I think this psychological trauma justifies ending the pregnancy. A woman who is the victim of such an act of violence should have the right to seek an abortion during the first weeks of pregnancy if that is her decision and, of course, if that option is recommended by health professionals.

In simple terms, Mr. Speaker, that is my position. I am not a lawyer. I did not want to debate Criminal Code Section 251 nor say that it is a legal issue because I do not believe it is a legal issue. It is a matter of ethics with far-reaching socio-

economic components. It is a personal matter which each of us has to settle as he or she sees fit.

For the record, I wanted to make my position clear. I do not see how I could be more convincing than by saying that I am pro-life, Mr. Speaker. Of course I am. That is how I voted throughout my life. I am not a violent man. I believe that abortion on request is an exaggerated and immoderate approach, therefore a bad option as far as I am concerned. That is a personal position which I am prepared to uphold and defend.

• (1800)

[*English*]

Mr. John Oostrom (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to be able to participate in this very important debate. I believe that there are only two positions in this debate. Either one is for life or one is against life. Any position in between is pure hypocrisy. The abortion issue, simply put, is black and white. Therefore, I cannot support the Government's motion. From the time of the ancient Greeks until recently, western civilization has condemned abortion and has traditionally upheld and honoured the Hippocratic oath.

A pagan physician, Hippocrates, wrote the oath to serve as a medical and ethical guide for students in roughly 367 B.C. Hippocrates said, and I quote: "I will give no deadly medicine to anyone if asked, nor suggest any such counsel; and in like manner, I will not give to woman a pessary to produce abortion."

Taking the oath has customarily been a part of medical school graduation, but lately the part on abortion has been dropped by many schools. Although Hippocrates lived in a pagan civilization, abortion was unmistakably condemned. One wonders if civilization has really progressed over the last 2,000 years.

Opposition to abortion was reflected almost universally by the world's great religions—Hinduism, Islam, and in ancient Vedic spiritual writings in India. With Judaism, from 1200 B.C., there was a strong tradition of opposition to abortion.

Christianity, at the same it emerged in the Mediterranean area during the 1st century A.D., strongly upheld the censure of abortion as a major moral principle. This prohibition was one of the distinctive behavioural injunctions of the early Christian church. The Christian community became vocal in the 2nd century and emphatically deplored and condemned abortion at any stage of pregnancy. Therefore, it is apparent that all societies, regardless of whether or not they had any religious beliefs, were universally consistent on abortion. Abortion was universally condemned as the taking of life or, simply put, murder.

As our society became more and more technologically advanced, religious beliefs began to wane. Science became the vehicle on which mankind began to rely. History has shown that the more a society becomes advanced the less it relies on religious and moral teachings. However, in the case of life, science has provided irrefutable evidence that life does begin at conception.

Science tells us that when the sperm and ovum unite, they become a complete genetic package programmed for development into a mature adult. Nothing will be added except time and nutrition. Each stage of development from fertilization to old age is merely a maturing of what is entirely there from the start. To put it in better perspective, the fertilized egg is like a computer chip. A genetic program to produce the person is already there.

Even pro-abortion journals admit that life does begin at conception. An editorial in the pro-abortion journal *California Medicine* of September, 1970, states, and I quote: "The reverence of each human life has been a keystone of western medicine, and is the ethic which has caused physicians to try to preserve, protect, repair, prolong, and enhance every human life.

Since the old ethic has not yet been fully displaced, it has been necessary to separate the idea of abortion from the idea of killing which continues to be socially abhorrent. The rest has been a curious avoidance of the scientific fact, which everyone really knows, the human life begins at conception, and it is continuous, whether intra- or extra-uterine, until death. The very considerable semantic gymnastics which are required to rationalize abortion as anything but taking a human life would be ludicrous if they were not often put forth under socially impeccable auspices." The pro-abortion journal pulls no punches. It recognizes that the concept that life begins at conception is the tenet in which the majority of the population still believes.

The overwhelming number of abortions are conducted for purely social and economic reasons. There is no thought given to the innocent life which is about to be destroyed. The rationale which the pro-abortionists use to justify this barbaric act is to describe abortion as socially acceptable and as a means for a woman to control her own body. By appealing to the feminist principle of a woman controlling her own body, the true reality of the abortion act is shielded. In fact, we are using the argument of the self to dictate supremacy over everything else. The self is the only thing that matters, an innocent life is only an appendage and the father is merely a participant in an act. It is only when we take time to examine the true facts that a truly rational decision can be reached.

• (1810)

When the law changed in 1969, health became the key word. The generally accepted definition of health by 1973 was that of the World Health Organization. Health is a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.

In Canada, physicians gave health unlimited interpretation. Therefore, abortions can be performed for "health" reasons

such as interruption of education or career, social embarrassment, sexual preference for a child, and so on. In fact, according to official statistics, 95 per cent of all abortions in the western world are performed on alleged psychiatric grounds. It would seem legitimate to ask how the psychiatrist arrived at the conclusion that having an unwanted child will result in complete psychiatric breakdown.

As a result of this, according to Statistics Canada there were 11,200 abortions in 1970, the first year of legalization. In 1985, the last year for which complete statistics are available, StatsCan reported that the number had risen to 60,956, an increase of over 260 per cent in 15 years. Even more startling is the fact that abortions outnumber live births in some Canadian cities, and there is an increasing number of women having multiple abortions. StatsCan reported that the repeat abortion rate in 1975, women who were having their second or subsequent abortion, was 8.6 per cent; 12.9 per cent in 1978; 18.9 per cent in 1983; and in 1985 it had reached 20.4 per cent.

It is apparent from these statistics that abortion is being used as a method of birth control. Abortion as a means of contraception is probably one of the most reprehensible acts that an individual can commit. In today's society there simply is no excuse for not being aware of the various methods of contraception available. Abortion cheapens the value of life. The ability to terminate a pregnancy with minimum discomfort gives individuals a lax attitude toward the sanctity of life. The greater ease with which abortion is conducted will serve to further desensitize the population into disregarding the value of human life. The more we do that, the more apt we are to inflict more injustices on our society.

Science has now given us the means by which we can tell if a baby is to be born defective, retarded, handicapped, and what sex it will be. Should these individuals be aborted? Do we have the right to play God? I want to read to you a newspaper report of an attempted abortion in 1981 as reported by the Philadelphia *Enquirer*:

> A woman's scream broke the late night quiet and brought two young obstetrical nurses rushing to Room 4456 of the University of Nebraska Medial Centre.
>
> The patient, admitted for an abortion, had been injected thirty hours earlier with a salt solution, which normally kills the fetus and causes the patient to deliver a mass of lifeless tissue, in a process similar to a miscarriage.
>
> This time, though, something had gone wrong. When nurse Marilyn Wilson flicked on the lights and pulled back the covers, she found, instead of a still-born fetus she'd expected, a live two and one-half pound baby boy, crying and moving his arms and legs there on the bed.
>
> Dismayed, the second nurse, Joanie Fuchs, gathered the squirming infant in loose bed covers, dashed down the corridor and called to the other nurses for help. She did not take the baby to an intensive care nursery, but deposited it instead on the stainless steel drainboard of a sink in the maternity unit's dirty utility room—a large closet where bedpans are emptied and dirty linens stored. Other nurses and a resident doctor gathered and gaped.
>
> Finally, a head nurse telephoned the patient's physician, Doctor C. J. Labenz, at home, apparently waking him. "He told me to leave it where it was" the head nurse testified later, "just to watch it for a few minutes, that it would probably die in a few minutes".

This type of incident occurs more than 400 times a year, according to the Centre for Disease Control, and those are just the documented cases.

It is ironic that a criminal proven guilty has more protection under the law than the unborn. Just stop and think about it. The guilty criminal has more protection than an unborn human being today. The unborn are innocent, yet their fate is determined with very little or no consideration at all. Compare the consideration given the unborn to that given a criminal in our justice system and it becomes apparent that something is very wrong with our morality.

Once life has begun it has the right to reach its natural end. By destroying life to ensure one's economic and social success, the human race is losing its honour and dignity. A human race now reaching for the stars must not be allowed to regress to the level where life has only a relative value. The whole existence of mankind has been toward the protection of human life. It represents an ultimate value. Therefore, protection cannot be limited and no distinction can be made between unborn and born life.

During World War II we abhorred the holocaust of the born, and today we must abhor the holocaust of the unborn. Life is sacred in all its stages, thus any attempt to define or legislate the beginning of human life as occurring at some point other than at conception would not be based on either biological or moral fact, but on arbitrarily chosen terms which merely describe stages of the embryological development of the human organism.

Therefore, it must be realized that the personhood of the human being is an intrinsic quality derived from the very fact of his or her existence as a human being. It is not derived from man-made law. Personhood, since it is always present while the human being has life, and is a concomitant of human life, cannot be awarded to, diminished, or withdrawn from any human being by Parliament or any judicial action. As a result, I cannot vote for the government motion and I therefore present an amendment to the motion which will recognize life as the only value which is supreme, and the innocent will be protected from the point of conception onwards. Therefore, I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Welland (Mr. Pietz): that all the words in the motion after the words "should prohibit the performance of an abortion," be deleted and the following substituted therefor: "While allowing those medical treatments which are necessary to prevent the death of the mother or to remedy a condition that, if left untreated, would cause the death of the mother."

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member's amendment will be tabled as agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Lise Bourgault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact and in this parliamentary debate, I am pro-life. In any case, how can anyone be against life? However, contrary to

those who hold radical positions on both sides of the issue, I have a practical and realistic approach towards this social dilemma which the Members of this House are called upon to resolve.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Government could not introduce a Bill at this point in time. Those who say otherwise have not, to my mind, thought about all the measures which will have to be taken into consideration when drawing up a Bill on abortion. And, in any case, is a possible social consensus on abortion? That is the main issue.

The 282 members of this House are asked to be the Canadian people's conscience. I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not fair, that it is sheer nonsense that a Member of Parliament he or she, in the course of his or her duties, should have to legislate on women's morality. Obviously, I quite appreciate the fact that there should be laws to protect life and that it is the duty of this House to enact rules aimed at guaranteeing the safety and freedom of this country's citizens. From time immemorial, the laws and regulations which govern us have been promulgated by men.

• (1820)

Women have had practically no say in the matter until today, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that people are more concerned about the result than about the reasons for an unwanted pregnancy. Mr. Speaker, when one holds the reins of power, one must be reasonable. After all, to govern is to do what is possible.

I speak as the Member for Argenteuil—Papineau, but my comments on abortion come from the heart of a woman and the mind of a Member of Parliament. I want my constituents to know why I cannot support the demands of the pro-life movement which wants to make abortion illegal, nor those of the pro-choice movement which wants abortion on demand. I am in favour of a realistic approach that takes into account the daily lives of women and mothers, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of a solution that would go halfway, setting a legal limit of 18 weeks on abortion. Women must exercise their rights within limits that can be scientifically determined. Our technology today is, in any case, able to determine the exact number of weeks of a foetus.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the pro-life position and its enforcement are a paradox. How could the Government enforce regulations arising from an anti-abortion law? If you ask members of pro-life who, I may add, and I want to make this quite clear, take a position that is entirely praiseworthy, if you ask them whether they want a pregnant woman to be thrown into jail, they will answer: Of course not. So we must be realistic. After all, the Government would look pretty silly if it tabled legislation that was unenforceable. These are all aspects which the anti-abortion groups have failed to consider. Abortion has always existed. If women can't get an abortion here, they will go across the border.

Mr. Speaker, abortions carried out by the woman herself or by some charlatan have had, and would have, a very serious impact on fertility. We have heard the horror stories about women who used the services of the worst kind of backroom butchers to obtain an abortion. To allow, within reasonable limits and based on the common sense of the woman involved, access to therapeutic abortions, preceded and followed by psychological care, would minimize the physical and mental side effects for women. Mr. Speaker, one or more abortions may be followed by wanted pregnancies. There are hundred of examples of women who at some time in their lives had an abortion and subsequently gave birth to one or more children. That is why abortions must be carried out under proper conditions. Making abortion illegal would mean going back to the dark ages. It would not reduce the number of abortions, and anyone who says so is sadly mistaken. With good psychological support, couples will learn to take a responsible attitude towards pregnancy.

Mr. Speaker, how does one make the father feel more responsibility for an unwanted pregnancy? Would those who want to make abortion illegal and in so doing, as I was just explaining, take drastic measures, even going so far as to create prisons for pregnant women, agree to punish the man who should have put on a condom before having sex?

The advocates of free choice, for their part, are too radical. Again, it is the duty of sex partners to protect themselves from unwanted pregnancies. I find the use of abortion as a means of contraception totally repugnant, especially since taxpayers must contribute to a woman's third, fourth, fifth, sixth abortion, and so on. The positions of the pro-choice movement are too broad and too vague for me to endorse them. One must still have enough common sense and intelligence to realize that there have been abuses and that they would continue if abortion were unlimited.

Mr. Speaker, I can understand the churches' position; it is deeply rooted and laudable. I can tell you this evening that I will not personally feel myself less Catholic tomorrow morning by voting for the Government to submit later a Bill limiting but not banning abortion, because my conscience as an elected representative of the people is not involved but rather the conscience of a woman who will make a decision with her doctor in a definite period of time. As legislators, how can we judge and condemn another person's moral feelings? How can we as legislators claim to improve the people's moral standards? It is impossible. Women have abortions for many reasons. A woman who decides to have an abortion is profoundly unhappy.

Have we in conscience really got to the bottom of these causes? As a society, have we thought of how to remedy the deep problems of women who, as you know, Mr. Speaker, have in the great majority of cases to care for their children after a divorce or separation? The statistics are overwhelming: three quarters of single-parent women—and most single-parent families are headed by women—live below the poverty line and the situation of childless women who have left their parents' or

husband's home as a result of family breakdown is hardly any better. Instead of engaging in sterile, illogical debates on abortion, we should try to set policies to really encourage people to have children and to correct the shortcomings of our society. If we want to be honest with ourselves and admit it for once, the present policies do not encourage families to have several children. We build dwellings with only one bedroom. It costs less. For a woman with two, three or four children to use public transport today is quite a feat. Has this problem been thought of?

A number of individuals have made the point that falling birth rates and adoption problems were mainly due to abortion.

Nothing could be farther from the truth in my view! We are now living in 1988, and when a woman brings her pregnancy to term, she keeps her child. It is extremely rare that a woman, in spite of her solitude, her emotional, financial and other problems, chooses to give her child away for adoption. That was done in 1938, not 1988!

Decreasing birth rates are this century's burden. It is my hope that nobody in this House nor even outside will think that women are to blame. We are facing a scary increase in violence against women and children, from men albeit distressed and desperate no doubt, but still from men. Are we considering those abused children, those horror stories we read in the papers?

Would those who would legislate against abortion think for a minute, deep down in their conscience, of those serious problems experienced by women, a large proportion of Canadian women in the native, visible minority and other groups? Again, there are a number of factors involved in falling birth rates, and it is my deepest hope today that provinces will join the Canadian Government in asking for a Royal inquiry on all aspects of the future of families into the 21st Century and on measures that will have to be taken now to promote higher birth rates.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this Government when preparing the legislation that of necessity will follow the vote on the motion now before us, will reflect the wisdom of Members in this House who reflect the views of their constituents. I have the deep conviction that a very strong consensus will emerge in favour of a middle ground.

Moreover, I urge government Ministers to consider right now, not tomorrow, as a preventive measure, a campaign of information and popular education, and I stress popular, Mr. Speaker, among young people and the general population, and that as a minimum, increased help and financial support will encourage mothers to complete their pregnancy.

Mr. Speaker, when we go back to our constituencies and meet young women who have to care for a young child on a welfare cheque that is hardly one sixteenth of the weekly pay of a Member of Parliament, Mr. Speaker, how can we claim that such a woman can decently live, while sharing the joy of life, bringing up a child under conditions that will necessarily lead to that child growing under conditions that are totally conducive to his or her personal growth?

Mr. Speaker, only then shall we solve for the major part that delicate question of abortion in the interests of Canadians.

• (1830)

Mr. Alain Tardif (Richmond—Wolfe): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to take part in the consideration of the important issue now before the House.

Like my colleague from Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier), Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to object to the Government's past and present handling of this important matter.

Abortion is obviously a very currrent subject much discussed every day in every way, mostly in the media. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Bouchard) recently said that he did not want an election as long as the House had not settled this important matter, lest the next election become the ideal forum for both schools of thought on this major issue.

I think that statement brings out the significance of the problem. Despite the scope of the discussion and the depth of the issue under review, the Government merely put forward a kind of compromise motion which does not satisfy either side and represents, from what the Government's spokesman is saying, an attempt to take a sense of the House.

In the circumstances, I deplore that systematic refusal to settle or approach the issue head-on so that the Canadian people know once and for all where the Government stands.

As I emphasized before, this is a very important matter. I have been a Member of this House for over nine years and, Mr. Speaker, despite the big problems and major issues that surfaced in those nine years, no other question has given rise to so many responses, meetings, papers and letters in my constituency. I have certainly received several thousand very moving pleas from persons—women in most cases—who, for the first time in their lives, have gone to the trouble of writing to their Member of Parliament to state their preoccupations and their apprehensions concerning this very important issue.

In the course of all these exchanges and experiences it is obvious that I have had to express my views and attitudes on the matter. I do not think that it is possible for any Canadian man or woman to have no opinion on this issue, particularily in view of the fact that those on both sides of the issue have provided so much information and lobbied so powerfully. I therefore believe that in some way or another just about all Canadian men and women have committed themselves one way or the other.

It is an important choice in a person's life, a choice based, to some extent, on personal experience.

As a lawyer, I have had the opportunity over the years to get acquainted with the regulations and the legislation on abortion. As a politician, I have also seen alarming statistics on the

subject; if I am not mistaken, nearly 100 000 abortions are performed every year in Canada. However, their number varies considerably from one region to another. The access and the criteria also varies considerably. The interpretation of the regulations was very liberal in some places and very conservative in others, and there were places where the matter was just not considered at all. These regulations had tragic repercussions in many ways since they created situations that were totally discriminatory. There were cases where the lady, the young woman who wanted an abortion could get one without any problem or restriction as opposed to other regions, other places where it was definitely impossible and unacceptable to get an abortion, very often even when it was justified.

• (1840)

That is a reality which we must, I think, take into consideration. It is a reality which must be taken into account in any debate like the one we are having in this House.

Here is another reality. I have three sons of whom I am very proud, three sons who have given me and obviously still give me the joys of fatherhood, of family life. I am obviously aware that my view in this matter is somewhat biased, given the fact that my experience of the family unit is not, admittedly, the general rule.

As a practicing lawyer, I have seen young couples who, not being able to have children and knowing that a woman was about to give birth, have asked me to take the necessary steps in order to get a private adoption. These couples were absolutely distressed, absolutely traumatized by their incapacity to have children and were hoping to adopt a child. In the light of these experiences, I have come to the conclusion that I am definitely pro-life, in the sense that I am systematically and staunchly opposed to what could be called abortion on request.

Yet, although I feel somewhat uncomfortable, I must be candid about it and recognize that no matter how much experience or knowledge I may have as a man, there is no way I could describe or define what a woman might go through at a time when beside being pregnant she must face harsh, cruel and painful realities, such as the possible loss of her job. I do not think that a man can understand what a woman goes through in such a situation.

There are circumstances where a woman, for economic reasons, cannot even consider, either directly or indirectly, the possibility of living a reasonably decent life with a child.

Such is also the situation of any young girl who suddenly realizing that she is pregnant is deeply traumatized by the thought that her parents might find out—and I could go on and on like this—Therefore I feel that under these quite particular circumstances, I am not qualified as a man to appreciate what women go through in such circumstances. However, I think that as legislators, we must deal with this issue, and that is why I said at the outset of my remarks that it is unfortunate that we should address this important issue through a simple motion which, really, does not solve anything.

I think that, as lawmakers, we had and still have the obligation to propose to the Canadian public a framework which is more complete and thorough, in order to develop eventually a society where a person faced with such an important decision will not be alone, but will be able to rely on sufficient resources readily available to overlook all the constraints which I listed before.

As a matter of fact, the situation in a great many respects is quite unacceptable, because there is hardly any place where a woman could seek the advice of resource people about the possibility of keeping her child. I feel that, quite the contrary, over the past few years, many women have been using abortion as a means of family planning.

These days it has become a rather simple exercise. I was even told that a young secondary school student could indeed enter the school at 1 p.m. and leave three hours later after having an abortion without her parents being told about it. I suggest that over the years there has been totally unwarranted and intolerable acceptance and that it is incumbent upon us as legislators and Government spokesmen, not to make the decision on behalf of women, for that is their personal choice, but to propose solutions, provide financial resources and do everything we can to defend and support the cause so that people will more readily think in terms of pro-life rather than follow what appears to have been the prevailing trend over the past few years and say not to worry, it is always possible to have an abortion.

Personally, I think it is important to say where I stand on this issue. I feel that in such particular and specific situations as when the health of the mother is at stake, when her health is involved, then we should have no hesitation and let the woman, the mother make up her own mind. In the resolution I refer to a consultation with the attending physician. I am not sure that is the ideal formula, for the very simple reason that there is a danger of reverting to the situation that prevailed some time ago, namely that some have more conscience than others, disparities will exist depending on which province or area you live in, so much so that eventually, for lack of a very specific framework, there will be situations where unfortunately there will be basic disparities or discrimination, under which the well-off can find services that may not necessarily be available in their own areas. I think that specific aspect is of vital importance when discussing this major issue. All Canadian women without exception, in all areas, in all provinces without any exception, should be able to rely on a framework within which they are equal, regardless of their place of origin of their place of residence.

The other aspect, and I think this was the subject of a number of speeches, the fact of becoming pregnant by reason of a criminal act, Mr. Speaker, again is a situation where the mother should have the unequivocal right to decide whether she should continue or stop the child's development.

Mr. Speaker, there is also an important question that eventually will have to be solved in my view, that is the time

element. Some have proposed 10 weeks, 15 or 20 weeks. I think science is sufficiently advanced to come up, if a date must be set, with a number of weeks, the smallest possible number of weeks so as to lessen the major controversy regarding the beginning of life. I know that in some countries the reference is to 10 weeks, in others 20 weeks. I am told that in the countries where it is 20 weeks, they want to shorten that period and where it is 10 weeks, they want to extend it. But then again, if the Government had really wanted to assume its responsibilities and face this important issue, as the people expected and demanded, it could have put forward a bill including all these elements so that we could have found a common ground which, while not pleasing everybody, would have assured Canadian women of fair and equitable treatment, taking into account of course the North American reality. On the other hand, if we moved towards very strict and restrictive legislation and regulations, a large number of Canadian women would circumvent them by going to places that are a lot more permissive.

During this important debate, I had the opportunity to meet and discuss with a number of representatives, particularly from the Pro-Life movement, with whom I talked a lot. I totally agree with some of their arguments.

My colleague just gave me a document which says in paragraph 4: "The only solution to abortion is adoption. Thousands of couples are waiting to get permission to adopt children." We have heard of all the procedures, problems and long delays such couples must go through before finally being authorized to adopt children. It has been admitted that it could be a very good approach, but it must also be understood that a couple's problem cannot be solved at the expense of the mother. I think a massive effort must be made to encourage more women to complete their pregnancies, to give those couples who want a child, or hope for one as many chances as possible of adopting one. We could not say that men and women who wish to adopt a child will see their problem solved because abortion would be banned from now on. I do not see it as an acceptable way of solving this issue, all the more so since I believe what is required is an effort, and that is where things get very difficult, for greater awareness and enhancing, efforts on ressources, on available services, to be able to correct a course that seems to have started, unfortunately, in the last few years.

I conclude and summarize, Mr. Speaker, by declaring myself as pro-life. My pro-life position is non-exclusive as that demonstrated by some of my colleagues, but pro-life in the hope that regulations will eventually de-criminalize that aspect, that there will be generous consideration of the very specific cases I described earlier, particularly when the health of the mother is at risk, when the pregnancy is the result of a criminal act, cases which, in my opinion, it would be entirely acceptable and reasonable to consider in the regulations the country will adopt eventually.

• (1850)

[*English*]

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York—Peel): Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to be given an opportunity to speak in this debate which is the most important debate, as far as subject matter is concerned, to come before this Parliament. I say that because we are dealing with a life or death situation with respect to abortion. Before getting into the body of my remarks, however, I would like to state my position. We have a motion before us which I cannot support for what I feel are three very important reasons.

First, I cannot support this motion because it does not clearly declare that the unborn is a human being. Second, I cannot support the motion because it does not invoke Section 33 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to ensure that any future legislation will be effective in the wake of the Supreme Court of Canada judgment to which some of our Members have already referred. Third, I cannot support this motion because it does not place the burden of proof on those who would snuff out the lives of the unborn by abortion. In my opinion, it is that group which should be required to show that such lives should be ended.

Having said that, let me say that I have already filed with the Clerk of the House an amendment that I hope will be considered. Immediately after the preamble of the motion, I propose that notwithstanding Section 7 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, such legislation giving pre-eminence to the protection of all life, and recognizing that the foetus is a human being, should prohibit the performance of an abortion except when first, two independent qualified medical practitioners in good faith and on reasonable grounds state that in their opinion the continuation of the pregnancy would, or would likely, endanger the life of the pregnant woman. Second, the termination of such pregnancy is performed by a qualified medical practitioner and, third, the pregnancy is the result of rape or incest where, in the opinion of two qualified medical practitioners, the continuation of the pregnancy would, or would be likely to endanger the woman's life or seriously endanger her health and the termination of such pregnancy is performed by a qualified medical practitioner.

I have already filed that suggested amendment with the Chair. Let me remind the House and Hon. Members what this process is all about. The Government has asked us to consider the motion which I have indicated I cannot support, but it fully anticipates that amendments will be made and considered and that in due course the House will pass on, presumably, its amended motion and that will show the Government the sense or mood of the House concerning the question of abortion. I feel that when a free vote is the order of the day, that is a very reasonable approach for the Government to have taken. I am surprised that those spokespeople from the Official Opposition and the New Democratic Party are critical of the process. It is rather dismaying that the very act of democracy, the very act of asking Members to voice their opinion before legislation is

drafted, should so startle the two opposition groups in this House. I hope that the attitude taken by those two opposition Parties will not become, if you like, a common attitude in the House. In short, this debate, prior to the Government, through its Cabinet, drawing up legislation to deal with abortion, is a vital ingredient of what the country would like to see prior to new legislation being introduced.

That leads to the question, as some Members have already indicated, why we need any legislation. In my opinion, the Supreme Court of Canada decision has left this nation in a totally unacceptable position. That decision means today that we have no law, certainly of a criminal nature, touching on the question of abortion. We literally are in a position of having a woman pregnant in the seventh, eighth or even ninth month and, from a criminal standpoint be aborted by the abortionist with no criminal implication.

Let us just step back and think of where we are. I have just said that a child could be in its ninth month and be aborted and there would be no criminal sanction on the abortionist or any party involved. Let the child be born and, of course, the whole weight of our law would come down on the person who would dare kill that child, and rightfully so. Surely the people of Canada do not expect this House to leave that situation unattended.

• (1900)

Let me go further. This afternoon I had an opportunity to listen to the official spokesperson from the Official Opposition and then to the official spokesperson from the New Democratic Party. With respect to the Hon. Member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan), I was very disappointed to hear how vague his remarks were. He even went to the point of saying that the Charter of Rights must be upheld over any question of abortion. That was never my understanding of the Charter. I thought that the Charter was to guarantee liberties, freedoms, and certainly to guarantee the sanctity of life itself. To have the official spokesman from the Opposition say that somehow or other the Charter is supreme and that even the question of abortion should never be allowed to alter the provisions of the Charter is inherently wrong.

As far as members of the New Democratic Party are concerned, they have made it very clear that they are virtually unanimous in supporting abortion on demand. On hearing the official spokesperson today for that Party, I thought that there was a coldness, an unbelievable coldness in the remarks concerning the subject we are debating here today.

Let me put my remarks into some type of perspective. It is easy, and Members have already made this reference, to say that there are approximately 60,000 abortions performed each year. The figure trips off our tongues very easily. But let us think of what that really means. Since 1970, for example, if we add up the aggregate abortions to this year, we see that this year is a very bad year. This is the year in which we passed the one million mark in total abortions in the country since 1970—one million future Canadians snuffed out by the system that we have allowed to develop and have tolerated in Canada.

Again let me put that into perspective. What exactly does one million Canadians mean? It is the entire population of Saskatchewan. It is the entire population of Manitoba. It is more than the entire population of Nova Scotia. We are talking about one million Canadians being wiped out, taken out of our future.

If we want to relate that figure to cities, it is approximately one-half the size of Metropolitan Toronto. It is more than the size of Ottawa-Hull combined. I hope that Hon. Members will try to seize upon the magnitude of what we are talking about. To say simply that 60,000 people in the form of abortions are wiped out is one thing. But let us put that into real terms. Let us put it into a real perspective.

The NDP, and in this I often agree, often speak about the horrors of war, the tragedies, the killing and how we must do all we can to ensure that wars will not break out in the future. Again, let us put this evening's debate into perspective. When we say that 60,518 abortions occurred in 1985, let us relate that to the last war, the Second World War. In that entire five-year period the total fatalities suffered by Canadians was 51,992. In short, in the one year, 1985—and I suggest the figures hold for 1988—we wiped out more than the total fatalities suffered by Canada in World War II. In fact, if we want to add up all the fatalities that suffered by Canadians in wars since the time of Confederation we would see that it is less than 120,000. In short, as a result of abortion in two years alone we killed more future Canadians than have been killed in all the wars in which we have ever engaged as far as troop fatalities are concerned.

I say these things because I feel that sometimes we become clouded. We see it is as some type of an academic idea. What could be more real than the fact that deaths are occurring and the fact that the Parliament of Canada is being asked to somehow condone or even to facilitate these deaths?

When one says that there were over 60,000 abortions performed in 1985, one might ask what the comparison of that figure is with the leading cause of death for the same year. The leading cause of death was heart attack. We find that 58,000 Canadians died of heart attacks in 1985. Through our abortion approach we kill more future Canadians than were wiped out by the number one killer in 1985, heart attacks. The interesting thing to note is that about three-quarters of those heart attacks that occurred in later years occurred in persons over 65 years of age. If we wish to look at the 45-year or older level, we see that the bulk of deaths were as a result of heart attacks. Think of the tragedy. Those people are dying, regrettably in their more senior years, while we are allowing 60,000 other future Canadians to be killed before they even have the opportunity to be born. That is what we are talking about in this debate.

In fact, one could put it this way. As far as an infant is concerned, from its point of conception until its ultimate death

the most tricky period that it will go through is in trying to avoid the hands of the abortionist. At the present time there is one chance in six that that infant will be wiped out before it leaves the womb of its mother. That is what we are dealing with in this debate. That is what was being permitted prior to the Supreme Court of Canada's decision. One in six pregnancies ends in abortion.

Let me put that another way. If from the point of conception through to death is the most difficult period, what happens if a child is lucky enough to be born? He's away to the races. If he is a male his life expectancy is 73 years of age. If she is a female her life expectancy is 80 years of age. I ask Hon. Members to think of how critical this debate is. What we are really talking about is will we preserve a system wherein up to the point of birth a person can be killed but upon birth their life expectancy is from 73 years of age to 80 years of age. If anything happens to them, if there is a murder or other type of mortality, the person responsible will pay with a very severe criminal sentence. That is what we are talking about. I would hope that, when we weigh the pros and cons on this question, we come down on the side of the unborn.

• (1910)

In giving my reasons why I cannot support the motion before us, I have said that I do so partly because I feel the onus should be on those who want to perpetuate the abortion system to put the case through Parliament to the Government that we stand for the unborn and we want the unborn protected. I say that because when Cabinet considers whatever draft legislation may be forthcoming there will not be any unborn able to speak at that Cabinet session. It is up to this House to make it loud and clear that we feel there must be a presumption in favour of the unborn. To do that, let me come to a second reason.

I said that I disagreed with the motion because it did not use the Section 33 notwithstanding clause of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Any meaningful abortion legislation that may be decided upon by the Government must include that notwithstanding clause to be meaningful in the context of the Supreme Court of Canada's decision. I see nothing wrong with suggesting that that clause should be utilized first. Why was it put in if it was never to be utilized? If it was put in to deliberately ensure that there is that escape valve, when would one want to use it when it is a question of life or death? In commenting at that time concerning the notwithstanding clause in the Charter of Rights, Mr. Alan Borovoy, legal counsel to the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, is reported in the Canadian Press to have stated:

> Canada at the moment is a parliamentary democracy in which the will of Parliament is supreme. If there were no notwithstandings in the proposed Constitution, this supremacy would shift to the judges who would decide whether or not a law offended the Constitution.
>
> By making it legally possible but politically difficult to override the Charter, they have married the two notions . . . The result is a strong Charter with an escape valve for the legislatures.

That is counsel to the Canadian Civil Liberties Association's comment on the justification of the notwithstanding clause. I am suggesting that it is now time for we politicians to take the difficult course of saying that this is an instance when that notwithstanding clause must be invoked to ensure that the lives of future children are not snuffed out even before they are born.

Let me touch on another question. What is the mood in the country? I can tell you that I would not be making the remarks that I am tonight without consulting. I feel in my capacity as representative for York—Peel I must particularly consult with my constituents. In a poll of those responding with an opinion, 69 per cent say that they believe there should be restrictions on abortion. Eighty-one per cent say that those restrictions should apply if the life of the mother is endangered physically by the continuation of the pregnancy. This is one reason why I have included in my suggested draft that that be a ground for abortion.

I would also like to point out in dealing with the question of the Charter of Rights that 53 per cent of those responding to the question stated that they felt the Charter of Rights must protect the unborn, and I read that that they believe the notwithstanding clause that I am suggesting be used in this motion should indeed be used. It has already been commented on. Certain religious groups have made comments concerning this matter. I have received, as many Members have, undoubtedly, representations from religious groups. Some are pro-choice and some are pro-life. One of the most meaningful representations I received was from the Salvation Army. In a letter from Commissioner Will Pratt he stated:

> The century-old experience of The Salvation Army through its Women's Social Services has been that abortion is not the panacea imagined by a woman regretting a pregnancy.
>
> Usually the long-term effects on the mind and spirit of a woman who does abort are harmful. It is not unusual for a girl deliberately to become pregnant again after abortion through experiencing guilt at having "murdered my baby". Carrying the fetus to term is almost always in the best interests of the mother, her family, and society as a whole. However, where rape or incest occurred, the mental health of the mother could be a determining factor, and we believe such exceptions are covered by the clause—

—to which they have referred. That is why I included that provision, Mr. Speaker.

Finally, perhaps the most disturbing aspects of what we are discussing are not only that the total number of abortions in this country has risen from 11,000 in 1970 to a current 60,000 per year, but we find the startling fact that persons having an abortion after one abortion has now doubled. The ratio of those who are having two abortions has doubled since 1975; and most alarmingly those who are having two, three, four, and five abortions has gone up fourfold since 1975. Surely when we are experiencing that type of situation it is time that we send, through this motion, a clear message to our Government that we want a pro-life, a sympathetic piece of legislation for the unborn. That is what the House has in my suggested amendment.

Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day when we have to resort to debate on an issue as

sensitive as abortion, but I fear not having any legislation in place at all. The situation is reaching a crisis level, especially in British Columbia, but still there are those who shout for greater access and say that they have to go across the border to have an abortion.

It is a real tragedy when a woman finds herself with an unwanted pregnancy, whether or not she is married. Where can she turn for guidance, for help, and for the right direction? Are there agencies in place that will help her and tell her the options? It is this that must be addressed as we go into this debate.

In my opinion the motion before us, alone and by itself, is not satisfactory, and I will speak further on it in my address on the amendment that I believe should be put in place to correct the approach of the motion.

The statistics tell the story. Since 1969 the number of abortions authorized under Section 18 of the Criminal Code increased yearly with the exceptions of 1981, 1983, 1985. The abortion rate per 100 live births remained steady at 16.5 deaths in 1985 and 1984, and then dropped to 16.2 in 1985. For the Province of British Columbia, the rate was the highest in Canada. There were 26.1 abortions per live births or a figure of 11,264. For every 100 live births there were 26 abortions in British Columbia. In 1985 from Statistics Canada figures we see that 89 per cent of abortions that were performed were performed before 13 weeks of pregnancy. In 1985 that represented 54,226 abortions of a total of 60,900 for that year. A further 4,685 abortions were performed between the thirteenth and sixteenth week gestation, while 1,831 abortions were performed between the seventeenth and twentieth weeks. Therefore, one can see that the main motion will have little or no effect on these statistics.

• (1920)

I am sorry to say that repeat abortions have risen dramatically over the last 10 years on the national level. In 1975, 8.6 per cent of all the women who had abortions were repeats. In 1985, the figure was 20.3 per cent of all the abortions. In fact, more women were repeaters in 1985 than the total of all the officially recorded abortions in 1970. In British Columbia, 25 per cent of all the abortions performed are repeats. In case you are not sure of what that means, it means that this is the woman's second abortion, or at least the second, and could be the third or fourth.

The word "therapeutic" has been tossed around quite a bit during all of the previous discussion on abortion, and I thought it would be worth while to find its meaning in the dictionary. According to the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, it is defined as "the branch of medicine concerned with the treatment of disease and the action of remedial agents in disease or health". With this in mind, pregnancy is not a disease and abortion is not therapeutic. It heals no disease but rather kills a human being.

You may ask, why do I support the protection of the unborn? I believe that if you accept the sanctity of life, it is impossible to avoid the fact that, no matter how a child is conceived or what kind of life he or she will have, that life should be protected.

Is the unborn child a human being with equal rights? I think so and if that is the case, laws should always seek to protect that life. We should be more concerned with the saving of the unborn child's life than with making it easier, safer and cheaper for those who seek to end it.

Those who believe that the woman has the right to do whatever she wants with her own body must also say to themselves that if she has control in this aspect, should she not also have the control of what is required to prevent the pregnancy in the first place, whether that be making sure that she has the proper birth control or whatever? Our society does not allow individuals complete control over their own bodies. Laws prohibit taking drugs, drinking alcohol before a certain age, and prostitution, just to mention some of the things that our laws prevent us from endeavouring to do.

We all value our rights to free choice, our vocation, our religion, our goals in life. Genuine freedom, however, does not give us the right to trample the human rights of others.

You may ask me, are you not trying to impose your morals on others? I really do not think so. It is important to recognize that every basic law which governs our lives is an expression of morality. The point is that many of our laws are based on morality and much of that morality is based on Judaeo-Christian ethics. Those who seek to change abortion laws are legislating morality, but so were those who sought to legalize abortion back in the sixties.

What if the mother's life is endangered by pregnancy? You cannot blame the mother for choosing her life over the child's. This is an act of self-defence, not murder. This goes back to when I talked about therapeutic. I see no inconsistency with saying that the life of the mother must have a pre-emptive role over the life of the unborn but, only in serious, life-threatening situations. These do not happen very often.

The unborn child is not like an arm, a leg or an appendix. Though they are dependent on their mothers, unborn children are complete, separate entities.

Let me give some examples: The baby can be male and the mother is female. The mother and the baby can have two different blood types and these can even be incompatible. The mother can be fair and the baby dark-complexioned. The umbilical cord and placenta belong to the baby. They are not part of the mother's body.

Why do some people believe that the unborn child does not become a human being until it is delivered? Do they not recognize that even at his earliest development this child is just at one special stage in a whole series of steps that will eventually lead to old age? The difference lies in the process of

maturing and aging—in developing. We must see the unborn child as a human being.

Should every child not be a wanted child, you may ask. This makes the incorrect assumption that unless a child is wanted by the parent, they are not wanted, period. Simply to be unwanted becomes then a capital offence. The child itself, though, must always retain his or her right to continue living. A child is not a piece of property. There are so many couples trying to adopt children that many agencies cannot take any more names. Yet, 60,000 babies are aborted each year. It is a crying shame.

You may ask the question, do not unwanted pregnancies become abused children? Abortion has not solved the problem of battered children. In fact, since abortion has become commonplace, child abuse has increased by at least 500 per cent. These facts show that in more cases it is the so-called wanted children that are abused.

I mentioned at the beginning of my speech that guidance must be given to the woman who finds herself in the situation of being pregnant and not really wanting her baby. I believe that the medical profession has a role to play in this, one that should be giving all clients the relevant information regarding abortion, including such things as the true nature of the procedure, the nature and development of the life to be terminated, the risks to the client both during and after the abortion.

Many women, when they understand what abortion really is, the risks associated with it and the actual nature and development of the life, would look for alternatives. Are we giving them this information? Such disclosures by the medical society would lead to greater education, encouraged scientific knowledge on the abortion question, and place the onus directly on the people involved. Those who practice abortion must be held responsible for its consequences. Even the United Nations has a declaration of the rights of the child. This reads that "the child, by reason of his physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection, before as well as after, birth".

There is an alarming and disturbing amount of evidence, and it is growing, that the post-abortion experience may be even more traumatic than the pre-abortion period of decision-making. We must not forget that every baby who dies in an abortion has a whole family whose lives are connected with that baby: the grandparents, the aunts, uncles, cousins, sisters, brothers. Society is also closely linked with that baby. For instance, within the last year the B.C. Ministry of Social Services conducted the province's first-ever apprehension of a foetus. The seizure occurred after a woman, 36 weeks pregnant, told doctors at the Vancouver Grace Hospital that she did not intend to consent to medical treatment for her child after it was born.

The doctors used the word "child" when referring to the foetus and the social worker conferred with a supervisor and a superintendent, and all three of them agreed that the child should be apprehended.

This shows us that society is definitely involved in one single case, and this is not an isolated case. In Ontario, a judge ordered a 38 week old foetus to be made a ward of the Belleville Children's Aid Society after its mother, who planned to give birth in an underground parking lot, refused medical treatment. I think these are landmark cases.

I commend the churches and those organizations which have sought to help by giving direction for what they deemed to be right. I would like to acknowledge the material that was sent to each Member of Parliament by the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, the Salvation Army, the Evangelical Fellowship of Canada, the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada, the Coalition for Family Values, and the Council of Christian Reformed Churches in Canada. These organizations have endeavoured to help give us direction as to how we might proceed on this very, very important question.

Many people today have opted for a self-serving role in society because their vision of life is limited and based on selfish value systems. Today, we, as leaders, are struggling to give leadership to a society which seeks to do what is right in its eyes.

What do we do? I have already said that there is a need for agencies and places that will help in a time of crisis. When an unwanted pregnancy occurs, the Government has to help these agencies in these circumstances. Many churches are now coming to the assistance of people who find themselves with an unwanted pregnancy. One organization which I have already mentioned, the Salvation Army, has been at the forefront of this practice for many, many years. They must be commended and they need to be copied on what they have done.

How do we deal with this? How do we try to find the balance between making sure that the rights of the mother and the rights of the unborn are kept in proper perspective when we try to put forward legislation?

I would like to support at this time the amendment tabled by the Hon. Member for Kitchener (Mr. Reimer), which I feel will go a long way to reach that balance, and the personage of the woman and the personage of the unborn will be clearly recognized. I thank you for this opportunity of putting my thoughts on the record and to let the people of Fraser Valley East know where their Member stands on this very important issue, and to thank the 2,500 people of Fraser Valley East who have written to me and substantially backed me on the statement that I have made tonight.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1930)

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us will agree that abortion is a very emotional, ethical, and moral issue. The differing views in this House reflect the Canadian pluralistic society, although not in

proportion to the general public. I only wish this debate could have included many more young men, and women of child-bearing age, because they are the people directly affected and they are not represented adequately in this debate.

While I think we must respect each other's differing views, I cannot condone anyone forcing their views on another person. This is why I believe in choice. For women, a decision regarding termination of an unwanted pregnancy is a very difficult moral issue as well as a personal health matter. I know of no one, man or woman, who favours abortion. So why are some women and young girls forced to consider abortion? Usually it is because contraception has been ineffective or because no method of birth control was used by either the man or woman. In some cases, the high incidence of teenage pregnancies, and we know of increasing numbers of 13 and 14 year old girls who have become pregnant, may be because they are ignorant about sex and birth control. Very often they are afraid to tell their parents that they are pregnant. Some do not even know until several months later. Often, I am sure, if they think it through, they would be aware that they cannot care for a child. Perhaps their parents will decide and advise them their lives could be ruined, so they agree to an abortion.

Many women who seek abortions are single, with no partner to share the responsibility, financially or as a parent. The sex partner often takes no responsibility for contraception. Men usually think this is a woman's responsibility, or perhaps they do not even care. More often than not, the man takes off, leaving the woman alone to either consider the painful decision of seeking an abortion or to care for their child with no support from the father. There are many women in this situation and I do not think we can stand in judgment on them when they choose an abortion.

Still other women may be married with many financial, health and family reasons for not wanting another child. This is true of men also. One woman that I know very well had four children, including twins. The children were very young. At the same time she had an alcoholic husband. She told me how desperate she was 20 years ago when she found out she was pregnant again. Even 20 years later she was really upset talking about it. She was so desperate that she decided to go through the agony of using a back street abortionist, there being no legal abortions at that time. It was either that or suicide, she said. So at great risk to herself she chose the abortionist, and she had many complications as a result.

Over the years this woman and many of her sisters in the women's movement have worked very hard to be sure that their daughters will not have to face this kind of tragedy in similar circumstances. They have worked together to ensure that legal medical abortions are accessible and based on the decision of the woman in consultation with her doctor.

The public has become much more liberal in its attitude toward choice. In a 1988 Gallup poll, 69 per cent of Canadians agreed that "the decision whether to have an abortion should rest with the woman in consultation with her physician". The Canadian Medical Association, a fairly conservative group, has also taken this position. So has the United Church of Canada.

The Supreme Court decision in the Morgentaler case judged previous legislation under the Criminal Code to be unconstitutional since therapeutic abortion committees delayed procedures, denied access, and threatened the security of the person. The majority of judges acknowledged the right of a woman and her doctor to choice in the earlier stages of pregnancy. In the later stages, they acknowledged the importance of also protecting the foetus.

I think most women, and men also, who support choice would not disagree with those principles, but many object very strenuously to recriminalizing abortion under the Criminal Code. Imposing criminal sanctions against women and physicians is no solution. Statistics show that most abortions are performed in the first trimester, long before a foetus is viable. I would like to give several facts which I received from the Canadian Abortion Rights Action League to clarify certain misinformation which has been circulated.

First, women do not approach abortion as a means of birth control. As Doctor Marian Powell's 1987 study showed, the majority of girls and women seeking abortion become pregnant while using contraception. Despite public perception, contraceptives are not 100 per cent effective, nor are they easily available, especially for the poor, the young, or people in isolated or rural areas.

Second, women do not have abortions for convenience or for frivolous reasons. On the contrary, women choose abortion because they take the responsibilities of motherhood seriously. Women realize how important the timing and number of children can be to the well-being of their families.

Third, women who want to have abortions want to have them as early in the pregnancy as possible, as do the doctors who perform them. Some 89 per cent of all abortions in Canada are performed by the twelfth week of pregnancy, and 99.6 per cent are performed by the twentieth week. Reduction in the legal impediments to access results in fewer delays and earlier abortions.

Prevention of unwanted pregnancies and earlier access to medical abortions are needed rather than criminal sanctions. It is interesting that countries with tough criminal prohibition have not reduced the number of abortions. In Brazil, where abortions are prohibited, over one million illegal abortions were performed in one year and many deaths resulted. Criminal prohibitions did not prevent or reduce abortions.

It is also interesting that the incidence of abortions in Quebec decreased during the period when the Criminal Code was ignored and abortions were available through community clinics. There is no evidence during the past six months, when we have not had any law, that abortions have increased. Therefore, why do we need Criminal Code legislation? We all

want to reduce the need for abortion, but tough criminal sanctions will not do it.

One of the saddest aspects of the abortion debate, particularly on the part of those who are anti-choice, is the fact that no attention is given to prevention. The federal Government and the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) have consistently refused to support positive sexuality programs and family planning. We support it for Third World countries through the UN but we do not support it in our own country.

The Conservative Government and the previous Liberal Government both cut back on funding to Planned Parenthood, which works hard at prevention and has proposed particular programs targeted at reducing unwanted pregnancies in young teenagers. It has published information in the national media. You may have seen a big ad entitled "Five Ways to Prevent Abortion and One Way That Won't". They recognized that all Canadians want to see the need for abortion reduced. This can be achieved by reducing the number of unintended pregnancies. Making abortions illegal will not work. It never has. Whenever governments have made abortions illegal, it has not stopped them.

Planned Parenthood had a recent campaign which advocated the following five ways to prevent abortion. First, ensure that all Canadians have access to contraception and family planning services. Second, ensure that all young Canadians have access to sexual health education. Third, increase the involvement of men in preventing unintended pregnancies. Fourth, increase government support of research into new and safer methods of contraception and, fifth, make Canada friendlier to children. Planned Parenthood studies support the premise that young people with high levels of self-esteem are the least likely to compromise their futures by taking the risk of unintended pregnancies. Thousands of Canadians across Canada have signed petitions in response to these proposals which I think make eminent good sense.

• (1940)

The one way that will not work in reducing abortions is to outlaw abortion and to have tough criminal sanctions. This will not prevent unwanted pregnancies or reduce the number of abortions. It will make women and doctors criminals and force back street abortions in some cases. It ignores the dignity and the right of women to make their own decisions for themselves and their families. It ignores the reality of statistics which show that women want early abortions and doctors do not perform late abortions except in extremely exceptional circumstances. It also ignores the fact that despite tough criminal sanctions in some countries, desperate women will still seek abortions, largely because of economic and social situations that are intolerable and are injurious to health and well-being.

Some have said that the debate on abortion is obsolete in view of the changing reproductive technologies including *in vitro* fertilization, surrogate parenthood, the use of foetal tissue and gender selection techniques, all very serious moral and ethical issues that society must consider and perhaps regulate. Our Party has recommended support for a Royal commission on reproductive technologies composed of at least 50 per cent women to look into this matter and to make recommendations. Scientists and physicians are also asking for directions on these matters.

The NDP supports a policy of choice which allows women to make a personal health decision in consultation with their doctors. We respect our colleagues and members of our caucus and Party who hold different views on this issue. They have the right to express their opinions. Choice does not mean that one favours abortion. I hope no one favours abortion. Choice means that a pregnant woman must have access to a whole range of options. She must have the finances and the emotional support to raise a child. The Government has an obligation to provide adequate income assistance and community support.

Second, men must take much greater responsibility for preventing pregnancies, for planning families and for sharing parenting. Third, there must be parental leave, access to adequate, affordable quality child care. We must eliminate child poverty and give more support to single parents, including affordable housing.

Fourth, adoption is another option which must be available to people. Fifth, in addition to all these options, a woman who is pregnant with an unwanted pregnancy must have ready access to a safe medical abortion with adequate pre- and post-abortion counselling if this is her decision. Free abortions must be available in all provinces and territories in Canada and must be covered by the insurance programs of the Canada Health Act. Public clinics should be encouraged.

In closing, I would like to say that I must oppose this motion. As my colleague said earlier, we object to it for procedural reasons and for technical reasons. We think it is poorly phrased and not adequate. I oppose it particularly because it calls for the recriminalization of a matter which I believe should be a medical question involving a personal decision between a woman and her doctor.

Mr. Benno Friesen (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, we are here debating an issue of national importance such as few debates include. In fact, it is an inter-generational debate. We are discussing values and attitudes that we will share with our children and our grandchildren and that we will pass on from generation to generation. We are in fact examining what kind of people we are, what kind of a society we are and what shape we want our society to be in years to come. It is probably one of the most futuristic debates we could hold in this House. It is of incredible importance.

I might add in response to the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell) that we are not here to sit in judgment over those who are facing unwanted or unplanned pregnancies.

Surely we have grown to the point where we do not do that any longer. We are here to embrace those who are faced with frustrations, but we cannot run away and we cannot present illusions to today's people or to future generations. We must face this squarely, be realistic, look at the repercussions and at the inheritance we want to pass on to future generations.

We do so, Sir, with some urging from the Supreme Court itself. Chief Justice Dickson has said:

> Similarly, Parliament must be given room to design an appropriate administrative and procedural structure for bringing into operation a particular defence to criminal liability.

On page 35 of his judgment, he said:

> Simply put, assuming Parliament can act, it must do so properly.

On page 37, he said:

> I have no difficulty in concluding that the objective of s. 251 as a whole, namely, to balance the competing interests identified by Parliament, is sufficiently important to meet the requirements of the first step in the 'Oakes' inquiry under s.1.

On page 38, he said:

> Like Beetz and Wilson JJ., I agree that protection of foetal interests by Parliament is also a valid governmental objective. It follows that balancing these interests, with the lives and health of women a major factor, is clearly an important governmental objective.

Then he went one step further. On page 39, he said:

> State protection of foetal interests may well be deserving of constitutional recognition under s. 1.

There he refers to Section 1 of the Charter. Certainly we have the urging of the Supreme Court on our side. The Supreme Court is urging us to debate this thoroughly and to pass on to future generations the values that we think are important for the preservation of our way of life.

When we debate this issue, we are in fact debating the role of law. It is the law which is our guidance mechanism today. Society has lost many of the institutions of support that historically have given us the moral and ethical standards by which we could guide our lives. We have lost those moorings. By and large, society has now rejected regular church participation. Schools are preaching irrelevance, moral relevance and situational ethics. There is no anchor. There are no absolutes which can guide us any longer.

For many people, the only thing we have left to give us guidance is the law. Justice Dickson said on page 32 of his judgment:

> The criminal law is a very special form of governmental regulation, for it seeks to express our society's collective disapprobation of certain acts and omissions.

For those who have no moorings, no ethical guidance mechanisms, no moral guidance mechanisms left, the only thing left is the law. Therefore, as we debate the law as we would like to see it today, we have to be especially careful about how we deliberate, about what we choose as our values and about what we think is important. For most people the law is the last guidepost of morality. It is the plumb line that tells them what is right and wrong. While the law is designed to put before us the limits of behaviour that we find acceptable, for many people it is also the maximum, it is both minimum and maximum. Since we have diminished the use of the institutions we have to be careful of the law.

• (1950)

While the law describes limits it does not describe "oughtness". It may describe how we can behave, how we are allowed to behave, but it never describes how we ought to behave. That sense of "oughtness" has melted away. For that reason we have to be very careful of how we define our law today.

The law itself has become for us the expression of our values, the protection of what we treasure, an expression of what we ought to be as well as the prohibitions of what we would design for our society in order to protect what we treasure.

That is why I support what is popularly called Option A, the amendment put forward by the Member for Kitchener (Mr. Reimer). That amendment allows us to circumscribe behaviour in a way which is reasonable. It protects what we cherish, namely, life. It provides access to abortion for those who really need abortion, and it makes a statement about life that is important to us. I commend to Members the speech made by the Member for Kitchener in which he described what we value in our society.

There is no doubt that this measure will be challenged in court. Whatever law is passed by this Parliament is going to be challenged. Whatever group is on the other side of the legislation will be certain to challenge it. However, I am convinced that the measures which this amendment provides for can withstand a court challenge. It is defensible before the Supreme Court. It is not enough for me to say that I believe that, because we are all entitled to opinions. We must be able to establish why we believe that and do so on a basis of argument and fact.

Because I am not a lawyer and do not have the advantage of a constitutional background, I took the trouble to engage a constitutional expert who has the respect of the entire legal community of Canada, has argued before the Supreme Court on a number of occasions, and is highly regarded there. I engaged the services of Mr. Goldie of the firm of Russell & DuMoulin. I would like to read to Members the statements he has made regarding such a motion as this. He said:

> Parliament has a legitimate constitutional interest in the protection of the foetus.

That is his conclusion based on his study of the Supreme Court decision. He goes on to say:

> In recognition of this interest, Parliament could restrict abortions to situations where the life or health (including psychological help) of the pregnant woman was threatened.
>
> Parliament could adopt a standard with respect to the condition threatening the life or health of the pregnant woman which required some independent medical opinion.

I will give copies of this to Members in order that they can read it for themselves. He says:

> Only one Judge expressly holds that Parliament cannot place any restrictions on abortions performed in the first trimester of pregnancy, except possibly that the woman's decision be taken after consultation with her physician. The two dissenting Judges base their dissent on their conclusion that the Charter does not protect the woman's right to terminate pregnancy at will. A standard, therefore, permitting abortions on request in the first trimester would in all likelihood be subject to constitutional challenge on the basis of Parliament's failure to balance the competing interests of the pregnant woman and the foetus. The Court has not ruled on this.

Therefore, I contend that the motion before us submitted as a basis for debate will not withstand a Charter challenge, if for no other reason than it is ultimately very arbitrary. What, in the name of common sense, could lead us to conclude that a woman who is pregnant and seeks an abortion at the sixteenth week is not committing a criminal offence, but if she goes into the seventeenth week she is a criminal? What could be more arbitrary than that? Putting it the other way, how could we make a law which says that a child is safe during the seventeenth week of pregnancy but not in the sixteenth? What could we be more arbitrary than that? The Supreme Court, in its judgment said over and over again that if the law is going to be fair it cannot be arbitrary, it must applied throughout Canada in the same way, it must be applied to all people in the same way, and it cannot be arbitrary.

I resist that motion on the basis of its arbitrariness whereas the motion standing in the name of the Member for Kitchener deals with the arbitrariness of the law. I support that motion, second, because it preserves the values important to our society.

I have already mentioned the value of life. I come from a province in which there are four live births for each one abortion, a ratio of four to one. That says something about our attitude toward life and our attitude toward society. Do we want to be judged by future generations on such an expression?

I want to leave Members with an observation by the eminent French historian sociologist Jacques Ellul who made some very perceptive observations about life. In a book entitled *The Betrayal of the West* he said:

> Reason combined with control leads to coherence. When the individual wins his freedom from the social body and wants to be free in the face of . . . others, he runs the great risk of incoherence . . . If a relationship is to be authentic, the other must be able to rely on the continuity of my behaviour, for instance, and know that he can expect certain kinds of words of help or refusals from me. Without such continuity a relationship becomes impossible . . .
>
> Coherence enables me to regard my commitments to others as durable. Marriage or a contract are not mere external formalities; they are meant to be declarations of intentions that are firm and fully accepted.
>
> Only then will I succeed in not becoming the inconstant prey of circumstances. Inconstancy in relations between the sexes is surely not an advance in freedom, but a withdrawal from true personhood, for it indicates the inability to resist circumstances and the impulse of the moment. Just think of the countless novels since *Madame Bovary* that have justified adultery and a way of life contrary to "bourgeois marriage". What do we find in them? Everything is the outcome of circumstances; a delightful evening, a ball etc., etc., throw people into one another's arms, people who want the marvelous experience of "free" love, unhindered by the conventions of the kind of marriage society will accept. But such free love is in fact no better than the marriage it rejects—

The point is that we all have contracts with each other. When two people engage in a sexual union there is a contract between those two people. Witness the pithy, terrible jokes about life: "Will you love me tomorrow?" Everyone hates to be jilted. There is a contract between two people. When that sexual union creates another person, there is another contract between the two people and a new individual. That new person is depending on the fulfilment of that contract for life. Society recognizes that.

As Mother Theresa said in Vancouver, when a woman has an abortion she commits murder twice, first she kills a child then she kills her conscience. Even Paul Anka recognized the contract in that song which was popular two years ago, *Having My Baby*. He said: "You could have swept it from you but you didn't do it". You see, there was a contract between two people.

If our society is going to maintain any kind of coherence, if people are to be able to depend on relationships in which there is a contract between two people, we have to depend on it in a sexual union and in a pregnancy contract because we depend on one another.

• (2000)

Third, I support that motion because it is the most compassionate. There is no doubt that we tend to be very flippant about this. But we need to enter into the world of the people who see themselves "in trouble". We need to walk alongside that teenage girl who is unexpectedly pregnant and is in distress because society might reject her, her parents might reject her or her boyfriend might reject her. We, as individuals, and our society need to learn to walk alongside those people and embrace them, care for them, provide for them support mechanisms that will allow them to enter into an enduring relationship with a life they are creating. We are thankfully beginning to do that.

Is it not significant that yesterday we celebrated the tenth anniversary of Louise Brown, the first test tube baby. I recall the outpouring of hunger for parenthood that took place the day after she was born. The day after Louise Brown was born, around the world there were 60,000 applications for *in vitro* fertilization.

Think of that hunger for parenthood. Why is it necessary to abort when there are countless thousands of couples across Canada who are saying: "We want to be loving and caring parents".

I think it is significant that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) yesterday tabled provisions that would create in our society new levels of child care that would allow people who are facing an unwanted or unexpected pregnancy another avenue of help. It may not be the answer for everyone because I think all of us believe that children grow up best and

do best in the home. That is the most natural place for them to be, but if that is not possible we have to find other ways of doing it.

We all know that there are better and more fulfilling ways of facing life than through an abortion. But we as a society need to care for them.

For over 100 years the Salvation Army has cared for young mothers who found themselves in distress. Now, having built a chain of hospitals across Canada to help young ladies who are to become mothers, they cannot fill these hospitals with mothers for that purpose. Is it a sign of our health, of our social and spiritual and ethical health that when we have support mechanisms out there to help people like this they get counselling that diverts them from it and counsels an abortion rather than a delivery? Is that a sign of our health?

Why should we deny charitable organizations like the Salvation Army that way of ministering to our society?

I commend to Members the motion that was put forward by the Member for Kitchener (Mr. Reimer) because I believe it fulfils the requirements that the Supreme Court has already strongly suggested it would look for in any kind of legislation. I ask them to resist the lure of thinking that a gestational approach is actually a solution because that motion is nothing but abortion on demand and there is no security of the person in that.

I say to Hon. Members: We need to look for hope, and look at the exuberance of life. Where there is distress and depression, we need to embrace and hold up those people who are in distress and provide hope for them so that this generation and succeeding generations can look to us as those who have saved a generation.

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I intend to echo the comments made by my colleague, the Member for Surrey—White Rock—North Delta (Mr. Friesen). This is probably one of the most important debates to be held in the House of Commons since the constitutional debate. At that time I stood up and voted against the Constitution simply because there was no specified protection in that piece of legislation for the unborn child.

Certainly it is the responsibility of society to protect the unborn, for if society will not do it, who will? The unborn have rights, and that is why this debate is so important.

Part of the problem may be due to a breakdown in our society. While there are probably many causes for that breakdown, one may be due to the fact that people have so much time on their hands in this technological age. I am not sure that we are using that time as we should. When I grew up we had chores to do that did not give us the time nor money that people have today.

We must impress upon society that the abortion question is a problem with which we all must deal. The Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell) said she wished there were more young people taking part in this debate. The last person I spoke to before I came into the House was a 22-year old lady who advised me about what I should say and how. She told me what she wanted to convey and that is why I am speaking today on behalf of my constituents. They expect it of me.

At a Mass on Sunday, the priest recommended to his congregation that they get in touch with me to make sure that I was here to represent their views. That is what I am attempting to do now.

We all must recognize that we are part of the process and cannot escape it. Certainly we are our brother's keeper, our sister's keeper and our daughter's keeper. We must accept the responsibility to give help where it is required.

I want to refer to an article in the *Red Deer Advocate* on Saturday, July 2, 1988. The column is called "A Closer Look", and the headline of the article is: "Abortion Trauma Entwines Itself in Women's Lives". It is written by Valerie Starno, a freelance writer and a former correspondent for the *Daily Interlake* in Kalispell, Montana.

• (2010)

One of the problems we possibly have is the fact that sometimes women think this is only their problem. I do not see it that way. I think it is a problem for all of us. We have to accept the responsibility. Perhaps it is because of a lack of discipline in our society, perhaps it is because of a lack of restraint, perhaps a lack of supervision. There could be multiple reasons why we have this problem to deal with. I would like to put this news story on the record:

> Five months have passed since the Supreme Court of Canada declared federal abortion laws unconstitutional.
>
> Since the Jan. 28 decision there has been intense debate, most of which has focused on the rights of the woman and the unborn child. An important aspect of the abortion issue which has received less consideration is the effect of abortion on women and society. Yet this aspect surely deserves attention for there is increasing evidence that abortion may be contributing to a plethora of personal and social problems.
>
> According to Tanya Hughson, national co-ordinating director of the Abortion Outreach Centre in Calgary, 75 per cent of the centre's 150 monthly calls are directly related to "post-abortion trauma" counselling.
>
> Hughson describes the trauma as, "sustained emotional denial which produces a variety of physical and emotional responses". She likened it to the clinically recognized Vietnam disorder, which has produced similar symptoms among many Vietnam combat veterans. The basis for post-abortion trauma appears to be the act (abortion), regardless of the woman's personal feelings of right and wrong and independent of society's values.
>
> She said some of the more severe manifestations of the trauma include depression, suicide attempts, chemical dependencies, child abuse and multiple abortions. Hughson's remarks were made during a presentation to 1,200 women attending a meeting with Elaine McCoy, minister of women's issues, May 5 in Edmonton.
>
> The volunteer-run centre is known nationally and has a 24 hour crisis telephone line to provide anonymity and easy access to counselling, Hughson said. The centre is privately funded.

The reason I want to put this on record is the fact that this is women speaking.

At a Red Deer College Nursing Association forum on abortion held earlier this year, another woman told of her own experience with abortion . . . (she) vividly described the post-abortion difficulties she had experienced—massive haemorrhage, several subsequent miscarriages and great emotional conflict.

She spoke of the numerous support groups forming throughout the United States (where abortion on demand has been legal for 15 years) for women who are experiencing similar difficulties. Rather than helping, abortion is hurting women, she said. Smith currently operates a home for unmarried pregnant teenagers and counsels pre- and post-abortion women.

Dr. Philip Ney a clinical psychiatry professor at the University of Calgary's department of psychiatry has reviewed the medical literature on the effects of induced abortion. He has also researched and published several articles that deal with the personal and social implications of the procedure.

In his most recent paper, Mental Health and Abortion—Review Analysis and Recommendations, (March 1, 1988, . . . Dr. Ney cites recent studies which are, "turning up an alarming rate of post-abortion complications such as pelvic inflammatory disease (with its subsequent infertility), depression, and a host of problems that may occur in the following pregnancy".

After a detailed review of studies on the mental health complications of elective abortions, Dr. Ney concludes: "When the psychologically harmful effects of abortion and its medical complications are considered, it is reasonable to state that elective abortion is more harmful than helpful to mental health".

In addition to his research activities, Dr. Ney has treated women suffering from psychiatric complications of abortion.

Women who have aborted may also be placing the mental health of their existing or future offspring at risk.

In an earlier article, A Consideration of Abortion Survivors, published in Child Psychiatry and Human Development, Vol. 13 (3), Spring 1983, Human Sciences Press, Dr. Ney calls attention to the plight of Children who, aware of their mother's abortion(s), "have considerable conflicts regarding their existence." He presents evidence which suggests that these children may exhibit psychological difficulties similar to children who live through disasters, accidents or illness or whose siblings died of the same.

"The knowledge they have been chosen to live creates peculiar psychological problems which may retard their development, subject them to an increased risk of abuse, neglect, existential guilt, as well as the possibility of becoming parents who have difficulty relating to their children," states Dr. Ney.

It is interesting at this point to consider the recent ethical dilemma of "pregnancy reduction"—the procedure whereby one or more unborn babies are eliminated while letting the other(s) survive. Currently, pregnancy reduction is largely confined to in vitro fertilization or fertility drug induced pregnancies where all lives may be lost due to pre-mature births. It is reasonable to conclude, based on Dr. Ney's findings, that survivors of this procedure would be among those at high risk of experiencing psychological difficulties.

So-called "survivors" are not necessarily restricted to persons whose mothers have experienced abortion, for as Dr. Ney said, "When up to 50 per cent of North American pregnancies end by induced abortion,it is reasonable to consider a live newborn as a survivor."

He adds, "We might wonder what happens in the future when abortion survivors hold in their hands the fate of those aged or enfeebled parents and professionals who regarded them so callously when as unborn children they were so vulnerable.

Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of the effects of induced abortion on mental health is the possibility that permissive abortion may be contributing to the problem of child abuse.

We all know of the dangers and problems associated with child abuse today.

In another article, Relationship Between Abortion and Child Abuse, (published in the Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 24, 1979), Dr. Ney cites studies which indicate a higher rate of child abuse among mothers who have previously had an abortion. He offers this explanation: "Once bonding is interrupted in the (first pregnancy), there are long-lasting psychological changes which makes it more difficult for a good bond to develop in subsequent pregnancies. For this reason, it is possible that abortion contributes to bonding failure, an important cause of child battering."

That is why I say we all have a part in this. It is all important to our society and is something for which we must all be held responsible. Certainly we all have a responsibility to ensure that abortions decline instead of increase.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I preface my remarks by saying that I regret that we do not have before us a legislative initiative. Instead, we are speaking on a motion. Notwithstanding the results of this motion, there may or may not be legislation. The law we had and which we followed was effectively abolished on January 28, 1988, by a Supreme Court decision. Although this law, which came into effect in 1969, was not very valuable because it did not adequately protect human life, nevertheless it did make a statement merely by the fact it was there. Today we have a complete legislative vacuum, a vacuum which has existed now for some six months.

I do not want to spend my time tonight criticizing the Government. Instead, I would like to concentrate on the issue at hand. I would like to speak to the issue of life and to the issue of abortion which we are called upon to discuss tonight.

• (2020)

I make my remarks perhaps being in an unusual, some would say unorthodox, position of being the only Member of Parliament who has changed his mind, or who has admitted publicly to having changed his mind, on this issue. First, perhaps I should explain to the House and to Canadians why I changed my mind on abortion.

This is the second very intense moral debate that we have had in the House of Commons since I came here. The first one was the debate on capital punishment. Today, we are discussing abortion. On the issue of capital punishment I took a position. The more I spoke of the position I took the more I was convinced that I was right.

I also took a position with respect to abortion. However, the more I spoke of my position, the more I attempted to defend it in front of constituents and in front of others, the more I was convinced that what I stood for was wrong. On April 11, 1988, I stood in this House and admitted that the position I had taken was wrong. I apologized to my constituents for having taken such a position. I sought to correct the wrong that I had myself created.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, as you no doubt know, since you are a Member of Parliament like us, after an MP changes his mind in this debate, many Canadians approach him and express their opinion. When a Member stirs controversy, as I did by changing my mind, needless to say, I got the attention of many Canadians. Those who agreed with my position said so; those who disagreed certainly did not fail to say so.

Mr. Speaker, that being said, this whole controversy has created a situation in which those around me asked me many questions. One day, my ten-year-old daughter Julie came to ask me, a few days after I had changed my mind on abortion, what an abortion is. She is barely ten years old. And she asked me that question in front of several people. I told her that I would explain it to her once we were back home. Naturally, once we were back home, I forgot, but my wife did not and neither did Julie. My daughter again came to me to say, "Dad, you have to tell me what an abortion is." I then tried to do so as best I could, with all the imperfections of a father, and I said to her, "Sit down, Julie, I will tell you briefly." I told her, "You know, Julie, when a woman gets pregnant, if she decides for one reason or another that she does not want to have a child, she can have an operation to remove the child, to have it taken out of her womb." Julie answered me, "Remove it—you mean kill it?"

Mr. Speaker, my 10-year-old daughter understood in 30 seconds what I had failed to understand for so long.

[*English*]

We are discussing abortion—we are certainly not inventing the wheel as legislators. It is a topic which has been discussed by many and, of course, for a very long time. The Hippocratic oath stated, and it was written somewhere in the neighbourhood of 400 BC:

> I will give no deadly medicine to any one even upon request, nor suggest any such counsel; and in like manner I will not give to a woman a pessary to produce abortion.

Hippocrates was a pagan physician, just in case people believe that the Roman Catholic Church or anyone else has a monopoly on being against abortion.

In the 11th century BC the Hittite code of Assyria provided for the flogging of a man responsible for an abortion for the daughter of a freeman. Of course at that time the only measure of life was whether or not someone was free. Therefore life was deemed to have value.

The Old Testament states: "If men while quarrelling knocked down a pregnant woman, thus causing a miscarriage, they were fined".

St. Thomas Aquinas maintained that the soul was directly created by God and that it was infused in the embryo, not on the day of conception but when the embryo was formed enough to receive it. I still do not know what that means. Nevertheless, it was recognized to have been some point during a pregnancy.

Pope Gregory XIV in his encyclical letter excommunicated those found guilty of the abortion of a foetus after the first moments of life.

The Napoleonic Code of 1810 provided for imprisonment and hard labour for the woman and the abortionist.

The issue of abortion is difficult for us to deal with. It is certainly the most gut-wrenching and difficult issue that I have ever had to deal with and probably ever will. If it gives us any comfort, it did not seem to be much easier 2,000, 3,000 or 5,000 years ago. But we were not sent here to do easy things. We were sent here to do the job at hand.

When I changed my mind on abortion I did so believing in the sanctity of life. One of the things that made me change my mind more than anything else, if you can believe this, Mr. Speaker, is that when I reread my own speech that I made on capital punishment I realize that I stated then that life is sacred and that all life is worth preserving.

I note that is the *House of Commons Debates* of November 9, 1967, when the then Solicitor General was banning capital punishment he said in his speech: "I believe that so long as the state claims the right under the law to deliberately take human life there will be a tendency to regard life more cheaply". That was 19 years ago. I believe he was correct. I believe also that the same comments are applicable when we deal with abortion.

There is an interesting contradiction at the present time between criminal law and civil law in Canada. Criminal law is simply non-existent as it pertains to the foetus. Jurisprudence in civil cases in the past year to be stated in this House in order to demonstrate to Members of Parliament the glaring contradiction between criminal and civil law.

In many wills there is an expression stated by the person leaving his or her estate that they leave it to "all my living children". This has been interpreted by the courts, as it should be, upon occasion. It is interesting to note that Judge Mathers in Manitoba Court of King's Bench ruled in 1918 in the case of a woman who was pregnant and who had not yet given birth in the following way. A gift as in this will to "all living children" comprehends those living at the testator's death and those who are "*en ventre sa mère*". In other words, civil law, in that case, and in the 1907 case of *Villar vs. Gilbey* was that a child yet unborn was a child for the purposes of receiving an estate. Interestingly enough, the child unborn is not deemed to be a child if its life is taken away. I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that that contradiction in itself should make us think about what it is that we are doing.

• (2030)

Some people claim that the unborn child is not yet a living person, that it is some form of amorphous blob, and that the taking of that life is not necessarily wrong. I do not know at what point human life begins. Unless someone proves differently to me, I shall assume that it begins at the time of conception.

Why do I come to those conclusions? First, I do not think that the onus is upon me to prove it. I think the onus is upon those who believe otherwise to tell me why life begins at some other point. To prove my case, I have here in front of me volume 317, dated November 19, 1987 of *The New England Journal of Medicine*. This journal can hardly be considered to be pro-life propaganda. It published an article entitled "Pain

and its Effects in the Human Neonate and Fetus". In the article it states:

> Cutaneous sensory receptors appear in the perioral area of the human fetus in the 7th week of gestation; they spread to the rest of the face, the palms of the hands, and the soles of the feet by the 11th week . . .

In other words, from the seventh week on there is a feeling or sensory perception on the part of the foetus. We know that there are live births at 18 and 19 weeks. We know that there are abortions at 20 weeks. Yet for some reason we pretend that that is not murder.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, some people will say that abortion should be allowed when there is a possibility the child may be deformed or handicapped.

I should like to voice my disagreement with this suggestion. As a matter of fact, I express not only my disagreement but also, I believe, that of our country as a political entity.

Indeed, on November 20, 1959 Canada signed the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child. Here is what Canada signed when it endorsed the declaration.

[*English*]

I read from this declaration one of the preambles which states:

> Whereas the child by reason of physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection, before as well as after birth.

As a nation we signed that Declaration of the Rights of the Child in 1959 which stated that the unborn child, when handicapped, deserved special protection, not elimination.

Canada has also signed other international covenants regarding the issue of the foetus. In 1947 the World Medical Association published its new version of the Hippocratic oath. Canada is a member of that illustrious group. I have here the *Declaration of Geneva*, the modern day Hippocratic oath, which states:

> I will maintain the utmost respect for human life from the time of conception; even under threat, I will not use my medical knowledge contrary to the laws of humanity.

Again a document that we as a nation signed some 41 years ago.

If we as a nation fail to legislate on abortion, I believe that we are allowing society to crumble and we would be contributing toward it. There is a dangerous situation happening now. I have before me the text of an editorial from *The Globe and Mail* of June 18, 1983. The article is entitled "Life and Death". It states: The City of Toronto's Health Department reported that in 1981, the latest year for which statistics are available, 8,313 abortions were performed in that city and that there were 7,597 live births." There is something dreadfully wrong when there are more abortions in the city than there are live births.

To further this case, I have a chart in front of me that was published by the pro-life movement, Alliance for Life, in which it describes the number of abortions from 1970 to 1986. They have identified it on that chart as representing 907,351. That compares to the number of Canadian deaths in the Boer War, World War I, World War II, and the Korean War of 99,449. In other words, there were ten times more abortions in the last 16 years than deaths in the last 80 years of warfare.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I spent a good many years as a child in the care of my grandparents. I used to live with them when I was a small child and my grandmother would tell me that it was wrong to break a bird's egg because it contained life, the small bird yet to be born. I think my grandmother was right, Mr. Speaker. The unborn exists not only in a bird's egg but elsewhere as well.

[*English*]

In conclusion, and unfortunately this is all the time left to me, I urge upon my colleagues the following. In our society, we need strong family policies, assistance for families, assistance for unwed mothers, stronger child encouragement such as child care, but more than that we need a strong abortion law which states our position as a society. We need a strong law to protect a human from the time of conception. I say only one thing to my colleagues that, before they vote, they reflect upon the following, and I ask them to let them live.

• (2040)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Pierre Blackburn (Jonquière): Mr. Speaker, the abortion issue which, as elected representatives, we have to address tonight is indeed a very difficult and complicated one. Are we for or against abortion? Deep down, is this something that we can wish for? Can anyone, whether a man, a woman, a priest, or just about anybody here hope to live through an abortion? Human life is something we all have in common, Mr. Speaker, and that is what is the most important. An unborn child for a couple or for the continuation of our society is the major principle of human life. As an elected Member of this House, however, I have a responsibility to legislate. The responsibility of the Church is to promote ethics, life and the respect for human life, but it is also the responsibility of legislators to promote the same respect, while considering its consequences. It is these consequences that we, as Members of this House, will have to take into account when we are called upon to vote at 12 o'clock next Thursday.

What did the former legislation say? It said that when a girl had an abortion, she could face a two-year prison sentence, and the physician who procured the abortion could face a life prison sentence. That was the legislation which we had before but which was not enforced and which was ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of Canada. That is why we have to deal with this issue.

Mr. Speaker, we should not shut our eyes and refuse to look reality in the face.

As a legislator, what do I do about a young girl of 14, 16, 18 or 20 who for various reasons decides to have an abortion in the earlier stages of pregnancy? If I vote according to my principles and ignore the consequences of my legislation, am I not also making a mistake with some very serious social consequences? Should a young girl who is afraid of being thrown out of the house by her parents because it was incest or rape or for any other reason, a young girl who panics and decides to have an abortion in the earlier stages of pregnancy, be brought before the courts and charged with murder, with the obvious social consequences for the girl herself and her family?

Another question, Mr. Speaker. Should I as a legislator overlook the fact that U.S. border states allow abortion, no questions asked? Am I not trying to ignore the fact that a young girl who can afford it will fly to the United States, have her abortion, not say a word to anyone and come back here? While the other girl who can't afford it will go down to the basement to be cut up by God knows who, with further consequences for her own fertility and health.

As the legislator, I have to consider that as well, Mr. Speaker. I cannot afford to vote according to my principles without considering the consequences of the legislation itself. Because after all, it could be your daughter, it could be mine, it could be the daughter of any of us. But in spite of all this, we cannot afford to leave the door wide open. That would not make sense. But how to find a middle ground from which we can protect life and at the same time not go overboard with coercive discipline?

On the weekend, I was talking to constituents in my riding. I tried to visualize some amendments, and I said: Actually, if we allow abortion only for minors, in cases of incest and rape, what do we do? So the girl goes to the doctor after two months and she says: It was rape. How can that be proven? It is impossible. Whenever we try to pass equitable legislation aimed at protecting life, problems do arise. That, Mr. Speaker, is the decision which we, as legislators, must make on Thursday.

Also, it is easy for us, men, to vote on the principle, but we are not the ones who bear children. However, we do have a stake in the matter. We must promote life, but we must also pass legislation which will not create social problems of similar significance.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, when I speak about abortion, I feel very much concerned because my wife and I have adopted two children. If their mothers had had an abortion, I would have been deprived of the opportunity of adopting these children. Therefore, I also know what I am talking about because I know the importance of the issue. Unfortunately, nowadays, women too often forget that there are couples who want children and would be only too willing to adopt the children they carry. As legislators, we also have a duty to make this possible and to improve the conditions in which the women who experience these problems find themselves.

So, Mr. Speaker, the motion before us today reads in part as follows:

> Such legislation should prohibit the performance of an abortion, subject to the following exceptions:
>
> When, during the earlier stages of pregnancy: a qualified medical practitioner is of the opinion that the continuation of the pregnancy of a woman would, or would be likely to, threaten her physical or mental well-being;

This objective, however, is flawed due to its lack of precision. We must not swing the doors wide open. It is obvious that we must be against abortion, but we must make allowance for specific conditions in which people find themselves in our society. It is in that context that I will try to analyze carefully, on Thursday, all the amendments which are proposed. As a Member of Parliament, I refuse to vote on a principle without giving any thought to the impact of this legislation. In so doing, I think that we must allow for certain options in order to make the legislation as human as possible.

[*English*]

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, last January, when the Supreme Court struck down the old abortion law, the Government said it was ready to give leadership on the question. On the day after the Supreme Court decision, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) said:

> "As far as our responsibilities are concerned, we intend to provide the leadership that is required on this issue.

I am reading from Don McGillivray's column of May 17:

> He was going to take "a position of leadership" and "provide all Canadian citizens right across the country with a uniform approach. That is the commitment that we make at this point in time. In addition, we will be dealing with this matter on an urgent basis."

Mr. McGillivray then added:

> Since then, the urgency as well as the leadership seems to have gone missing.
>
> Instead of talking about leadership now . . .

And this was more than two months ago.

> . . . the government is ducking responsibility. The prime minister says abortion is not something on which a party position is proper. The justice minister says he wants to "let the House of Commons determine the course of this matter".

Mr. McGillivray observed that:

> As the Mulroney government goes into hiding on the abortion issue, it is forcing individual members of Parliament into the open.
>
> A free vote shifts responsibility to the individual MP. He or she must take a stand on a subject the government itself considers too hot to handle.

Those comments seem to be very fair ones, with regard to the kinds of responsibility or, rather, lack of it, that the Government has shown on this issue, if it regards the matters as being important in doing what it seems to do.

What we are given this day and over the next couple of days, through extended hours of debate through the night, perhaps, is the opportunity for individual Members to express their opinions. I am reminded of the practice in the U.S. Congress where members very often want to put something on the

record and simply do so by inserting it in that record. They do not have to speak it in the Congress. It is simply printed as if it had been spoken. This happens to be one of those times when American usage might have been useful.

• (2050)

Instead, we are going to be going through this particular charade, and I say that advisedly, of expressing ourselves on the matter. There is going to be a kind of reading taken in the House of what Members think about various aspects of the question. We may get a majority on the motion and we may not. It is all too likely that this Parliament will end before it can consider legislation. It will have been quite literally a charade with the votes occurring, ironically enough, six months to the day last January when the Supreme Court of Canada rendered its verdict.

There is a very serious question to be asked at the outset when considering this motion, that is, how serious have the consequences of the Supreme Court decision actually been? There are those who suggest that chaos reigns in the land. I have seen that in material sent to me by the Evangelical Fellowship of Canada. I noted in the comments by the member of the Official Opposition who responded to the Deputy Government House Leader, observations about some sort of crisis into which Canada had been cast last January. I am not sure that this is the best way to read the situation.

What continues to be the case is that abortions can only occur legally by the actions of medical practitioners in hospitals or in clinics, if they are going to be legal and provided for within the national medicare system. It is not obvious that there has been any great increase in numbers. In fact, if there is one vital fact to be noted about the consequences of that Supreme Court decision, it is that in a number of jurisdictions there has been a flouting of the decision. There is no more equality of access within the law in a number of provinces than there was before.

That is a very different kind of problem from the one that alarmists are trying to raise in pressing this issue. Is it possible that the Government has backed off from legislation because of its recognition that the situation is not nearly as chaotic, or as much a matter of crisis as some of the alarmists would have us think?

It is worth saying, of course, that with the Supreme Court decision on Section 251 of the Criminal Code dealing with therapeutic abortion committees and hospitals, we are not left by any means without law on abortion. There are still illegal abortions as there always were. That is to say, it is possible for an illegal abortion to occur. It is still necessary to ensure that the proper medical practices prevail. In that particular context, I think one of the other facts that those who wish to stampede us into action need to consider is that the decision rendered by the Supreme Court of Canada after years of decisions at lower court levels, in which Doctor Henry Morgentaler played a central role, made one thing very clear about the law that Parliament passed and established. One of the most fundamental principles of public life, of jurisprudence, of the practices of the judicial system in Canada, one of the most fundamental principles on which we depend for our security of person, is the principle that one will be found guilty only by a jury of one's peers.

The fact that juries refused to convict women or Doctor Morgentaler as a qualified medical practitioner said something about the law of Canada. We in this Parliament, recognizing the importance of jury decisions as fundamental to our security of person, certainly needed to respect those decisions.

Having said these things about the situation which, it seems to me, does not deserve nearly all the alarmism projected by various persons, it is after all in this context that we may see colleges of physicians and surgeons, provincial departments of health, conceivably the federal Department of National Health and Welfare, and hospital boards, respecting the Supreme Court decision and the law as it has declared it, developing the standards and ethical practices which are to be applied when physicians consider the question with a woman of the desirability or otherwise of an abortion.

The fact that this is through and through a moral question seems to me to make it quite appropriate that colleges of physicians and surgeons, hospital committees and boards, departments of health, provincial and federal, should be involved in considering what is proper, what is right, in these matters, with all the assistance that can be provided by medical ethicists in universities and other places and by informed public debate, the kind of debate this resolution does in its way make possible.

The position of the NDP is well known, I think, to all Canadians. It is sometimes misinterpreted but there is little doubt, I am sure, in the minds of any Canadian that the NDP is committed to freedom of choice for women. I would say, in fact, particularly following on some intensive discussions which took place in our caucus over some hours today in clarifying the position we would adopt *vis-à-vis* the resolution put before us, that the position of the NDP is profoundly focused on freedom of choice because in our Party, perhaps above all of the three Parties, there has been a recognition of the extent to which the abortion question is part of the struggle of women in our country and in other countries to establish their security of person, to establish their rights and their control over their present and future.

The fact that this is an ongoing struggle in the way I have already suggested, the failure of jurisdictions such as Prince Edward Island where no abortions are available at all, or other jurisdictions which have failed to follow through on the Supreme Court decision or the spirit of that decision, the fact that those things exist underscores the way in which this struggle by women to ensure their own security of person continues in our country.

It is quite clear in the debate that took place among us in caucus, and in my brooding over the resolution, that the policy

position the NDP has taken, which is opposed to any kind of criminalization of women or physicians involved in these matters, reflects a profound commitment to the desire of women to control their own lives and their own circumstances and to be secure in their own persons. For those reasons, in a certain sense, the NDP could rejoice last January in the fact that the Supreme Court came to a somewhat similar position on the whole matter.

The fact that there is this insistence, then, that women must have this security of person, must have the opportunity to make this decision in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner , the reality of that fact in our caucus and in the positions we have taken over the years, is quite clearly paralleled.

• (2100)

This is in the most genuine of senses a concern about life. We New Democrats are not for abortion. We are for choice and for the right of women to be able to make those choices, to be free to make them. It is a concern about life on which that is based. It is a concern about the lives of women, the lives of families and the lives of children. It is a concern about all these human realities. It is imperative that that be appreciated.

It is all too easy for persons to recognize that abortion is a control question. Every time another man rises to make a speech against abortion, it is astonishing how often he gives himself away in the extent to which he understands that this is a control question, or halfway understands it at least. He knows perfectly well that keeping women in check and under control is a way for men to continue in the control that they have exercised for so long in society.

Against such a context is a choice as an assertion of the freedom of women and their desire to achieve full lives for themselves, to have good lives for their families and to be able to provide for their children the comfort and plenitude we would all like to have. Those are the things that are vital to life in society. To focus in a very narrow way on the question of whether it is a human life from the moment of conception and on not interfering with it in any way is surely to get involved in one very particular aspect of the question and all too easily to ignore all the others.

One Conservative after another is claiming to be really committed to life in this debate this evening which presumably will continue through the nighttime hours and similarly tomorrow and into Thursday. At the same time, they support a Government which in one area after another has acted against the interests of the family. It is not doing enough in the interests of children. It is interfering with the need for family planning and for education in sexuality. To be supporting all those things while at the same time claiming to be a great supporter of human life from the moment of conception is hypocrisy of the worst sort.

This Government has cut back on funding for Planned Parenthood of Canada. It is holding back on family allowances and increasing taxation for families. It cannot find the money to meet the child care needs of the day let alone into the future. It is a Government which has done nothing in the area of housing policy. I refer as well to previous Liberal Governments which, over the past two decades, have driven the cost of housing to exorbitant levels which load every family down with pressures that force women into the workforce, whether they choose to or not. These pressures make it absolutely essential that both husband and wife be wage earners. Those realities cannot be avoided in any consideration of who is for life and who is against it.

This question is very clearly a moral one. Each of us looks to his own community for assurance or otherwise. As a member of the United Church of Canada, I note that among other points that were made to all Members of Parliament in March of this year by the United Church, the following observations were made:

> *The United Church of Canada is not pro-abortion.*
>
> It is in favour of responsible and informed choice in certain medical, social and economic crisis situations.

That is quite clearly a position very much like the one New Democrats take. The United Church also observed:

> *Abortion is always a moral issue.*
>
> It must always be seen as the lesser of two evils, a decision to be made in full recognition of the consequences for the woman and her family of either choice. It must not be treated as a form of contraception.

Again, that is a position that New Democrats take time after time. Another item is as follows:

> *Women must be respected as moral agents.*
>
> Few, if any, women undertake this decision lightly. Their right to be treated as moral persons must not be ignored.

I put those on the one side in support of what I am saying about the matter of life. I put against that those who claim the pro-life label for themselves and put forward their own radical position that life must be sacred in practically every circumstance from the moment of conception, quite ignoring the realities of spontaneous abortions which occur in remarkable numbers of pregnancies, and other brute facts of pre-natal life. This is an assertion which is largely just an assertion.

Having grown up in an evangelical context, and a number of colleagues in the House are familiar with these influences as well, I have looked at the Scriptures to see if there is any contradiction to the position I am spelling out. I found practically nothing. If one has to look to the poetry of Scripture in the Psalms for some sort of support for a radical position, then it is on the very thinnest of ice that one is skating. If one has then to fall back on the attitude to life that characterizes Judaism, the attitude to life that Christ taught, then we are surely not very far away from what I have been saying about a regard for the freedom and security of person, of women, a concern for the health of the family, a regard for little children and their safety, all of which are concerns of

New Democrats. These should be the concerns of the Government, and particularly of those Members who claim to be pro-life. Those are the contexts within which we put abortion.

I too regret the number of abortions that occur in Canada, but it is not by means of criminal law that we will deal with the fact. In moving to a conclusion, I would consider what the needs of the hour actually are. In making a suggestion, I have to go beyond the policy of the New Democratic Party which, as I have already said, has been focused in a peculiar way, though quite understandably historically, on the rights of women and protection of their security. I have to go beyond that by suggesting that with a moral question of this sort, it is not the criminal law that we need at all. It is development in the ethics with which we approach these matters and it is development in the social provisions that are most imperative.

If we do not get the kind of development in the protection of families that I have already suggested, women will continue to be faced with harsh economic and social situations. Women will find themselves victims of the abuse of men, as happens time after time.

Just over the weekend, I was reading an article from the *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law*, under the rather cute but ultimately incredibly painful title of "Men Will Be Men". It focused on the fact that 98.5 per cent of cases of sexual abuse are cases of which boys and men are guilty. What is it in our society that leads to that kind of abuse? How profoundly wrong it is to focus on women and the abortion decision they may be driven to in these circumstances instead of recognizing that it is society that needs to be changed and transformed.

What we need most imperatively, obviously, is equality of access. I would suggest that the Government consider using the Canada Health Act and taking strong actions with those jurisdictions that refuse to provide ease of access for women, particularly during the first trimester of pregnancy. If women were able to achieve an abortion when forced into it by the harsh necessities of life in the first 12 or 14 weeks of pregnancy, all our concerns about later abortions would fall by the wayside, except of course in those terrible situations that arise when a doctor must make a choice between saving the life of a pregnant woman or the foetus. Of course we generally save the life of the pregnant woman. In other circumstances I doubt that there would be many abortions occurring at the later stages of pregnancy, so all of those concerns would be provided for.

• (2110)

If we needed to provide any limitations I suggest that regulations under the Canada Health Act could do the job perfectly well in stating the desire of society, that is to say, our moral expectations. We could specify what we will fund and what we will not fund in the way of procedures which occur in the area of abortion. We could lay out for physicians, hospitals, and the departments of health in the provinces the expectations that we have.

All of this could be done without using the criminal law power of the federal Government at all but focusing, instead, on the spending power of the federal Government. That, it seems to me, is the way to move ahead on this profoundly difficult question before us. It is something which could be done without acting with the sense of panic which alarmists all around us have been trying to create.

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, after the striking down of the existing law respecting abortion by the Supreme Court in the Morgentaler case it has become our duty and responsibility, as Members of Parliament, to fill the void left in the law. Only an extreme fringe would argue that it is acceptable to perform an abortion at eight and a half months. The previous speaker outlined the official NDP position on abortion on demand paid for by the state, although I know there are members of that Party who take a differing view. I am sure that even that Member would not countenance abortion done a couple of days before an expected birth. That, Sir, is too close to infanticide.

What the law should be is one of the most difficult things that we as Parliamentarians have been called upon to decide, certainly in this Parliament. People have strong opinions firmly held on one side of the question or the other. It is not my intention tonight to get involved in the technical arguments on one side or the other. Those have been given many times by speakers much more eloquent than myself.

People, including Members of Parliament, are unlikely to be swayed by argument. There is one Member of this House, the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria), who has admitted to changing his mind on the issue. Everyone else is of the same opinion as they were years ago. People hold these views on account of strong moral, ethical and religious convictions.

We all have our own biases. My particular bias is well known. I am certainly towards the right-to-life end of the spectrum. To me abortion is only acceptable under very special circumstances where there is a real risk to the life or serious threat to the health of the mother or in certain cases such as rape or incest.

However, it is incumbent upon us to bring this debate to some sort of a conclusion and to put in place law dealing with this subject. It is a given fact that whatever the law, it cannot reflect all views. Therefore, there has to be some kind of a compromise, and that in an area in which people are singularly reluctant to make such a compromise. The best that we can expect from an eventual law is that the result will be criticized equally strongly on both sides, but perhaps we will end up with something with which people can live.

The easy thing for a Member of Parliament to do in this debate—and we have seen much of this today—is to state his

or her point of view and then vote against anything that does not coincide with that. It is pretty easy to be critical and it is very difficult to work toward this necessary compromise which is bound to cause much discomfort. However, to take that attitude is tantamount to washing our hands of the issue. It is a denial of the responsibility and duty to which I referred earlier placed on us as Members of Parliament by the people of Canada.

It may be that Members in the Opposition, and perhaps even private Members on this side of the House, can take that attitude. However, the Government, *per se*, cannot. I know of the great amount of thought and discussion which took place within the Cabinet and within the various Party caucuses before the motion which we have before us tonight was placed on the Order Paper. This motion, if passed, or if passed as amended, will form the guide for legislation to be drafted and brought into this House at a later date.

In short, the concept contained in the main motion is that we will have relatively easy access to abortion in the early stages of pregnancy. If we have such a Bill before us I will probably argue in favour of a pretty restricted period. We are going to have a much more strict limitation in the later stages of pregnancy. Of course there will be a requirement that the procedure be done by properly qualified medical practitioners. I do not think that that particular provision will cause much dissension.

Despite personal opinions to the contrary, it seems to me that this approach as expressed in the government motion is the only approach with which the great majority of Canadians could eventually live. It is one which would comply with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms as interpreted by the Supreme Court of Canada and one which would be complied with and not ignored by those seeking an abortion. It would worry me if we were to pass a very strict law on this subject which would then be disregarded by thousands of Canadians, most of them young women.

When we draft the law we will have to address ourselves to what penalties are to be imposed for breaking the law. What are we going to do with a 15, 16, or 17-year-old girl who goes out and has an abortion contrary to this very strict law? Are we going to throw her into jail? Are we going to subject her to a heavy fine? It seems to me that the best answer is the one contemplated in the motion in order that we will not be throwing young women into jail and they will not be forced to skip the country.

We should, at the same time, do all the other things which so many people have mentioned to reduce the number of abortions performed in Canada. Estimates of that number vary between 60,000 and 100,000 a year, and that is unacceptable. We must use all other methods besides strict legal ones to make sure that there is a reduction in the number of abortions performed in our country.

• (2120)

Therefore it is my intention to fulfil that responsibility and duty imposed on me as a Member of this House, not avoid it. It is my intention to vote in favour of the motion standing in the name of the Deputy Government House Leader.

Mr. Jim Jepson (London East): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed both an honour and a privilege for me to rise in my place this evening to speak in this debate on this most controversial yet vital and important issue, namely the abortion question.

As most Canadians know by now, this House is debating the abortion issue as a result of the Supreme Court of Canada overturning Section 251 of the Criminal Code and supporting this decision on the basis of Section 15 of the Charter. By this decision the court has left the innocent unborn in their mothers' wombs completely unprotected and vulnerable to the abortionist's tools.

At the outset, I want to thank the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the Government for allowing me as a Member of Parliament the freedom to take my place and, without pressure of any sort, to vote on what I and I believe a majority of people feel is right in this situation. I thank the Government for that opportunity.

When we talk about abortion, we are not talking about the very few pregnancies that result from reported rape or incest, or the case of the threat to the life of the mother. We are talking about approximately 100,000 abortions in Canada, as reported in Statistics Canada figures, as well as those abortions carried out by various abortionists across the country.

What most Canadians also do not know is that in 1982, 11,000 women in Canada had an abortion for the second time, and 2,000 women for the third or fourth time. In 1981, the City of Toronto released figures stating that 8,300 abortions were performed, while there were only 7,600 live births.

It becomes obvious from these figures that abortion is not really a result of serious health problems but more a result of choices based on personal inconvenience or added financial burden.

The irony of the high number of abortions is that essentially, Canadians believe life is worth protecting. In 1982, they spent $30 billion or 8.4 per cent of our Gross National Product because they believed that life is the greatest gift we are given. It is hard for me to fathom that on one floor of a hospital all the medical expertise available is being used to save a life, yet one floor down in that same hospital an unborn baby is being cut up by an abortionist's tools and sucked out by a vacuum into a waste basket in an operating room.

We hear the term unwanted pregnancies, yet in Ontario there is a five-year waiting period for adoption. The population of Canada is approximately 25 million. In order to maintain the status quo, Canadians should average 2.3 children per family, yet the average family size is 1.6 children. In fact, in Québec, the average is 1.3 children per family.

It must be stated clearly, though, that many women are forced to look at abortion because of men or boyfriends who are not willing to accept their responsibility and offer love, understanding and financial support to see this pregnancy through. In stating the obvious: "It takes two to get pregnant", it is not just a woman's problem.

Essentially, we are only maintaining our population through increased immigration. In Ontario in 1969, official agencies processed the adoption of 5,400 children. In 1979, this figure had dropped to 1,248. By 1984, 862 children were adopted through provincial agencies in Ontario. In this same time frame, abortions have increased over 600 per cent. As a Government, it is important to see that those women faced with unexpected pregnancies have available counselling services and possible financial assistance.

One of the basic debates in this very difficult and emotional issue is, when does life begin? I believe, if one is totally objective, that medical evidence clearly shows that life begins at conception. Did you know, Mr. Speaker, that four days after conception the sex of the unborn can be determined under a special microscope, or that after 24 to 25 days the heart begins to beat and pump its own blood, or that 43 days after conception brainwaves can be determined? Did you know that 30 days after conception, foundations of the brain, spinal chord, nerves and sex organs are completely formed?

All of the following occur even before the mother knows she is pregnant. Nerves and muscles begin working together, lips become sensitive to touch and the shape of the body is unmistakenly human and possesses all the internal organs of an adult.

In fact, the stomach produces digestive juices, the liver manufactures red blood cells, and the kidney eliminates uric acid from the body. Even the legs, arms, fingers and toes have already been formed. From this point on the only changes will be in size and sophistication of use of the unborn's parts. When we consider the abortion procedure, it becomes very clear that if the unborn foetus were not a living being there would be no reason for terminating its life.

I think it is important for Canadians to realize just what happens when a baby is aborted in its mother's womb by an elective abortion procedure. I realize there are those who are offended by such descriptions, yet I think in many cases people's consciences are pricked when they see and hear what really happens when an abortion is performed.

The first procedure is the D&C or the dilation and curettage abortion. This method is most often used in the first 13 weeks of pregnancy. A tiny hoe-like instrument, the curette, is inserted into the womb through the dilated cervix, its natural gateway. The abortionist then scrapes the wall of the uterus, cutting the baby's body to pieces. This is now used less frequently than suction.

The second procedure is suction abortion, the most commonly used method for early pregnancies. The principle is the same as in the D&C. In this technique, which was pioneered in Communist China, a powerful suction tube is inserted through the cervix into the womb. The body of the developing baby and placenta are torn to pieces and sucked into a jar.

The third procedure is salt poisoning, or hyper-natremic abortion. This method is generally used after 13 weeks of pregnancy. According to Statistics Canada, in 1985, 1,715 babies were aborted between 17 and 20 weeks, and 181 babies were aborted after 20 weeks.

In this procedure, a long needle is inserted through the mother's abdomen and a strong salt solution is injected directly into the amniotic fluid which surrounds the child. The salt is swallowed and breathed and slowly poisons the baby, burning his or her skin as well. The mother goes into labour about a day later and expels a dead, grotesque, shrivelled baby. Unbelievably, some babies have actually survived this "salting out", and were born alive.

As graphic and distasteful as these descriptions are, I believe Canadians must have awareness of the medical procedures involved in an abortion if they are going to continue to voice partial support for abortion in this country. When the abortion issue becomes a question of respect for human life, and it always does, it not only refers to the lives of unborn children, but to the lives of the elderly, the sick and, indeed, our own lives. Abortion is only the tip of the iceberg as we see today in our society euthanasia being discussed and even practised in moderate form. Does this mean in the final analysis, as Dr. Harley Smith at the Hospital for Sick Children in Toronto stated:

> There is relentless pressures on Governments to govern and physicians to practice on the principles of pure utility. In this view, what is good is not what is just or what is right, but what is useful. What is strong will survive. Who is wanted will be welcome.

I find it ironic that we live in a country that protects eagles' eggs and baby seals under law and yet allows abortion on demand. Throughout the abortion debate, we cannot get away from the fact that we are talking about the protection of or the taking of the life of the innocent unborn. We are living in a different world since Mr. Trudeau brought in his Charter, Section 15 of the Charter in particular. We hear an emphasis on rights, but what about responsibility and accountability?

• (2130)

In the abortion debate we constantly hear that women should make the choice over their own bodies. I agree that women should have the choice, but that choice should come before she enters into a sexual relationship with her partner. Grown men and women know that by entering into a sexual relationship there is always the possibility that a pregnancy could occur. Surely, abortion should not be considered a solution in that situation, like removing a troublesome wart. Margaret Eihler, one of the leaders of the radical feminist movement in Canada, stated: "Thanks to the feminist movement, the traditional or nuclear family is a goner". The radical feminist lobbyists, supported strongly by taxpayers' money,

feel that Governments should put sexual orientation into the human rights code and have abortion on demand. Let us not be fooled by these demands. If we accept their premise, we only destroy the family unit which history has already revealed is the strength of a nation.

When we consider the simple facts, that our population is declining and abortions are increasing, does it not become obvious that we are virtually destroying our own population? Do I dare say, we might even become an endangered species? Let us never forget that civilizations are judged by the way they treat their weakest members. That is why in closing, I take pleasure in moving an amendment to Government Order No. 36, that the motion now under consideration be amended by striking out all the words following "to protect the unborn" and replacing them with the following: "Such legislation should prohibit the performance of an abortion except when two independent qualified medical practitioners have, in good faith and on reasonable grounds, stated that in their opinion the continuation of the pregnancy would, or would be likely to, endanger the life of the pregnant woman.

We have heard excellent speeches from the Hon. Member for Kitchener (Mr. Reimer), the Hon. Member for Surrey—White Rock—North Delta (Mr. Friesen) and the Hon. Member for Grey—Simcoe (Mr. Mitges). I look forward to voting with them and others to protect life in Canada and against the resolution put forward by the Deputy House Leader.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Garneau (Laval-des-Rapides): Mr. Speaker, in the few moments during your absence, the rules have been changed somewhat on the matter of amendments. Thank you for this opportunity to speak on this subject which, as you know, is a difficult, complex and in some respects emotional one. It is difficult because of the various tendencies in a multicultural society such as ours where rules are no longer easily found that are widely accepted, especially those involving ethics, lifestyle, education and culture. So, this is a difficult debate, but it is also a complex one, because on whichever side one is, pro-life or pro-choice, it is difficult to draft legislation that is certain to achieve the desired goal, and I think this task is nonetheless an extremely important one for legislators.

While difficult and complex, this debate also is emotional because lives are involved—the lives of unborn infants, and what could be more marvelous in fact than witnessing the birth of a human being, a new baby?

Therefore, the motion on abortion raises a question that is linked to our culture, our religious beliefs, our lifestyle, and in order to find a solution, we must strike a balance between various rights, that of the mother over her own body, that of the foetus which is an unborn baby, its right to live, and the moment during pregnancy where that right takes precedence over that of the mother.

In terms of rights, there is something else we were reminded of recently by certain newspapers. What are the rights of the biological father of the unborn baby?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to state at the outset that I oppose abortion on demand. Such an approach would not answer the questions I raised, the questions raised by this debate on abortion— namely those of balancing the rights of the various parties involved.

Before going any further, I would like to stress that what is before this House is a motion rather than a piece of legislation. I heard colleagues earlier refer to the legislation. There is no legislation before us.

Instead of assuming its responsibilities and presenting the House and the Canadian people with a legislative measure which would have spelled out the fine details of its intentions, the Government—probably intent on avoiding internal dissention within its own membership—chose to throw the whole issue at the House of Commons in a haphazard approach. No bill, no leadership in terms of ideas and guidance for the Canadian nation. So here we are debating this motion, and once we all have had our say the problem will still be with us because no legislation will have been enacted. We will still be empty-handed, trying to cope with the Criminal Code or the provisions which the Supreme Court of Canada struck down because they are *ultra vires*. Nothing will have been solved, we will simply have talked about the issue for a while. Undoubtedly this will enable the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) to go on the hustings and claim that the question has been debated in the House of Commons. But his Government—this Conservative Government—will have done absolutely nothing to find a solution to a problem which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) described as a priority which had to be dealt with at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I had to say that, because I still think that Quebecers and other Canadians, men and women both, will be under the impression that this debate has solved the problem. Far from it.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, drafted as it is the motion under consideration would not stand the test of court action and a reference to the Supreme Court. What did the Supreme Court have to say in its January 28 judgment? For all practical purposes it stated that Criminal Code Section 251 which provides that the uninterrupted pregnancy of a woman would probably endanger her life or health is contrary to Canada's Charter of Rights. And according to Criminal Code Section 251 the decision must be made by a group of physicians, a kind of medical council of at least three doctors appointed by a recognized hospital, and these doctors are allowed to decide whether the mental health of the mother might be endangered if the pregnancy is not brought to an end.

The Supreme Court ruled that this clause was *ultra vires* because it interfered with the right of a woman to use her own body as she saw fit.

Mr. Speaker, because I heard a great many speeches in this House dealing with the motion before us and suggesting amendments which are exactly consistent with Section 251 of the Criminal Code, I feel that those who moved these amendments should know that the notwithstanding clause in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms should also be used to achieve their goal. Concerning the use of the notwithstanding clause, we should be aware that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) had indicated that using it was out of the question.

They will have to live with this and the consequences of their actions. All Conservative, Liberal or NDP Members who want to propose such amendments must be willing also to say that they will propose amendments to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, because even by using the notwithstanding clause, such legislation would have a five-year sunset clause, so that every five years, they would have to return to the House, debate and pass the same legislation, failing which it would become *ultra vires*.

Mr. Speaker, the motion before us is extremely vague and does not define any of the criteria necessary for us to pass judgment. For instance, this motion states in part:

> Such legislation should prohibit the performance of an abortion, subject to the following exceptions:
>
> When, during the earlier stages of pregnancy: a qualified medical practitioner is of the opinion that the continuation of the pregnancy of a woman would, or would be likely to, threaten her physical or mental well-being; when the woman in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner decides to terminate her pregnancy;

I try to read and understand exactly what this really means. If there is a direct intervention by a physician before the woman may make a decision and that her decision is not contrary to the physician's opinion, we are faced again with Section 251 of the Criminal Code which the Supreme Court ruled *ultra vires* while replacing the medical board by a physician. Then again, if we assume that, in the third paragraph of the motion before us, the first part does not lead into or precede the second part, we could read that the woman in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner decides to terminate her pregnancy.

In those conditions, can she exercise the freedom of choice called for by the Supreme Court ruling? Such would be the case only if a doctor is of the opinion that her physical and mental well-being is in danger or if the decision can be made by the woman alone. And when I read the English version, Mr. Speaker, things become even more complicated, because the French version reads as follows:

> . . . la femme enceinte, après avoir consulté un médecin qualifié, décide de mettre fin à sa grossesse;

While the English version reads as follows:

• (2140)

[*English*]

"When the woman, in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner, decides to terminate her pregnancy".

[*Translation*]

The French version reads as follows:

> . . . la femme enceinte, après avoir consulté . . .

While the English version reads as follows:

[*English*]

"When the woman, in consultation—"

[*Translation*]

Which of the two versions, the French or the English, is to take precedence? Will the decision be made by the woman alone or in consultation with her doctor? And what happens if the English version takes precedence and the woman and her doctor are not of the same opinion?

Therefore, the motion before us is extremely vague and, in my opinion, contrary to the Supreme Court's ruling. If we use this motion in a Bill or translate it into a bill, I think we open the door to another court challenge and a resumption of the debate while the matter goes back to the Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, I will therefore have to vote against the motion because it is far too vague. For instance, what does "in the earlier stages of pregnancy" mean? If the motion were more specific and referred to a certain number of weeks, perhaps I might give this aspect some serious thought. However, when someone refers to "the earlier stages of pregnancy", some people define this as the first 20 weeks or the first 24 weeks, while others say it is the first 12 weeks. Having tabled a motion as vague and as unspecific as this one, was the Government really serious about asking us to speak to this motion as Members of Parliament?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to leave the technical aspects of the motion and get back to the substance. What is the role of the legislator in our modern society? What is our role here in the House? As I see it, we are here to organize a social order, not to impose our personal views, views that I may have as a Catholic, as a citizen of Montreal, or other beliefs, other personal attitudes which I may be prepared to defend outside the House as a private citizen. Mr. Speaker, I am for the protection of life. I could preach all kinds of sermons outside the House of Commons to defend the right to life and try to convince people. If my daughter came and told me she was pregnant, I would certainly try and persuade her not to have an abortion. However, those are my personal beliefs. That is my set of values.

But when I speak in the House, is that what I am supposed to defend? Shouldn't I try to organize our social order instead? That is my perception of the debate we are having today. It's all very well to say, I am against abortion, except in cases of incest or rape. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine how long it

would take to prove this before a medical board? Who is going to determine whether a woman was raped? Who will be able to say, in front of whom, in front of which doctor, that it was a case of incest? I think it is too easy to say this.

We can satisfy our conscience. We can act very pro-life, if we happen to hold that position, but between the moment the problem is brought before a physician and the moment there is enough evidence to prove it was incest or rape, the child will already be born. I say we must be realistic. Of course we have an easy time of it. Earlier, I heard another Member say: A woman who doesn't want to be pregnant should realize this before. Before having sexual intercourse, I suppose. But what about the man's responsibility? Why put the entire onus on the woman, who is trapped, while we men can just go home and forget about it! I think it is unfair to look at the problem from that perspective, from the perspective of male morality alone. And what is our morality? To let others, to let women cope with a situation that men have created?

I say that when organizing this social order, we must take into account the position of the woman in this situation, and her desires and rights, but we must also define those rights in relation to the rights of others. I believe that the foetus has a right to life. But at what moment does the foetus exist? After the fourth week or the fifth week? I think we need legal and medical opinions. And then perhaps the rights of the foetus will have to take precedence over the rights of the woman, but there is also the right of the biological father. And there is also, according to the Supreme Court's judgment, the right of the woman to control her own body. I believe that if we want to organize this social order, we cannot do so solely on the basis of one set of values. We live in a society that is extremely pluralistic in its religious beliefs and its attitudes to life.

• (2150)

We have people from different countries. We are evolving into a pluralistic society that is much more permissive than before. Some of my colleagues have quoted the Bible and Scripture. Even if we quoted legal texts from 50 or 60 years ago, there was then a set of values to which 90 per cent of the population subscribed. Today this is no longer possible, and much as I feel at ease in a church and I agree with the bishops who set Catholic morality as a goal, Orthodox Jews set their morality as a goal and other religions set their morality as a goal. But there is a difference between proposing something as a value, which I support, and trying to impose it on those who do not have the same values. Since we live in a pluralist society with different opinions, I think that we have to take account of all these factors in organizing the social order.

That is why, just as I am opposed to free, unrestricted abortion, I believe that the State has the responsibility to consider the various opinions in society and to set a legal framework, not in a vague, imprecise motion like the one the Conservative Government presented, but in a series of precise clauses that would to some extent limit a woman's right, as described by the Supreme Court of Canada, to dispose of her own body and determine when this right takes second place to the right of the unborn child. This must all be put in a legal context. I think that if the motion were more precise, we could perhaps draw some conclusions and positions for the Government, but as it is written, this is impossible. I believe that we must find a solution that certainly at the beginning of a pregnancy allows a woman to exercise some judgement on the future of the foetus she is carrying and to make her own decisions. I find it a pity that such a question must be decided by a majority of men. I would like there to be many more women in this House to help us make that decision. I am not ready to blame women who, in their conscience and because of the environment in which they live, decide to have an abortion.

In this House, we have all seen examples of families in our neighbourhood where such things have happened. I find it easy to make very impassioned speeches, but who is ready to jail a woman for deciding to have an abortion at the beginning of her pregnancy? I am not prepared to do that and that is why I ask those on the extremes, either pro-life or pro-choice, to be a little more reasonable in their approach and to distinguish between one's own deeply held beliefs and the organization of our society. Personally, as a legislator, my choice is to let women at the beginning of a pregnancy be free to choose, but I also say that the State has a responsibility to set limits for this freedom and that we must be presented not with a vague motion that goes nowhere but with a legal text, a Bill, that would enable not only Members of this House but all Canadians, men and women, to judge the value of the proposals contained in it, not just a vague motion of principle like the one in the resolution we have before us.

Mr. Ricardo Lopez (Châteauguay): Mr. Speaker, I too am pleased to rise today on the motion before us which deals with a very controversial and stirring issue. Of course, a matter as important as this one deserves much consideration and must be dealt with not emotionally but with wisdom and most of all with a cool head.

I cannot agree with the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau) who, earlier, criticized the Government for having brought forward too vague a motion that will not necessarily become law if it is adopted.

Considering the complex and controversial nature of the issue, we will have to take as much time as we need to understand it fully and to have consultations, seek legal advice and other views likely to enlighten us to arrive at a more appropriate conclusion. To pass a motion or legislation hastily would seem to me a shunning of responsibilities, particularly on a matter of such enormous, vital importance.

Mr. Speaker, of course, I too am against abortion. I am sure that all Canadian men and women are against abortion. But we must not close our eyes, because there are times in life when decisions must be taken, and it is never easy especially on an issue as crucial as this one.

I am sure any woman who makes the painful decision to get an abortion, and I am referring to the physically and mentally painful aspects of it, does not do so with a light heart and takes that decision because she finds herself in a situation she considers desperate, she sees no end to the tunnel and no other way out.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that before judging women who get abortions, we must rather judge ourselves as Parliamentarians and as a government.

It is obvious that the Government has a social responsibility. We often hear that, in some cases, when women reach the very sensitive and painful decision to get an abortion, it is due to a lack of resources. In the old days, it could have been because they were judged too harshly and condemned by society. Today women think that they want children, but cannot afford to raise them. So they decide not to bear children who might be victimized.

This is an economic issue which should not necessarily prevail over morals. But things being what they are, we cannot change every Canadian's mentality.

It seems to me that, in such circumstances, the Government should design programs to aid women, particularly single parents, poor women and homemakers.

I would be very happy to see and vote for a piece of legislation giving a salary to women who stay home to care for their children. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if such a law were enacted, the abortion problem would be greatly reduced. If we could at that point have support for women in need, financial support of course as well as moral help and support, I believe the scourge or problem of abortion could be significantly reduced.

• (2200)

A lot of money is spent on other things, things that of course are often legitimate and acceptable, but in my view, Mr. Speaker, the most important thing, the most valuable institution in this country is still the family. And in this case, since it is the most important in my view, I believe it should be the priority for our Government. The priority of helping women who support and contribute to this country, who raise children, who work very hard to conceive them, to bring them up, and who are often considered careerless, lacklustre, some even say insignificant because they link a person's worth to a career or a high standard of living, and of course a woman who spends her life at home rearing children cannot at the same time have a career, she cannot go into business and earn a high income either.

Therefore, the sad thing about our society is that we pass judgment on those women, and we may be unfair to them.

Therefore, before we pass judgment on women, of course, I too do not accept that a girl or woman of any age be put in prison because she decided to get an abortion. All we would then be doing is trading one wrong for another. This would not solve the problem.

We should first provide women who find themselves in the difficult situation of having to make such a hard choice with an alternative. After providing them with the alternative support they deserve, I think then the Government perhaps should bring in much tougher legislation to deter some women from using abortion as a contraceptive method. This would be sad. My concern is that some might ultimately do that.

This is why I oppose abortion, because my concern is that some individuals could abuse that right if it were unrestricted.

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that today's exercise will raise our consciences, will bring out the ideas and the issues and will lead us to reflect further and to seek expert advice.

After this conscience-raising debate, we will be in a much better position to present an excellent and real piece of legislation, which, of course, will have to be precise, and yet take into account the situation. We must not forget today's reality. We must not forget that we too often tend to be judgmental. These are victims in our society. Therefore, before passing judgment, I think we must encourage them through our own attitude.

I keep saying that, before judging a woman, we must offer alternatives in the form of assistance and, of course, a salary for the woman who has children, a measure which has long been hoped for. As a matter of fact, last week, I submitted a questionnaire to my constituents and it appears that a large percentage of the population is in favour of such a measure. Such a measure could get these women out of a distressing situation, confined as they are at home and unable to see any alternatives except through prostitution or even, when they are pregnant, by asking for an abortion, although we may not agree. But as a result of the situation they are stuck in without any possibility of getting out of they feel compelled to take such an unfortunate action.

Mr. Speaker, we should start by asking the question ourselves and the exercise we are involved in now is a step in that direction: we should adopt an attitude which is more fair, equitable and understanding toward these women who sometimes, because of their situation, are compelled to make decisions which they often regret afterwards, and we will end up with legislation to prevent some people from abusing the situation.

Often women have tried, and this is the reason I am against abortion, having heard during the public hearings which we held last year throughout Canada from a great many women who came and told us individually: "I tried on several occasions to get an abortion, but I failed. Finally, with time, I decided to accept this notion as a fact and to keep my baby." They are telling us today: "I am glad I kept my baby." This should silence those who claim that an unwanted child will be an abused child and that the wanted and planned child is a happy and well treated one. Such is not the case, Mr. Speaker.

Now thanks to planning, families can have the number of children they want when they want them, etc., to the point where they can even determine the sex.

If that were the case there would be no mistreated children today. But unfortunately the contrary is true. There are more and more of them. So it is not because the child was planned, wanted, hoped for. There is no guarantee that the child will be well treated. None at all. Just like the opposite is also true. Nor is it because at the outset a woman did not want to become pregnant and did not want to bear a child. It does not necessarily mean either that the child will be mistreated. He will probably be the most loved. I know some cases which attest to this. And it does not prove either that the child will not grow up to be an outstanding citizen, perhaps even the kind of good Parliamentarian we really need.

So, Mr. Speaker, for me this is an opportunity to reflect upon the issue and I urge all my colleagues to give serious consideration to this matter, and either of the two extreme positions which might be proposed or adopted seem totally unreasonable to me. I think that free abortion on request at any time for any woman is a cop out which I cannot accept. But there is the other extreme view that abortion should never be considered under any circumstances, and again I must express disagreement. It seems to me there should be a way to reach a compromise somewhere, and I leave it to the experts to shed more light on the issue, but there must be a middle course which all Canadian men and women would find acceptable.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, July 26, 1988

[*English*]

The House continued its sitting.

Mr. Howard Crosby (Halifax West): Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that I fully realize and am cognizant of the fact that most of what can be said about the issue of abortion in Canada has been said in this debate. However, I think it behooves every Member of the House of Commons to take the opportunity to express his or her own views on the issue of abortion, for the benefit of their constituents and all other Canadians who are willing to listen to that expression of views.

In order to express my views, for the records of the House of Commons, and anybody else who is interested enough to review them, let me begin by examining the motion placed before the House of Commons. Basically, the Government in this motion has asked the House of Commons in Parliament to achieve a balance between the right of a woman to liberty and security of her person and the responsibility of society to protect the unborn.

I think that that is a laudable goal, but I am afraid that it is not the issue that now exists in Canada. I say that because we are here debating this matter simply because we cannot bring Canadians to a consensus on this issue. Even though the Government and Members of the House of Commons may try to be even-handed, may try to come down the middle of the road, there are in fact two totally different views with respect to abortion in Canada, that is to say, there are groups of people who have banded together on one side or the other of the issue and demand that their view be accepted. That is the problem we face. Coming down the middle of the road is not the solution. It is indeed the problem because too many Canadians will not accept that approach to the issue of abortion.

• (2210)

Quite frankly, and contrary to the resolution, I think the House of Commons and the Government of Canada and every other person must take a position and then be judged on that position. It may seem difficult, it may even be cruel in the circumstances of a real and growing and living society, but it is the fact of the matter, in my view.

What am I talking about? I am talking about the pro-life view or anti-abortion view on the one hand and the pro-choice or the individual right of the woman on the other hand. How do you rationalize those two opposing views? We are here because the Supreme Court of Canada failed to rationalize those two views. If an individual looks at the decision of the Supreme Court in the Morgentaler case, one might say that the judges of the Supreme Court in some cases were Solomon-like in their decision. They looked at the two opposing views, that is the right of the mother and the right of the unborn, and tried to make a compromise between those two connected but in a sense different views.

I recall specifically that Madam Justice Bertha Wilson, in expressing her judgment, took that kind of Solomon-like approach by saying simply, here we have a problem, it relates to the termination of pregnancy, so what we will do is look at the whole of that pregnancy and in fact cut it off in the middle. On the one side we will say pro life or preservation of life in the later stages, and on the other side we will say the right of the mother to terminate the pregnancy in the earlier stages.

That obviously represented an attempt similar to what Solomon did in the famous case involving cutting the baby in half and looking for the real mother to object. Unfortunately, that view has not, in my opinion, been accepted by a great majority of Canadians. They do not believe in compromise on the issue. That is the problem we have to face. If compromise could be achieved, if Canadians could come to a consensus on the issue, then the difficulty would dissipate. Therefore, let us not put that aside. The choice has to be made between the two opposing disparate positions.

As I said, Madam Justice Wilson tried to deal with it, and our problem is that that decision is not accepted by a great many Canadians. The solution is not to rely on the Supreme Court of Canada decision. The solution lies in Parliament making a decision.

What can Parliament decide? Is the House of Commons capable of rendering a decision on the issue of abortion? That leads me to a review of the current situation.

In 1982, Members of this House of Commons, with the consent and concurrence of nine of the 10 provincial Premiers, adopted the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. That Charter contained very specific provisions. I do not recall, when I attended here on Parliament Hill in the presence of Her Majesty the Queen at the signing of the Charter, anyone standing up and saying: Do not sign the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. There was almost unanimous support for the Charter, although there were some very important objections.

However, the point is that we made the Charter of Rights and Freedoms the law of Canada, and now we must live with its provisions. One of those provisions grants to individual Canadians rights which the Supreme Court of Canada, I think quite properly, has interpreted as meaning in the case of a pregnant woman the right to terminate a pregnancy in certain circumstances and at a certain point in time.

I do not quarrel with the adoption of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. I certainly do not quarrel with the Supreme Court of Canada's interpretation of it. However, that allows us to look only at what our law-making power is in the Parliament of Canada, and that is to enact criminal laws. Indeed, that lies at the heart of the Supreme Court decision in the Morgentaler case involving Section 251 of the Criminal Code of Canada.

It is worthwhile reminding Parliamentarians that that provision of the Criminal Code made it an offence for a mother to have an abortion and it was punishable by imprisonment for two years. In the case of other persons involved in an act of abortion it was an indictable offence punishable by imprisonment for life. That is what the Supreme Court of Canada was looking at.

I think some people will understand that such a law was questionable. Some people would wonder whether that was the right approach to what is basically a social problem. Therefore, we should not be too critical of the Supreme Court of Canada when they tackled this problem of Section 251 of the Criminal Code and the extreme punishment that was imposed in certain circumstances on those involved in abortion. It is understandable that the law was questioned.

Therefore, what can Parliament do, having received the judgment of the Supreme Court? There are two things it can do, in my opinion. The first is to enact a new provision of the Criminal Code that does not violate the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Second, if Parliament is determined to abolish abortion or restrict it more than the previous law did, then we must seek an amendment to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. All Members of the House know that that involves concurrence of the provinces under the current formula, which is seven provinces representing 50 per cent of the population.

It is very clear. If you want to change the abortion law in Canada from the current void that exists following the decision of the Supreme Court, you have to enact a new provision of the Criminal Code because that is the only power Parliament has with respect to abortion.

Second, if you are not satisfied that a criminal law of less force and effect than Section 251 is sufficient, then we must have an amendment to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. That, simply stated, is why I object to the resolution we have before us. It does not address either of these problems. It does not make clear what the change in the Criminal Code would be, and it does not even deal with the matter of a possible amendment to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

• (2220)

I think it is a terrible flaw in the motion that it does not mention punishment. We are talking about criminal law which means offences and punishment. Every Canadian should know that if we pass judgment on this motion, we should be condemning people involved in abortion to imprisonment or some other punishment.

I am not saying that that is wrong. Indeed, that is what criminal law provisions are all about, but let us have it in the motion. The great crime in Canada is that 60,000 and more abortions take place each year, with the consequences we have all heard described. Is the alternative to place 60,000 women in jail? Do we want to stop abortions by punishing those who have abortions with jail terms?

I do not know what the people of Canada want. I have not got a clue. I have heard submissions made to me from both sides. I know there is a real concern about the right to life and the pro-life movement. I accept that and understand it. However, what are the alternatives? That is what we have to face.

I do not believe that this resolution helps us face the real problem. That is why I introduced in the House of Commons last Monday a new private Member's Bill, Bill C-312, which proposes an Abortion Law Interim Measures Act. That Bill spells out very clearly that abortion is an offence punishable by two years' imprisonment, but there is an exception. If an abortion is medically necessary and that is certified by a medical practitioner, there is no offence. Indeed, if a woman who believes her life is in danger and that an abortion is medically necessary has one but does not have access to medical assistance of the kind described in the provision, then there is also no offence.

One of the complaints and concerns of the Supreme Court of Canada was that the previous law did not fall equally upon all Canadian women. Those who had easy access to medical practitioners and hospitals could comply with the provisions, and other expectant mothers who did not want to carry their children to full term did not have that kind of access. That meant an inequality in the law that in effect destroyed the law from within. Its failure to provide for equal application across Canada to all Canadians made it invalid in the eyes of the Supreme Court. I do not think anyone can blame the Supreme Court for coming to that conclusion because if there is one thing to which we all subscribe, and I defy anyone to deny this, it is the equality of all Canadians before the law. Once we see on the face of a law a failure to observe equality, then the law is worthless.

Through my Bill, I have tried to overcome the objection that the provision of the Criminal Code under Section 251 was unequal in its application. I have also dealt with the second point, which is that we can enact a criminal law and we can also seek an amendment to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms to protect the unborn. If we are not willing to seek an amendment to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms to protect the unborn, then we are not serious about doing anything about abortion law in Canada. Through the simple expedient of amending the Charter of Rights and Freedoms by extending it to include the unborn, we can enact a law that protects the foetus.

Historically, and I do not think anyone will deny this, a distinction was made under Canadian law, and under the British law on which our law is based, that until a child was born, the child had no rights under the law. Indeed, in the Criminal Code of Canada, there are offences like infanticide, which is when a child is killed at birth. There are offences like concealing a child and failing to provide assistance at childbirth. It is clearly understood that until a child is born, under the law of Canada, the child has no rights.

We have faced this problem in the law for literally centuries. We have faced it in Canada since Confederation, and before that it has been faced by British law. Therefore, we are talking about a very substantive change in the law if we want to protect the unborn child, and we need a constitutional amendment to do so. I am sure the officers of the Department of Justice understand that. I am sure that that is the advice they would give to those who say that they want a law that protects the unborn to the extent that some Hon. Members have mentioned.

The only way we will get such an amendment to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms is by going to the provinces and obtaining their concurrence to such a change. That is exactly what I have provided for in my Bill. I have provided that upon the enactment of the legislation I have proposed, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) would have to convene a conference of First Ministers to deal with the matter of a change in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms or, alternatively, introduce it as a priority item at a conference of First Ministers. If the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) is so asked, he would prepare an amendment to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms that would achieve that purpose.

Let me make what I am saying abundantly clear. If we are to deal with abortion in the manner indicated by a great many Members, that is to say if we are to have greater protection for the lives of the unborn and assurance that abortions will be performed only in very extreme circumstances, then we must have a change to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We must have a constitutional base for a law. Otherwise, we are restricted to the kind of law that I have proposed in the Bill I have introduced, Bill C-312 which has been entitled the Abortion Law Interim Measures Act.

My solution to the problem is to have legislation before the House and to seek a constitutional amendment. Of course, we must recognize all the time that if a constitutional amendment cannot be achieved, if the House of Commons and the Senate of Canada with all its lofty deliberations refuses to amend the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, if Parliament approves an amendment but the provinces do not concur, then we have to recognize that we cannot change the abortion law of Canada in the substantial way that many Canadians and indeed many Members of this House seek. That is the issue and let us deal with it. Let us not hide behind resolutions.

Let me end by simply reading into the record the statement of Archbishop James M. Hayes, President of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops. He said:

The Government has introduced a Motion that proposes the totally unacceptable gestational approach for a new Canadian abortion law.

The position of the Catholic Church is that human life begins at conception and must be valued, respected and safeguarded from the beginning.

To a degree, this is an exercise in futility. Neither those who try to achieve protection for life like the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, nor the people who believe in freedom of choice and the *status quo*, will accept this resolution with whatever amendments may be made. I would like to see Bill C-312 or some similar legislation passed, and I wash my hands of this resolution.

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, none of us feels comfortable with being required to engage in this debate. I think it is an example of one of those situations in which Members of Parliament or of any legislature often find themselves, which is that they have to take a position and make their position known. There are times when one cannot be whipped from one side or the other by one's electorate. One must express one's view on the basis of one's philosophical, moral, and ethical point of view. I must say that I was disappointed in the intervention just made by my hon. colleague across the way. He pointed out that there are two quite different opinions on the issue. He said that there could be no compromise, then proceeded to take both sides. I hope that I will not be a victim of that approach.

• (2230)

We have entered into this debate tonight because the Supreme Court, almost exactly six months ago, handed down a decision which, on the basis of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms threw out Section 251 of the Criminal Code which regulates abortions in Canada. In so doing it once again posed the dilemma of reconciling divergent, often polarized opinions among Canadians.

There are very many Canadians, and I was among them, who did not see that decision as a victory of the enlightened over those of darkness. It was not a victory, in my view, for abortion on demand, and it was not an occasion for those on either side to regard the others as either stupid or unprincipled because they did not share these views of the polarized factions in this debate.

This is a significant issue to all Canadians. It is an issue of great controversy, an issue of great disagreement, an issue which tests Parliamentarians and tests the Government, a test which the Government fails by the very nature of its response.

We are given a resolution, which I will discuss in a moment, which may or may not be adopted, which promises legislation as a result of the outcome of this debate. Yet, we know that what we are involved in here is a charade. It is another example of the failure of the Government to live up to its responsibilities, another example of a Government which, in failing to live up to its responsibilities, would like to fool the Canadian people into believing that it is doing something of significance.

What is going to happen to whatever comes out of this deliberation? If this resolution is passed, what will happen to it? Is the Government going to introduce legislation before the end of this Parliament? I do not think there is anyone in this country who seriously believes that there will not be an election before this matter is resolved. Therefore, why bother?

The only appropriate action for which the Government had plenty of time was to introduce legislation, to take responsibility, to take the knocks of having acted as a Government should, and bring forth legislation which could be discussed in detail and which would provide Canadians with an understanding of where they stood. Most important, the Government should have attempted to reconcile the divergent views in this country which must be reconciled.

We have basically two quite polarized, divergent positions on abortion which have been clearly identified in debate. There is, on the one hand, the pro-life position and, on the other, the pro-choice position. The Member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby) indicated that virtually all Canadians are on one side or the other and, indeed, must be on one side or the other.

His experience indicates that that is so. My experience indicates the contrary. My experience indicates that the great majority of Canadians would like to see a position somewhere in between those two extremes, because they are extremes.

As I have said before, this matter divides Canadians on the basis of deeply held religious and philosophical convictions. Our task is to resolve this problem, to produce legislation which is permissive, and to produce legislation which does not compel anyone to act counter to their religious or philosophical beliefs.

Let us examine those two sets of beliefs. On the one hand we have the pro-life position, most clearly, but not exclusively, articulated by the Catholic Church. It is beautiful in its consistency and not open to attack, and I am not here to attack it. That position is that we have, at every period of gestation, from the moment of conception, a human life itself.

That position argues that there really is no distinction between the potential for human life and human life. That is not a position which St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Augustine, Aristotle, or even the Catholic Church until a little over 100 years ago, accepted. It was clear to the philosophers in that church, and to others, that there was a biological distinction to be made between an embryo, an early foetus, and a fully developed human being. Separate from such considerations, as an almost life-long biologist, I am convinced, because the evidence is clear, that there is a distinction between an embryo and an infant that has the characteristics of a human being defined by St. Thomas Aquinas as a rational being, a being which can exist independently and is capable of thought.

However, that is the position of the pro-lifers, that life in its potential is equivalent to human life and that its consistency extends, not only to the point of conception but beyond because it accords to the egg and the sperm equivalent respect. That is the basis for opposition to artificial methods of birth control. This is a belief deeply held by many Canadians and they are offended, as their beliefs would have them be offended, by any attack on that which they define as human life.

On the other hand, we have those who represent the pro-choice position. They are conscious of the many instances in which women have been driven to have abortions and the very many situations in which such abortions are justified, and cognizant of the imposition, mainly by males, upon the abilities of women to make decisions. This is the position which has been described as abortion on demand. It has been interpreted far too much on the basis that that kind of position means the trivialization of life.

I have difficulty with the pure pro-choice point of view when it is expressed exclusively in terms of the need of a woman to have complete control over her body. Surely it is possible to argue that in certain circumstances and over a period of time during gestation that can be true, as the Supreme Court at least recognized in terms of the judgment of Justice Bertha Wilson who pointed out that there ought to be increasing restrictions depending upon the stages of development. What is offensive to me in the free-choice position, justified exclusively on the basis of a woman's control of her own body, is that the question of reproduction is not simply a question of the decision of an individual at all stages. It cannot be.

• (2240)

Reproduction of humankind is not just a question for the individual; it is a question for humanity. As Justice Wilson recognized, it must include some consideration of the interest of society in general as it is expressed by the state. Therefore, neither position is acceptable to me.

However, a rational position can be taken and it is, at least in some measure, recognized in this resolution as it was in the judgment of Justice Bertha Wilson. It is to recognize that as development occurs, certainly in the early stages it is appropriate that the decision to abort a foetus be made between a woman and her doctor. It is not abortion on demand; it is abortion on the basis of choice, with full consideration of the health of the woman in consultation with appropriate medical practitioners. That is as it should be during the early period.

Surely it ought to be evident to all that in the later stages of pregnancy there is a fully viable human being, an entity that would be fully viable if born at that stage. Recently, one of my assistants gave birth prematurely to an infant at six and one-half months. Surely it must be clear at that stage that we are dealing with something other than the abortion of a foetus, other than the termination of a pregnancy that does not entail larger values and considerations than abortion normally would in the context of the appropriateness of freedom of choice.

Most European nations have recognized these limits. Most recognize that there should be sharp restrictions on access to abortion at the stage of potential independent viability. The test should be the survival of the mother and other such significant considerations. The question of what to do between the twelfth week and twentieth week should be determined in the deliberations of whatever committee will deal with this resolution. It seems clear to me that the rational position to be taken, which can be justified philosophically and morally, involves free choice during the early stages of pregnancy with increasing limits thereafter, as this resolution proposes. That is the position that the vast majority of Canadians would accept.

I believe it is an indication of the rationality of most Canadians that they have not adopted either of the two extreme positions, however meritorious they may be to those who hold them. We must find a means to reconcile appropriately the diversity of opinion that exists. It cannot be either of the two extremes suggested by the Hon. Member for Halifax West. It must be a compromise position that does not insist that one employ abortion and one that does not exclude it as a medical means to deal with serious problems which we all know necessitate abortion in many instances. When abortion is not available it leads to all kinds of tragedy brought about by illegal abortions.

I am not standing in this House in support of abortion. No pro-choice individual to whom I have talked, nor anyone I know concerned with any part of this issue, likes abortion any more than they like amputation or other severe medical solutions to a medical problem. If we want to eliminate abortion, we should begin to address the circumstances which have led to abortions.

Twenty-three per cent of terminated pregnancies involved teenagers. Teenagers are all too frequently denied advice and counselling on sexual behaviour. According to a study conducted a couple of years ago, teenagers spend an average of two minutes a day talking to their families. We have created an environment in which the family is under the test. We will not solve the problem by banning abortions. We can certainly do a great deal more than we have to prevent unwanted pregnancy, which means information on contraception should be available and young people should be provided with the kind of knowledge about sexual behaviour that they need.

We must do much more to strengthen the family. If we are concerned about the issue of abortion and deal with that problem in the next Parliament, we ought also to address the other significant issues arising with respect to reproduction. These include the new reproductive technologies, the use of foetal tissue for experimental purposes, genetic engineering, and all scientific and technological manipulations that can take place to shape human beings or select the gender of offspring. All these matters are of equal importance to the future of humankind and to the family.

If we ever resolve this issue, I hope we will also address the other considerable problems that technology presents to the future of humankind as we know it, and the future of society as we would like to have it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Plourde (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup): Mr. Speaker, let me start my speech against abortion by quoting His Holiness John Paul II: "Life must be defended from the moment of conception against everything that threatens it, such as famine and war; it must be cured of anything that weakens or dishonours it, such as illness, alcohol and drug abuse; it must be protected from anything that debases it, such as violence, sub-human living conditions, degrading working conditions and so many ills of that kind." And the Holy Father, at the end of a 10-day trip in the United States, in September 1987, thanked Vice President George Bush with these words: "The final test of your greatness is the way you treat each human being, particularly those who are weak and defenceless. Feeding the poor and welcoming refugees, strengthening the social fabric of the nation, encouraging an authentic advancement of women, guaranteeing the rights of minorities, pursuing disarmament while ensuring self-defence, none of that will succeed unless the respect for life and its protection in law are granted to every human being."

• (2250)

Mr. Speaker, the motions put forward when the political climate does not seem to point in that direction, appear illogical, abnormal and inhuman, and contain drastic provisions which would not even be necessary in most cases if we bothered, in this society, to offer serious sex education programs, particularly with regard to contraception. Both matters go hand in hand. If people only hear about abortion, they won't think in terms of contraception and that will lead to abuses tied to a serious act which represents the termination of a human life through barbarous means and should not have its place in a human and civilized society.

Mr. Speaker, to make myself quite clear and illustrate what I just said, I would like to quote an article from a book entitled *Les trois menaces à la société contemporaine* written by Father Lawrence Abello and published by *Mouvement Pro-Vivère inc.*. This article called "Victim declared subhuman" reads as follows: "It is no wonder that so many in our society say, without any proof, that the unborn child is not a human being. Throughout history, every time exploiters wanted to kill a group of persons, they claimed that the victims were subhuman. For example, higher castes, slave owners, explorers and Nazis have rationalized that untouchables, slaves, savages and Jews were subhuman, non-persons in the eyes of the law, and therefore did not even have the right to life, which is the foundation of all rights." Because of such de-humanization, the above exploiters in the past could not realize that killing their victims was killing human beings. In the same way, in our present society, many people cannot realize that abortion is murder.

For those who are reluctant to characterize abortion as murder or to compare abortion clinics to communist or Nazi extermination camps, let us look at what happens in abortion clinics.

Mr. Speaker, I will refer to two cases which, morally speaking, are typical of all abortions to the extent that in each abortion an unborn child is killed directly. The only unique feature in both cases was the publicity they enjoyed. The first one is the Waddill case. We must refer to a 1977 court decision in California, followed by another decision in 1978, and the proceedings that led to those decisions. Mr. Speaker, in that case the abortionist replaced part of the amniotic fluid with a salt solution, which not only poisons the system and burns the skin of the unborn child, but also causes its premature expulsion from the womb. The baby girl survived the abortionist's attempt at burning and poisoning her, and also her traumatic and premature expulsion from the womb. Did the baby survive the abortion? In fact, during an hour, half suffocated, she cried after escaping the doctor's attempt at taking her life. Then the doctor returned, caught her by the throat and strangled her to death.

An abortion as we now understand it is not complete so long as the child is not put to death. That abortionist could not claim self-defence or the need to protect a victim from an aggressor. Therefore, from an ethical point of view, how can that abortion be characterized?

Mr. Speaker, that was a direct killing of a harmless human being, that is a human being that threatened nobody's life through a positive act. Even if that type of crime is generally called an abortion, or euphemistically a pregnancy termination or removal of the product of conception, the fact remains it is pure murder.

The other case, Mr. Speaker, is the testimony of a nurse in September 1981 to a Vancouver radio station, CJOR, during a program chaired by the former Minister of Health of British Columbia, Rafe Mair. After attending a hysterectomy abortion, the nurse snatched away the living baby on the abortionist's sterile table in order to baptize him, Mr. Speaker. The abortionist turned to the anaesthetist and shouted: "Did you see that? She snatched my specimen away!" The nurse replied: "I just baptized your specimen Paul."

Mr. Speaker, is not using human beings as guinea pigs before killing them what went on in concentration camps? Let us recall that morally, those abortion cases are no different from any other kind of abortion, either by means of abortives such as drugs and intra-uterine instruments, or by an abortionist who pulls a baby to pieces by means of a vacuum tube, carves it out with a blade or removes the uterine wall to prevent the baby from implanting, the so-called expansion and curettage. He ties up the umbilical cord to suffocate the baby or simply throw the aborted baby into a garbage can where it dies after struggling for a period of between 15 minutes and three hours, etc.

Faced with such cases, Mr. Speaker, any refusal on our part to recognize that abortion clinics today are the equivalent of concentration camps is to deny reality.

• (2300)

Two remarks must be made here: First of all, in the Waddill case, if the physician for instance had strangled the same baby, also prematured, but born in the delivery room across the street from the abortion clinic, he might have been accused of murder instead of being paid for carrying out a medical procedure. Which means that the life of the baby would have protected by the legislation only if someone, perhaps the mother had, wanted it. But to allow any interested person to determine at whim whether or not the baby in question is a human being with the right to live reminds us of Nazi methods.

Mr. Speaker, the Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup riding which I have the honour and privilege to represent in the House is mostly a rural riding. I have made it my duty over the past few years to visit one of the finest counties in Quebec and I have had the opportunity to discuss with groups representing the area, including l'*Âge d'or*, the AFEAS groups, *Maison des femmes*, Knights of Columbus, *Cercle des fermières*, *Filles d'Isabelle*, and a great many others, and I asked their opinion about such issues as capital punishment and abortion. Mr. Speaker, I often had extraordinary exchanges with fathers and mothers with families of 10, 12, 15 children, sometimes even more, and during a survey I carried out as early as 1985 on the abortion issue, 65 per cent of my constituents were against abortion. Some in all of its forms, others with restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, even more recently, on April 22 last, Mrs. Adrienne Tanguay of Saint-Pascal and Mrs. Gertrude Madore of Kamouraska held a press conference to hand me a petition against abortion signed by 8,016 residents of 18 parishes in the Rivière-du-Loup and Kamouraska regions. They also handed me a similar petition signed by 698 residents of five parishes in the Transcontinental, that is the Pohénégomook region.

These two women, both of whom are mothers and grandmothers, acted spontaneously without the support of an organization, simply bacause they love life, consider abortion to be a crime and believe that it is their duty to defend innocent and defenceless beings, "choosing to act in silence for those who die in silence".

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the idea that human life must be respected is very important in the long run because of the extremely negative consequences which can occur otherwise. After having been conditioned little by little to accept the idea that the human foetus is nothing more than a sandwich, human beings could very well reach the stage where they seek to destroy themselves more or less unconsciously. Euthanasia would rapidly become, with all its dangerous aspects, another step in this lack of respect for human life. People would then start asking, as in the case of abortion, who must die and when and in the case of which disease and below which IQ or following which emotional reaction.

Mr. Speaker, the role of health professionals and physicians could become dangerously ambivalent since in too many cases they would begin to wonder whether they should treat a disease, save a life, or quite simply end one. The cowboy approach might prevail quickly, and by that I mean it might become very easy to eliminate any individual whose behaviour is frustrating or embarrassing, or whose face one does not like.

The interest of any human being commands respect for one's own life and that of others, and everything begins with the life of the human foetus.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell you the true story of a mother who is glad she said no to abortion. Here it is:

> My baby gave me a reason to live. I was glad I decided to keep my child. My daughter was beautiful and beaming with joy. Her small and warm body made me dream. She was entirely dependent on me and gave me a reason to fight.

After a difficult pregnancy and delivery which required several weeks of rest and hospital care, Marlène finally got her daughter back. She is happy and looks to the future with confidence.

Marlène says:

> I had agreed to live with the father of my child in Quebec City. In the beginning I was proud to have my own daughter, at last. We shared a nice apartment, my friend had a job and I was getting social assistance for myself and my daughter. We had everything to be happy, but we were not. There was a big problem between us. I was never satisfied. I was independent and demanding, and gave little. I no longer wanted to stay with my friend who did not provide financial support since I was independent. Moreover, I was not satisfied with his educating skills for our daughter. So I returned to Jonquière with my daughter where I went back to school.
>
> It is at that time that I got back in touch with my girl friend Claude. I was really happy to see her and we renewed our friendship. But she seemed different to me. She had changed. During our separation, she had become a Christian and had learned to put her confidence in God. She took me one night to her church and I was really impressed by the atmosphere of the place. I felt at peace. Claude gave me a bible that evening and I started to read. I did not understand everything but I kept on reading.
>
> Time went by and my little girl was growing up. But as I watched her grow up, I started thinking I had failed in the way I brought her up. This bothered me and it became an obsession. That was when I turned to God to ask Him for His help. When I was reading my bible, I saw in the Old Testament that many problems were due to the fact that people ignored God. My friend Claude also told me that if I talked to God, I could be sure He would listen.

And she concludes as follows:

> I have always been very proud of my daughter. I never regretted keeping my baby and refusing to have an abortion. God has always watched over us. He has always been true.

Marlène maintains that although being a single mother is very difficult, she never regretted keeping her child.

> When she was small, I marvelled . . .

. . . she says, . . .

> . . . at her very presence and at the progress she made. I loved to watch her learn about life. Later on, when times were difficult, her presence meant something to fight for. And often when I felt hurt, her little arms around my neck were a great comfort.
>
> After my mariage, when we had our other children, my husband and I, she was a great help in taking care of the little ones and their education. We are really very proud of her. Today, she is a lovely young girl of 13 who is a real joy. We could not do without her.

Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of stories like this about women or unmarried mothers who said no to abortion.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, I ask God to enlighten all Members of this House in this important historic debate, and especially during the vote on Thursday, so that reason may prevail.

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I too am pleased to take part in the debate on a subject that I think is increasingly important. But before getting into the subject, I must tell you that looking at the motion the Conservative Government presented, I must express my disappointment, as my colleagues have done, and I think that Quebecers and Canadians are disappointed with the Conservative Government and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), who lacked the courage to present a Bill.

As we speak, I think many Quebecers are certainly asking themselves questions. Why did the Conservative Government not have the courage six months after the Supreme Court decision to bring in a Bill to amend the Supreme Court decision? Why did the Conservative Government wait until July 26? We will discuss it on July 27, at a time when many people are away on vacation. Why did the Government wait so long to come up with just a motion? Why did the Government only bring forward a motion which, in my opinion, is not sufficiently clear and does not meet the needs of the situation? The Government already failed in its attempt to submit to the House of Commons three options for motions that were only meant to sound out people's opinions. Since the Official Opposition, the NDP and even most Conservative Members disagreed with this approach, Mr. Speaker, we would have thought that the Government would have learned its lesson and that it would have brought us at least a Bill to legislate clearly and precisely on the abortion issue.

Mr. Speaker, all that we have before us are unclear wishes.

● (2310)

The Government's motion reads as follows:

> Such legislation should prohibit the performance of an abortion . . .

I am all for prohibiting abortion.

> . . . subject to the following exceptions:

And then it reads as follows:

> When, during the earlier stages of pregnancy: a qualified medical practitioner is of the opinion that the continuation of the pregnancy of a woman would, or would be likely to, threaten her physical or mental well being;

My first question is: What is meant by "earlier stages of pregnancy"? Two weeks? Three weeks? Four weeks? Ten weeks? Twenty weeks? Mr. Speaker, no one in this House can honestly defend the interests of his or her constituents and vote on such a vague motion.

If one reads well the definition, apart from the imprecise nature of the phrase "earlier stages of pregnancy", the decision is linked to a doctor's decision. On the other hand, the same paragraph states the following:

> . . . when the woman in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner decides to terminate her pregnancy; . . .

Then, there is a second attitude. Not only do we not know the duration, according to the Government, but in this case, contrary to the first option which requires that the physician should decide with the pregnant woman whether she should end her pregnancy for physical or mental health reasons, it is the opposite: it is the woman who, after seeing a physician, whatever his decision, may decide to have an abortion. Now, if we look at the English side, the interpretation is different: It is the pregnant woman who, with her physician's agreement, may decide to end her pregnancy.

There is a third option, still in the part which deals with the "early stages of pregnancy" of which we do not know the duration. Is it six months? In this option, the termination is performed by a qualified medical practitioner.

In the second paragraph:

> When, during the subsequent stages of pregnancy:

Again, it is not clear. We do not know what the Government's intentions are. I do not think there is a single Member in this House who is serious about his responsibilities to his constituents who can support such a motion.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you right away that I will vote against the Government's motion.

When we look at the amendments moved by some Members who are extreme Pro-Life supporters who came to the House and said: Abortion should be permitted only when the physician decides that the very life of the mother is at stake. Or in the case of rape, incest, or other difficulties, perhaps for mental health reasons, following consultation with a physician and at the request of the pregnant woman, the termination of the pregnancy is necessary. Unfortunately, I find that those who support the extreme Pro-Life position lack compassion. Because the decision we have to make today, in addition to our religious belief—a while ago, someone was praying to the Lord who, I think, was always quite generous with women faced with such enormous difficulties, because God would have permitted the termination of the pregnancy for different reasons.

There is the other extreme represented by the Pro-Choice supporters who are promoting abortion. I do not care for this approach at all. I would have liked it better had the Government introduced a Bill stating: We are against free abortion on request. I honestly believe there are not that many Members or that many people in Quebec and in the rest of Canada who favour unrestricted abortion. But it could have been allowed with certain limits for various reasons, limits with respect to the time to make decisions, not partisan decisions but decisions made by people fully conversant with the legal and medical aspects, people who would be able to tell us which month or the number of weeks which would be acceptable.

I would also have liked it if the Government had tabled a Bill and announced a family assistance program, a program to set up clinics, but not the kind of clinics where an individual or a young girl for instance realizes that she is pregnant and thinks that her parents will not want to see their unmarried pregnant daughter, so her companion says: We are too young, we have no money, so the first decision is to say that we have no choice—and this is quite human—we will have an abortion. So she goes to a clinic, something like the Morgentaler clinic, and the attendant for whom this is the only interest, the only way to earn a living, the only employment, says to her: So you came to have an abortion. Well, fill in this form and we will perform the abortion.

I would have preferred to see a Bill where the Government provides for financing clinics jointly with the provinces across Canada. As in the example I just gave you, a young girl or young couple would come to the clinic and explain their situation and ask for advice. However, the decision would still be up to them. And before opting for the most extreme solution, because there may be people who decide to have an abortion because they don't think they would be able to afford a child, perhaps the Government could make provision in the legislation for some kind of financial assistance during the initial years for what we used to call unmarried mothers, if that is still the term used today. The clinic would include social workers and health professionals who could offer a range of choices, and when the girl or the couple go home after two days, they may have decided, although when they first arrived at the clinic they were in favour of an abortion, they may have decided differently because they were initially unaware there was a program that could help them. And there would be a way to explain this to the parents and get them to accept it. And there would also be the question of adoption. There would be several options. And after that, the decision would be up to the woman.

I think it would have been better to have a debate around a Bill, which I think would have had very good results, and we could have proposed some solutions to the problem we are confronted with today, and certain sums of money would have been allocated, and we would not have had a series of good intentions that will be allowed to gather dust until after the election.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Prime Minister of Canada did not have the courage of his convictions. Sad but true, it has been six months since the Conservative Government realized it had to face up to its responsibilities. And it is particularly unfortunate that the Government brought us into this debate near the end, just before an election, and the only reason we are discussing this subject today is as a face-saving measure, to avoid losing any votes.

Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mulroney) cannot show courage, he does not deserve to lead the Government. Extremists often pretend that senior citizens are all pro-life. But in every constituency, including mine, we find some older people who are totally against abortion and others who understand, who, because they had children and for other reasons, had to get an abortion since it was the only option. People accept it today.

It is no longer a matter of age, but rather a humane approach in my view that a the majority of Quebecers, a majority of Canadian women and Montreal women today share. I believe a majority of the Canadian people support a middle position rather than either of the two extremes.

It is not a strict matter of principles, namely that a woman's body is involved and the decision is hers. Because it will be a man's body and the decision will be his—if one decides to take one's own life, one will take one's own life. And it is not strictly a matter of pro-life.

Therefore, at the other extreme, independent from the moral implications for families, those who maintain, and I base my reasoning . . . if we now look at the trend toward child-parent reunion, what we see on television or in newspapers, reunion associations, mothers who 20 or 30 years ago, for various reasons, were forced to abandon their child . . . and as we remember, what 30 years ago being an unwed mother was like . . . but today, this is accepted and there is a very generous realization, nobody turns away anymore, but 30 years ago matters were different.

If we look at all those persons who are interviewed, they did not decide alone. It was not the mother's decision, it was a choice forced upon her by her parents, thinking . . . my intention is not to hark back in order to blame anyone, I am simply recalling those facts in order to show people who believe that today the free choice is strictly that of the woman, she would decide—I believe that this could happen today and that in the absence of specialist advice we would see today what we saw 25 or 30 years ago. Abortions would be forced upon young girls against their will by their parents, or a husband or spouse, having decided not to have an unwanted child, would force his wife or spouse into abortion where she would have decided otherwise.

• (2320)

Therefore I prefer to check—and I understand how couples in a difficult situation could turn to abortion first.

But I go back to the importance of having clinics that are not exclusively abortion clinics but rather family counselling and planning clinics where health professionnals would soon discover that an abortion was not the first choice nor the decision of a wife, a spouse, a pregnant woman who had yielded to pressures from her husband or her companion and had come to the clinic, but when she got there, those professionals could perhaps give her advice and suggest ways to convince her companion that the pregnancy would be a happy experience and that the birth of the child might bring much more joy than anticipated.

So, Mr. Speaker, I again raise these questions and I would hope that the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice will answer tomorrow. I have two minutes left. Why did the Government wait six months after the Supreme Court judgement to react? After it tried to present three motions and most Members refused to take a stand on them, saying that they wanted a clear and precise Bill, why did the Government again present us with just a motion, one that is imprecise and that no Member of Parliament can accept? Why does the Government bring such an important subject up for discussion on July 26 or 27? Why did the Government not wait for the session to resume in September, if it did not want to call an election immediately? Why have this sham discussion, which is what I think it is? Perhaps on Thursday morning, if one listens to the speeches and follows what people are saying . . . I have not heard most Members who have spoken say that they would vote for the Government's motion.

So it is possible that we will wake up on Thursday to find that the Government's motion has been beaten, that the amendments from the various groups have been defeated, and that we are right back where we started. And the Government knew very well that this was a possibility, because among those who have spoken against the motion and condemned the Government's behaviour are Liberals, New Democrats and Conservatives.

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude, my time is up. But tomorrow, I would like either the Prime Minister, who I think has lacked courage, or the Minister of Justice to answer the questions that I asked them.

[*English*]

Mr. Elliott Hardey (Kent): Mr. Speaker, before entering debate on this issue, which I think is the most important issue facing Canadians today, I want the House to hear the observations of Mother Teresa, recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1979. She said that the nations with legalized abortions are the poorest of nations. She said that it took centuries for our civilizations to recognize a legal personhood of blacks, with the right to equal protection of the law. She said that it took a decision of the Privy Council in 1929 to determine that a woman was a legal person and therefore eligible for appointment to the Senate. She said that surely the time had come for Canadians and Canadian leaders, with a large revision of human rights, to recognize the unborn, the weakest, the most helpless of mankind, who have no less a claim to freedom and equality and logically the right to live.

This debate must not be treated lightly. The argument presented today and in the following days will be seriously considered when a law to replace that which was struck down by the Supreme Court of Canada is brought forward later this year. It is my intention in the time allotted to me to present arguments based on facts and common sense and in harmony with our Constitution and the Charter of Rights.

I find that I cannot support the motion in front of this House without amendment. My position is that abortion should only be permitted when two independent and qualified medical practitioners have, in good faith and on reasonable grounds, stated that in their opinion the continuation of the pregnancy would likely endanger the life of the pregnant woman, or seriously and substantially endanger her health. Grounds for such opinion would not include (a) the effective stress or anxiety which may accompany an unexpected or unwanted pregnancy and (b) social economic considerations. I will support the motion as amended in this matter, and I appreciate the opportunity to participate in a free vote on the question.

How can we move into this debate on the question of legal abortions in Canada, without first, and absolutely first, considering the rights of the unborn? I continue to be astounded by the fact that in spite of well-known advances in medical technology and observations of the foetus in early stages, the rights of women were the only rights considered by the judges in the decision last January 28. It is puzzling, to say the least, why the majority of Supreme Court judges believed they should not have to consider the question of the rights of the unborn in the Morgentaler case. If there is a constitutionally guaranteed right to life, then the Supreme Court will have countenanced the death of countless unborn children because it struck down the only law providing any protection of that right. It would clearly have been preferable for the court to address the constitutional right of the unborn, possibly hearing both cases and then rendering a simultaneous judgment.

• (2330)

By the way, one might also ask why men have been legally, psychologically and medically bypassed at a time when they are changing roles and becoming increasingly involved in raising their children. Yet they are systematically denied the right to be involved in life or death decisions affecting their unborn children.

Somewhere in this debate we must ask this question, and indeed we will end this debate by answering it. At what stage of embryonic or foetal development does a child become sufficiently like the rest of us to earn the right to life even if the mother wishes otherwise? Such discussion is rendered difficult by the fact that there is no qualitative difference between someone who is conceived a week ago and someone who was conceived 70 or 80 years ago. To distinguish, you must have to invent some arbitrary line based not on morals or principle but on size or appearance. No matter where you draw your imaginary line, the decision nonetheless affects a distinct and defenceless human life.

The question that simply has to be answered is: When does life begin? Madam Justice Bertha Wilson noted in her decision that the state's interest in the unborn child could not in any circumstances be paramount in the early stages of pregnancy, and that a differential abortion policy with a time limit in the second trimester is in operation in a number of countries, and the examples given were the Soviet Union, China, and some Eastern European countries.

Certainly I cannot accept that line of reasoning. Medical advances and common sense make it absolutely clear that the foetus in the second trimester is the very same human being that it is in the first trimester. We must refrain from supporting measures which fail to give the unborn full legal protection from the moment of conception. The fundamental right to life must always be in place and only put under consideration when the life of the mother is in jeopardy.

The eventual law we are seeking will have to deal with possible conflicts of rights of mother and child, for once we recognize the unborn as children or human beings or people then we are back to the Charter, and under the Charter lives of people or persons are protected. Surely if there is a conflict between the rights of mother and child, the right to life is primary.

There can be no quick fix of this complex issue, but the country's whole future is at stake and time is of the essence. Since Section 251 of the Criminal Code was struck down, the Ontario Government has taken the most sweeping and liberal approach possible. Almost immediately the Ontario Minister of Health, Elinor Caplan, announced that therapeutic abortion committees would be abolished and that the provincial health plan would fund abortions whether they were conducted in hospitals or doctors' offices or in clinics such as the Toronto facility operated by Doctor Morgentaler. We are now in a state of complete abortion on demand at any stage and this is not only disturbing, it is frightening and totally unacceptable.

I realize there is no doubt that many women consider abortions because of social as well as economic pressures. No one can ignore the terrible agonizing effect on the women who find themselves carrying an unwanted child. Many of these women are abandoned by their families and sometimes by the father of the child. I am aware of the problems that would result if an abortion were denied to these women, and much work needs to be done by society to assist in this area. By that I mean assisting in sex education, planned parenthood, as well as finding homes for unwanted children.

However, the results of abortion and the agonizing effect on so many women, both physically and mentally, are equally important and as common. I am in no position to criticize the medical profession, but I have often wondered about doctors and surgeons taking so much time with a patient who is about to undergo any kind of treatment or surgery other than therapeutic abortions. They will explain with pictures and sketches and drawings exactly what the patient will be subjected to during that treatment or surgery. Every detail of the operation is explained and even what are expected to be the feelings experienced during the period of recovery.

Yet I am told over and over again that none of this is explained to women who enter an abortion clinic. Afterwards, the stark reality of what really took place begins to come about. So many people experience guilt and depression beyond their ability to cope partly because the unborn child was denied humanity, or that he or she was denied a grave or a grave marker, and the grieving process is left unfinished. Worse still is finding out later what the doctor or the abortionist really physically did to the child.

I will not go into it further, but it is a fact that much or more social work to assist in repairing the mental anguish after an abortion will be needed if abortions continue unchecked. The amount of assistance required to control and assist with unwanted pregnancies in ways other than abortion or killing an unwanted child needs to be found.

We as legislators have a duty and responsibility, and it would be all too convenient for us to avoid this controversial issue by insisting our hands are tied by the Supreme Court. That is not true. On reading the judgments one clearly finds that a fairly restrictive abortion law would be constitutionally acceptable. Parliament can indeed adopt another system to assure that the life or health of the pregnant woman is endangered before an abortion is permissible. That system, according to the judgments, could include a requirement that the danger be verified by a reliable and medically sound opinion of a person or persons other than the pregnant woman's own physician. A majority of the judges would uphold a criminal law that restricts access to abortion from conception to situations where there is an independently verifiable danger to the pregnant woman's life or health.

There are, therefore, a number of legal options available to Parliament to protect the rights of the unborn, and in the wake of the Morgentaler decision, even without resorting to the power to override certain sections of the Charter granted by Section 33. It is my opinion, indeed the opinion of most people in my riding of Kent, that we must consider these options and replace the law quickly and decisively, considering the right to life of the unborn child.

Abortions in Canada must be controlled. Any caring society must find ways to give both mother and child the right to life and the freedom to live well.

• (2340)

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to take part in this very important debate. It is an opportunity to explain to my constituents of Broadview—Greenwood and to all who are taking part in the debate nation-wide where I stand on this issue.

I must begin by saying that I find that the labels pro-life and pro-choice both present difficulties. In my philosophic approach, I am very much shaped by the fact that I am a Christian believer in a religion which teaches me a sense of reverence for life and a belief in the purpose of creation. However, I have been a woman involved in the women's movement for so many years that I have a very strong sense of the desperation of women with unwanted pregnancies and of the need to have legal access to abortions.

I certainly respect the ideals of those in the pro-life movement. I certainly respect their vision as well. In a good society, there would not be recourse to abortion. In a better society than the one in which we live today, there would be no unwanted pregnancies. I think there are many practical ways we could work to achieve that.

When our friends in the pro-life movement say that they want a law which respects human life from the moment of conception until death, I have to respond as a practical legislator by saying that it cannot be done. Such a law, if passed by Parliament, would simply not be respected in practice. Many illegal abortions would occur. There would be test cases and we would have another Morgentaler-type clinic. A case would go to court and I think a jury would, as in the past, decide that medical necessity prevails and we would see that law thrown out as unconstitutional.

Very severe laws mean that women will seek illegal abortions. There will be botched abortions and people will go back to the back street butchers. We know that that results in infertility and suicides in some cases. We do not want to go back to those days.

As legislators, we can promote the choice for women to carry their children to term. We can do this in practical ways. We can ensure that there is adequate child care and that there is parental leave which will make it possible for parents to welcome a new addition to the family. We can see that there will be support for single parents to raise children in difficult circumstances. We can see that there is practical support through family allowance and child tax credits as well as better provisions for parental leave. We need better contraceptives and adequate sex education.

I think that men can play a much more important role by acting responsibly and by thinking about the consequences of their own sexuality. I am rather disturbed when I hear that men want to intervene through court injunctions and the heavy hand of authority. Men have it within their power to teach young men that there are consequences of a sexual act and that if they do not want to be responsible for abortions being performed, they should not be responsible for unwanted pregnancies.

I would hope that those who want to see abortion eliminated from society, and I share that goal, would be much more active in dealing with the question of unwanted pregnancies and would take a much more responsible approach to sexuality. I think there is much we can do as legislators, but I do not think we have the option of simply passing some kind of idealistic law that would be flouted and would be ruled

The Government's motion suggests that there are two different stages in a pregnancy and that they ought to be treated differently. People in the pro-life movement resent this because they argue, quite correctly, I think, that human life exists from the moment of conception. What else is it but a human life? They are quite right. However, practically, the

decision for a late abortion is a greater tragedy. It is much riskier medically and much more stressful psychologically.

All of us recoil in a very common sense way from the idea of an abortion of a viable foetus, an eight-and-a-half-month old foetus to take a fairly extreme case. It is a different thing, and it seems to me to be very reasonable to take a different approach to abortions at a late stage. This approach of the Government, given the difficulties of the situation, is not an unreasonable compromise.

However, it is important that the decision to have recourse to an abortion for the purposes of health be that of a woman. In the case of a later pregnancy, the idea of having a second medical opinion is reasonable. There may be other ways of recognizing the differences as well. I do share the pro-choice principle that we cannot shut off access and that it is the woman whose life and health is at stake, and therefore, it must be the woman who makes that decision. Where I part company with some of my colleagues in my own Party and with other people who support the pro-choice position is that I do not share that position for all kinds of abortions.

My own Party is referred to in very blanket terms as the pro-choice Party, as if we all had the same point of view. That is not true. There is a majority position and a minority position, as there is in every Party. As well, we have to look at the context in which those debates took place. They took place in the context of the women's movement, with women claiming control and demanding the right to be able to make decisions without being thrown into desperate circumstances.

We now live in a different world. There is reproductive technology which permits other kinds of choices. I think it is morally wrong for abortion to be used for purposes of sex selection. It is wrong to decide that a male or a female child will be wanted and that the sex that is not wanted will be aborted. That is morally wrong, and I think we could have laws that would provide that women would have the right to abortions only in the cases of their own health but not in the cases of selecting the sex of the children.

We are now getting into a science fiction, futuristic scene. There is the possibility that women could try out pregnancies, and if they did not get foetuses with the right qualities, say a foetus that was not athletic enough or one that did not have the right physical or mental characteristics, they could abort them. This possibility now exists. Playing God in that way is inappropriate for human beings, and I do not think abortions for those reasons should be permitted. Those reasons are quite different from the reasons of the health or the life of the mother.

As well, the use of a foetus for medical or experimental purposes is morally wrong. A pregnancy for those purposes with an aborted foetus to be used for medical or experimental purposes seems to me to be wrong in principle. We could have a law that deals with that issue.

I note, however, that the motion before us put by the Government does not specify anything of this kind. I suspect we would find a very large number of Canadians who would share the horror I feel at the prospect of abortions for these kinds of reasons, reasons which are quite unrelated to the life and the health of women themselves.

A more difficult question arises when we deal with the issue of foetal abnormalities. This is a grey area. Some people claim that a woman should have the right to make this decision no matter what. I find it inappropriate that a decision be made that a child should not live, that its life is not worth living. That kind of decision should not be made by the mother, the father or anyone else. We do not allow people to make that kind of decision after the birth of a child. If there is a disability, no one has the right to decide that that life ought not to be continued. If we do not make that kind of decision about children who have been born, it seems to me that that kind of decision should not be made by human beings when it comes to viable foetuses.

• (2350)

We can imagine that the prospect of this kind of traumatic pregnancy might be extremely stressful to the mother. It might have health consequences and there may be reasons for the mother to seek an abortion on those grounds. However, simply to say that the prospective quality of life of a foetus as a human being is not worth living and that therefore that person will not have the opportunity to live on the basis of our decision about that value, is an inappropriate decision for human beings to be making.

I think we do need a law on abortion. I would like to see it as an Act of Parliament rather than in the Criminal Code. I think that such penalties have been tried too much in the past and have not been very effective. They have caused a number of horrors. However, there are some issues on which we should be stating our position. We should be supporting practical measures to make unwanted pregnancies an infrequent or non existent fact of life. We should be working on all the practical issues I suggested earlier from contraceptives to education, financial support for the family, parental leave, and child care. The Government has been negligent in all of those respects.

We must recognize that freedom of choice is often only rhetoric which does not mean very much. The reality is that very often a woman is pressured into an abortion by financial stress and also a lot of psychological stress from her partner. Sociologically we know that one of the major reasons for abortion is this pressure from the male partner, be it husband or boyfriend, of the pregnant woman.

There are instances in which we need further study such as the case of foetal abnormality. I support the proposal put forward by my Party that there be a Royal commission on reproductive technology. That would be very helpful. However, we do not need a Royal commission on issues such as the use of foetal tissue and the use of abortion for sex selection or the selection of other characteristics. Those issues are right or they are wrong and we have positions as moral persons on those issues. Some of them are perfectly clear and we can proceed on them without further study. However, I think that we do need further study on some issues and we should be prepared to amend our laws as we attain the results of those studies.

Finally, it is extremely difficult to respond to a specific motion, some parts of which I agree with and some parts of which I do not agree with. My own Party is putting forward an amendment which reflects the majority view of the caucus. I do not share it entirely although I share parts of that approach. I believe that many of us find that when we work out our philosophy it does not entirely fit the mold of any particular organization.

In conclusion, I hope that we will have a good discussion throughout the couple of days during which we will be considering this issue. I hope there will be good amendments moved. I hope we can proceed in an orderly fashion to deal with the issue. We will never reach a solution which will have 100 per cent or even an enormous amount of consensus. We are going to be divided, but we must come up with a solution which will be acceptable to a very broad range of Canadians. We will have to deal with those differences in a constructive way. I hope that we will proceed to deal with the root cause of a recourse to abortion, that is, the unwanted pregnancy. I hope we will be much more vigorous in dealing with those in a constructive way.

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I approach this subject with a great deal of difficulty. I have a major concern with the situation in which we now find ourselves. We have before us a government motion which clearly calls for protection during the gestation period. If we as pro-life supporters were to say that we cannot live with that condition and were to vote against the motion of the Government, we would in turn find ourselves faced directly with abortion on demand. As a result of the Supreme Court decision, we have in Canada today a rapid growth industry known as free-standing abortion clinics under another name.

I would like to talk about Peterborough for a moment. Since the Supreme Court decision was announced the provincial Government has intentionally moved to establish clinics in Ontario which will operate as extensions of hospitals and give consultation to expectant mothers and then offer the service of abortion. This is being done in a great number of communities against the will, in my perception, of the majority of those communities.

In the City of Peterborough the provincial Government moved in against large demonstrations, candle-light vigils, and marches on the hospitals and announced its intention, through the provincial Minister of Health, to open a free-standing clinic as an extension of the Civic Hospital and fund that clinic to the extent of $800,000. This was at a time when it announced to the other Peterborough hospital, St. Joseph's Hospital, which is a Catholic hospital that will not perform abortions, that it did not have the money to assist it in a $400,000 over expenditure.

It could find some $800,000 to open this clinic to offer a service of consultation to expectant mothers when the medical profession in the City of Peterborough is currently offering those services. This new free-standing clinic was going to do that at a cost of $800,000 for the Civic Hospital when the provincial government could not find $400,000 to cover the deficit of St. Joseph's Hospital, forcing it to close beds, reduce services, and reduce operating procedures.

If that is not bad enough, add to it that as a result of the desire to find doctors in Peterborough who will perform abortions, the provincial Government has allocated funds to this free-standing clinic to train doctors to perform abortions. In the City of Peterborough there is only one medical doctor who will perform all abortions. In addition to that there is one doctor who will perform abortions for his patients only.

Part of the reason I am having so much difficulty with the abortion issue is that a lot of my personal friends, male and female, are medical doctors. My wife is a registered nurse. The situation within the medical profession has become so bad that a great number of doctors have decided that they can no longer recommend to boards that abortions should occur. Part of the reason for that is that they see young people who have had not only one abortion but two and in some cases, although not a large number, three abortions as a means of birth control.

There are two things which we must consider.

• (0000)

One is whether society is ready today to accept the fact that abortion is the norm and there should be free-standing clinics and abortion on demand. Some people tell me that they know I have fought for the return of capital punishment, and have shown by my interest in the return of capital punishment a lack of respect as it pertains to human life through the execution of the convict.

I thought about that for a long time. I answer my constituents by saying that when I deal with a convicted murderer I deal with someone who has been convicted as guilty and to take that life as a penalty that fits the crime is a reasonable form of justice available to Parliament to consider in the form of legislation. I ask the abolitionists who, in a number of cases, happen to support abortion, why they have so much respect for the proven guilty, like the Clifford Olsons, and so little respect for the life of the unborn child. That sort of analogy shows the difficulty facing Members of Parliament with this very controversial issue.

I find it difficult to deal with the Criminal Code and its sections that bring with them the penalties of law when we have a Constitution in Canada that is mute on the protection of the unborn child. That is why in the past year I have appreciated the opportunity to support Private Members' Bills that have called upon the Government of Canada to take to a First Ministers' Conference, as a priority, changes to the Constitution Act, 1982, which would recognize the foetus as a human being with some rights. I do not believe one can take the foetus through the gestational period and come to the conclusion that at 12 o'clock noon on the fourth week, it suddenly becomes a person. I think it comes to the point where each Member of Parliament will have to decide whether rights should be extended to the foetus and who among us has the right to determine on what hour, on what day, in what week, or in what month those rights take place.

I look to church leaders for their views on a number of these issues. Although I did not have the support of the Catholic bishops on my stand for capital punishment, I think I will have their support on my position in the protection of the foetus and the extension of rights to the unborn. Of all the correspondence I have received, this one letter that I received from Archbishop James M. Hayes, a member of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, sums up my position on this issue of abortion. He says:

> The Government has introduced a Motion that proposes the totally unacceptable gestational approach for a new Canadian abortion law.
>
> The position of the Catholic Church is that human life begins at conception and must be valued, respected and safeguarded from the beginning. The gestational approach is scientifically and ethically indefensible because it draws an arbitrary dividing line between life which is worthy of protection and life which is not.
>
> The government's Motion abandons a primary function of the law: The protection of human life. Furthermore, it does not achieve the socially imperative balance between the rights and interests of women and the equally important rights and interests of unborn children.
>
> We count on the good will of everyone who values human life to work and pray for legislation which recognizes, values, respects and protects human life from conception to natural death.
>
> To this end, a new abortion law must be developed in the context of other laws and social policies which together will make this a society ever more hospitable to all human life at all stages of development.

Let us carry that to the next stage in dealing with the motion before the House. I was pleased to be able to table an amendment to the government motion that I believe would satisfy the Catholic bishops who have said that they are prepared, when it would cost the life of the mother, to bring the pregnancy to fruition. They would consider in the protection of the life of the mother the loss of the life of the infant.

I was disturbed that the justice critic for the Official Opposition, the Member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan), said that one of the most difficult problems arising from Section 251 of the Criminal Code is the definition of the life and health of the mother. If I am quoting him correctly, I believe he said that over his years it has been the number one problem in the broad definition of the term "health of the mother". Yet that same justice critic for the Official Opposition said he would not put in an amendment, but would wait and see.

He does not like our motion and other Members opposite have said that they do not like our motion. Perhaps they are simply not used to a free vote in the House of Commons. Anyone who is at all interested in the protection of the unborn or the rights of the unborn would give serious consideration to amending a motion to allow it to answer their concerns.

According to my amendment, we would delete all the words after the words "to protect the unborn" in the main motion and substitute therefor: "Such legislation should prohibit the performance of an abortion except when two independent qualified medical practitioners have, in good faith and on reasonable grounds, stated that in their opinion the continuation of the pregnancy would or would be likely to endanger the life of the pregnant woman".

That is the amendment. I believe that in Peterborough we would have more success in finding doctors who would perform abortions if the cause of the abortion was that. What the doctors object to is the rubber stamping of abortion on demand through free-standing clinics like Dr. Morgentaler's.

The motion in the House would allow people like Morgentaler and company to sign an abortion. That would make it legal if we approved the Government motion without an amendment requiring that the life of the mother be the prime requisite for the granting of an abortion.

• (0010)

I would like to close with two thoughts. First I will recap my opening remarks. If we do not win a pro-life amendment to this motion, if this House cannot carry the consent and wish to protect the unborn child, then there are only two other alternatives. The first is to vote for the government motion which recognizes a gestational period but removes abortion on demand and, second, to vote against the government motion and go with the status quo today, thanks to the Supreme Court of Canada, which specifically says we can continue on the way we are, and the way we are today is abortion on demand.

I am still in the position where I am considering. I am pro-life. I want a pro-life amendment as much as I want anything, and I want to be able to offer an abortion to my constituents who require an abortion if it threatens the life of the expectant mother. However, I would much prefer the government motion to what we will have if we do not get the government motion through. We would then have abortion on demand.

I think it is best stated in the words I wrote down this afternoon. I do not want to be too brutal. I do not like to preach "holier than thou" types of sermons. I was raised in a parsonage and I heard a lot of sermons in my day. But I would like to give the House this thought. First, by allowing abortions, we are deliberately allowing a destructive, brutal and violent act to be undertaken with state approval. Second, we live in a society that will not allow discrimination on the grounds of sex or colour. Yet we are prepared to consider allowing abortions on the grounds of foetal abnormality. I feel quite strongly about this. If this occurs, as sure as night follows day it will be followed by infanticide, the liquidation of the handicapped and the euthanasia of the aged.

I think the time has come when Members of Parliament will have to stand up and be counted. Are we prepared to give recognition to the foetus? Are we prepared to give protection to the life of the foetus? Are we prepared to accept what Christian-Judaeo teachings tell us that a person is a person from the time of conception until death? Or are we moving our society closer and closer to the kinds of dilemma that will follow if we fail to give protection to the foetus at this most important point in this Parliament's history.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, I rise feeling a certain difficulty this evening about speaking to the resolution that the Government tabled today with the intention not of legislating on abortion but rather of finding out where MPs stand on termination of pregnancy. Let me explain: the debate we have had this evening has not been a debate on a bill, it has been a poll by the government to find out what all our positions are.

Why? I think that if the Government had done the responsible thing, it would have tabled a bill and not a resolution which is neither fish nor flesh, which wants to be seen as the via media and doesn't satisfy anybody, neither the pro-life groups nor the pro-choice groups.

I also think it is hypocritical of the Government to hide behind a mediocre resolution instead of presenting us with a Bill.

The motion we are discussing this evening flies in the face of the Supreme Court ruling, because the approach the ruling took gave women a voice. And the motion we are faced with this evening is quite a different story. When I listen to the majority of the speeches that have been made in the House this evening, it seems to me that a majority of MPs want to take away women's voice. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what percentage of the Hon. Members actually read the Supreme Court ruling before giving their views. I don't think I would be wrong if I asserted that at least 90 per cent of my fellow-Members have not read the ruling, because, (if they had), there would have been a number of speeches this evening that would surely not have taken the tack they did. Some even referred to the rights guaranteed by the Charter, and if you read the ruling, you will find it is based on those very rights.

They confront us with a resolution, as I said just now, that flies in the face of the Supreme Court ruling, because in the ruling it says that in the early stages of pregnancy the decision is entirely up to the woman. And here we have a motion that says she has to share that decision with her doctor, and in the second paragraph that she has to share it with two doctors. I won't read the motion, Mr. Speaker, because a number of my colleagues have already done so. But I am taken aback to see the Conservative Government, which claims to be a government that extends and promises liberty and equality to women, blundering so badly when it comes to the right of women to terminate a pregnancy, which is a fundamental right, as the Supreme Court ruling spelled out. But is is a right that seems to terrify a number of lobby groups, and the Conservative government too. Otherwise it would have tabled a Bill.

As I listened to certain MPs this evening, I thought how interesting it would have been to have their wives speaking in their place this evening. I am sure the approach taken would have been a very different one, because I know very few women who—even if a majority of women tell you that life begins at the moment of conception, they'll also say that the decision rests with the woman. I know very few women, Mr. Speaker, who think abortion is a good thing. To be in favour of the freedom to choose is not the same thing as being in favour of abortion. You have only to recall all the difficulties and physical pain women used to undergo to obtain an abortion, simply to obtain a therapeutic abortion.

I can look back to around 1966, when the first family-planning clinic was opened in Montreal, when it was still illegal to talk about contraception. At that time I was the nurse in charge of an obstetrics and gynecology ward, and on Monday we would be told, "There've been 15 admissions for miscarriages—" But, abortion being illegal, all those cases of miscarriage would turn out to be cases of abortion. And when you examined the patients you found that they had used lye, Javex, knitting needles. We were told crazy stories such as: I was painting and the smell of paint caused my miscarriage, or I fell and at that very moment, I had contractions and aborted.

• (0020)

But if you took a closer look at it, you could see that these women had had a voluntary abortion. At that time, they had to be reported. I remember, after taking a nurse training course in the suburbs, I came to Montréal for my specialization, I had never been faced with a woman who was arrested because she had had an abortion. Then, as head of my department, I see two policemen coming. They tell me: You have a patient under the name of Mrs. X. Then I answered to them: Yes, she is in bed 15-3. Then I ask: Did anything happen in her family so that you come and visit her? They answer: No, we have had a report that that woman has had an abortion and she must be arrested. Can you imagine my surprise? That did not take place 50 years ago, Mr. Speaker, but in the years 1967-68 in Montréal.

Thus, I decided to have a meeting with the staff and nurses and to tell them that before they report women and send them to jail, they would better make their comments and reports to the department head so that it doesn't happen again.

But some of these women who had had an abortion on the kitchen table woke up later on and thought they had aborted; they were haemorrhaging, most of them did not abort but they could not have sex for the following months and years.

Later on, the rate of miscarriages was very high. If you look at it, since the passage of the therapeutic abortion legislation or even in the past few years, you will see that the percentage of miscarriages in Canadian hospitals was very low because there have been abortions. But at that time the number of miscarriages was very high because everybody was having so-called spontaneous miscarriages and everybody knew that they were voluntary abortions.

In 1969, we passed the therapeutic abortion legislation. I would like to deal with it, Mr. Speaker, because I sat on the first committees on therapeutic abortion. I sat on and helped set up abortion committees from Newfoundland to Victoria. All the committee members were men. We had to fight for one or two years before they agreed to have women sitting on those committees. Each woman, each case that was studied, because we had no right to ask the patient. A case was presented and defended and each woman about to have a therapeutic abortion had to talk with a psychiatrist to ascertain whether she was not mentally disturbed. Or else it was said that she was going through a breakdown or that she would be deeply disturbed, but there was always some reference to a psychological disorder and that was the only way to get a therapeutic abortion.

Of course, women were 12 weeks pregnant when they arrived because they were coming from regions where nobody knew that they were entitled to a therapeutic abortion.

Subsequently, I was a member of the Badgley Commission which considered the implementation of the abortion legislation. We travelled throughout Canada and realized that women were going to hospital to undergo a therapeutic abortions thinking that it was still forbidden. But again, according to the provinces, it was a federal legislation that some of the provinces refused to enforce. There were also some hospital administrators who refused to provide for therapeutic abortions. Thus, according to the region where you lived, according to your financial means, you could or could not have a therapeutic abortion.

I remember being told by some provincial officials: There is no abortion here, we do not need it. Women had to go to the neighbouring province. They were going in particular to the Town of Lethbridge where abortions were provided for the whole Province of Saskatchewan where therapeutic abortions were not available. They had to go to the Atlantic provinces where the federal legislation is not implemented at the present time, and Montréal hospitals are overflowing with women coming from the Atlantic provinces because they cannot have access to therapeutic abortions in the hospitals of those provinces. Montreal hospitals were packed and officials used to say, what are we going to do with those patients? And those patients went to clinics.

The Badgley report on the implementation of the Abortion Act made some major recommendations but said, among other things, that if we were to stop unwanted pregnancies, what was needed were clinics providing for sexual education and contraception services throughout Canada.

But when I sat on the committee on child care services in 1986, we travelled throughout Canada and I ventured to ask questions about pregnancies among teenagers, since we were dealing with child care, and I was told that no sexual education course was given in several regions because it was not permissive to even say the word "sex", and that contraception means were even less offered. With the result that in one of the Atlantic provinces, in 1985, there were more childbirths among single mothers than among married women. That was not 20 years ago, but two or three years ago!

At present, it seems that women are being denied the right to interrupt their pregnancy but on the other hand, we do not provide support services either to those who have children or to those who want to go on with their pregnancy. We have at present in Canada no service that is designed for women willing to go on with their pregnancy. We have no drug service, they are not given any particular assistance, any welfare, they have no housing. If they are young, there is no way they can go on with their studies and they have to turn to food banks. They are undernourished and often give birth to sick babies.

The Conservative Government has introduced a motion instead of a Bill. They say that they are for the family, that they want to do more for children. But if you look at what the Conservative Government has accomplished since 1984 for the family and children, we find, first, the Badgley report on child abuse tabled in 1984. Only one committee has been created since and no recommendation has been implemented.

The birth control department was closed down in 1985. There have been dramatic cut-backs in the budget of Planned Parenthood. The tax reform has increased taxes for Canadian families. Naturally, there is no sex education program and obviously no contraception program because this is permissive!

Very little if anything at all has been done for battered women. There are not enough day care centres. One out of five children in Canada is poor and 57 per cent of children between the ages of six and 14 are left alone after school.

Then, the women are told to shut up and that it is not up to them to determine whether they can continue their pregnancy and take care of their children afterwards. And all this to protect the unborn child!

Mr. Speaker, I agree that we shall have to decide up to which stage of a pregnancy abortion can be practised.

Earlier, I heard an Hon. Member say that he would accept abortions when the life of the mother is threatened.

I simply want to point out that the mental balance and the very life of many mothers in Canada are threatened every day because they live in poverty, because they do not have access to daycare, because they are battered, because they are sexually abused. We talk about danger. It is always more dramatic to speak about a threat to the life of the mother. But what are we doing for women in their everyday life? What are we doing to help them? I must admit that it is very little.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, no one is for abortion and being pro-choice is not necessarily the same as being for abortion. Being pro-choice means to respect the choice and to provide support for every woman who decides to continue her pregnancy and to help those who decide to have their pregnancies terminated. People will say: those women could continue their pregnancy and give up the child for adoption, because there are not enough children for those who want to adopt. However, we should look at the figures. Most teenage mothers do not give up their child for adoption. They keep their child, maybe for three years and then they decide to put up the child up for adoption. The child will remember that.

There is no family policy in Canada, and this causes a lot of hardship. To support free choice, we must have services. We need clinics providing termination of pregnancies and services to help women who want to continue their pregnancy, as well as education services and follow-ups. I quite agree with several Members who said: there are clinics where women have abortions, after which they go home and we do not know what happens to them afterwards. There should be follow-ups to provide support services to all the women who get an abortions. First, to avoid re-occurrences, and second, to check on their psychological state. There is nothing like that at this time.

Teenage pregnancies have reached epidemic proportions in Canada. As I recall, teenagers account for 34 out of every 1,000 pregnancies in Alberta. Naturally, there is no sex or contraception education program.

I have been listening to my colleagues since 3 p.m. this afternoon, and I have found that Members generally confuse two different concepts, the right of the mother and the right of the unborn child. I believe that we should have a Bill which takes both concepts into account. It is not the case now. We have a motion which does not solve anything.

It is rather strange to hear Members tell us that women do not have the right to make the decision when we are given the responsibility to raise our children. Women are given custody of the children in case of separation or divorce, but we are denied the right to decide whether to continue a pregnancy or not. We are given responsibilities, but denied the right of decision.

From what we hear, women are no longer having children. Many will say that it is because of abortion. Howevere, Mr. Speaker, it is not because of abortion, but because of our economic system and the economic position of women. I believe that this is the major responsibility.

We also have to remember the ruling of the Supreme Court which speaks about human dignity for women. As I said earlier, I know that the majority of my colleagues have not read the ruling of the Supreme Court, and I shall therefore conclude my speech by reading a few passages from that ruling. When the court speaks about the human dignity on which the Charter is based, it is referring to the right to make fundamental personal decisions without interference from the state. This is a crucial component of the right to freedom. Mr. Speaker, in a free and democratic society, the right to freedom does not require the state to approve the personal decisions of its citizens. However, it requires the state to respect these decisions.

In addition, the right to freedom provided in section 7 guarantees for each individual some personal autonomy about the major decisions affecting his private life.

More recently, and this is still in the ruling of the Supreme Court which I would have liked my male colleagues to read, the fight for recognition of women's rights has been a fight against discrimination so that women would find a place in a man's world, to develop a package of legislative reforms to put women on an equal footing with men. We are not struggling here to define the rights of women in relation to their particular position in the social structure or in relation to the biological difference between the sexes. The sole form taken by the needs and aspirations of women today is that of guaranteed rights. The right to reproduce or not to reproduce is one of those rights, and it is rightly considered an integral part of the contemporary fight by women to affirm their dignity and value as human beings.

I would also like to summarize briefly what the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Beetz point out, that is, that the existing legislative structure for obtaining an abortion plainly "subjects women to considerable emotional stress and unnecessary physical risk." And then they add that in their view the existing legislative structure "is more deeply flawed" than that. Essentially what it does is assert "that the woman's capacity to reproduce is to be subject not to her own control but to that of the state." She is not to be allowed to choose to exercise that capacity or not. In my opinion, this not only violates her right to liberty, in the sense of her right, her personal autonomy in decision-making, it is also "a direct interference with her physical person".

How can a woman in that situation have the slightest feeling of security about her person? And the justices conclude by saying that they consider that Section 251 of the Criminal Code deprives the pregnant woman both of her right to security of the person and of her right to liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to see my colleagues in the House of Commons approach this motion bearing in mind what the Supreme Court ruling says. I think women must make themselves respected. It's very nice to want to respect the unborn child, but we live a daily reality where women are always there, and obviously they tend to get forgotten. They are inconvenient, because they speak out and demand things.

So I just want to say that I will vote against the motion because it does not respect the liberty or the human dignity of women, and also I hope that one day the Government will assume its responsibilities and table a Bill in which there will be a balance between the rights of the mother and the rights of the unborn child, and in which there will be provision for services such as education, contraception, and support for the mothers who want to continue their pregnancies as well as for those who want to interrupt them, because I must say that a motion like this one is in my view an abdication on the Government's part and a step backward.

So I hope we will soon have a Bill, and above all that this motion will not be used to gain Brownie points during the upcoming election campaign, because I think the Government has no call to be proud of what it has tabled here today.

• (0030)

[*English*]

Mr. Brian White (Dauphin—Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in tonight's important debate. For me the issue goes back to 1983 when I was first nominated. In the 18 months that I spent campaigning between that time and the election I was taken aback, or perhaps a little off guard, at the number of times I was confronted by future constituents on the abortion issue. Economic matters would be brought up and someone would mention the abortion issue and ask where I stood on it. It was something that took me quite by surprise. I felt that the citizens whom I was purporting to represent had a right to know where I stood on the issue.

After careful study and much reflection I decided that, should I be elected to Parliament, I would support the pro-life position on abortion whenever I had the opportunity. I feel that I was elected to serve the constituents of Dauphin—Swan River. Occasionally votes come up on moral issues such as the current abortion debate. In such issues I feel that I must vote as my conscience directs. Therefore, on Thursday my vote will reflect my pro-life position on the abortion matter.

I recognize quite clearly that many of my constituents and many other Canadians disagree with me, but I believe that a moral and very emotional issue such as abortion cannot be voted upon based on public opinion polls. We must show tolerance and respect for minorities and, at the same time, we must also protect those unable to do so for themselves, such as our unborn. I intend to vote on Thursday for the amendment which best considers the rights of our unborn, from the time of conception to birth.

On June 2, 1987, I joined with 61 other MPs in voting in favour of the motion brought forward by the Hon. Member for Grey—Simcoe (Mr. Mitges) which attempted to entrench the rights of the unborn in our Constitution. Then, as we all know, in January of 1988—in fact, the very reason that we are debating the issue tonight—the Supreme Court ruled that Section 251 of the Criminal Code was unconstitutional. At that time it was said that the ruling by the Supreme Court on Section 251 was a blow to the pro-life movement. I disagree. In fact, I was glad that Section 251 was ruled unconstitutional. I was also ashamed, quite frankly, that under Section 251 over 60,000 Canadian unborn children were aborted every year, almost 200 a day. Since 1969, when Section 251 became the law of our land, over one million Canadian unborn children have been aborted. I was ashamed to say that our country would condone such a slaughter of our unborn.

We now have the opportunity to recognize the rights of the unborn. That point was mentioned in the ruling brought down by the Supreme Court, that it was within the power of Parliament to recognize the rights of our unborn.

Today, we have begun debate on what we as Parliamentarians feel should be the basis of legislation on abortion. Several options are available to us. The main motion, as presented, will attract many amendments that will reflect many differing opinions of how Parliament should deal with the issue.

I reject the so-called free choice option, that is, that abortion is a matter between a woman and her doctor. I reject it because it ignores a third party—a very important third party—namely the unborn child, whose very life is at stake.

At the same time, some would have us accept a compromise, that is that abortion is okay after the first trimester or perhaps that it is okay until the 24th week, which is currently in place in other countries; that somehow the foetus becomes worth while at some arbitrary point in development. I will not now, nor will I ever, accept such a compromise.

Who on this earth has a right to determine at what point in foetal development the unborn becomes too valuable to abort? Not I, not anyone. Genetic science has clearly showed us that life begins at conception. We know at that point that it is clearly defined what the eye colour of the child will be, how tall that child is going to grow up to be, the hair colour, the skin colour, the personality.

The trimester approach to abortion presents our society with many other bio-ethical issues, the first of which is foetal tissue experimentation. If the trimester approach is accepted, do we as a society then condone a scientific experimentation or organ harvesting, for example? Second, the other bio-ethical issue that is brought to mind is euthanasia. The logical extension, in my mind, of a gestational approach to abortion is to say that at a certain age a senior citizen becomes somehow arbitrarily worthless. That is as equally abhorrent to me as the arbitrary assessment of worth of the foetus as it develops. Therefore, in my opinion, the ultimate legislation must consider foetal rights from the time of conception.

• (0040)

To quote Mr. Iain Benson of the Canadian Bar Association, "what is a distinction between the foetus before birth and a child after birth, such that one has the right to life and the other does not?" I say that there is no distinction, and both must have equal rights to life.

Many Canadians claim to be defenders of human rights yet at the same time advocate abortion on demand. In my humble opinion, no person can be taken seriously on matters of human rights if they do not at the same time defend human life at its frailest, at its most defenceless, namely, in the mother's womb.

Those who support abortion on demand are dooming our unborn and taking away their most basic right, the right to life. They are dooming our unborn, whose only crime is being unwanted, who gets in the way and are not strong enough to protect himself or herself.

I for one am prepared to do and offer whatever I can to support and protect our unborn from conception onward. The government caucus has said that MPs of our Party are free to vote according to our consciences on this issue on Thursday. I expected nothing less from the Government. It shows it recognizes the sensitivity of the issue. I find it astounding that anyone would criticize a free vote in the House of Commons. What could be more democratic? Every Canadian is represented in this House of Commons, and it is our difficult duty as MPs to decide on how Parliament should proceed on this most difficult and emotional issue.

I look forward to standing on Thursday and voting in favour of amendments that will protect our unborn from the moment of conception until birth.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, my intention this evening is to provide what I hope will prove to be a reflective intervention on the resolution before us. The word "reflective" is used on purpose, because for those who have gone beyond the reflective mode to hold without doubt either the pro-life or the pro-choice position, the abortion debate has long since ceased to be a debate in any real sense of the word. Instead of a contest for considered public opinion, it has become a psycho-political case of nerves and a shouting match which excludes the vast majority of people who are so humble as to not be absolutely sure what is right.

Unfortunately, the real debate has been a long time in coming, as both so-called sides of the debate have been so given over to name calling and the impugning of the motives of those with whom they disagree, that many who could have made a useful contribution to the debate over the years have found themselves without a place and unable to stomach the self-righteousness which has abounded around this issue.

The debate tonight has been commendably civilized, and I hope that it continues in this way. I commend everybody who has been involved so far.

When I say that those who take a position have gone beyond what could be called debate, I contend that they are players in a dispute which is a classic example of what is wrong with contemporary moral disagreement.

This sorry state of contemporary moral debate has been well described by Alastair MacIntyre in his book *After Virtue*. I quote:

> Every one of the arguments is logically valid or can be easily expanded so as to be made so; the conclusions do indeed follow from the premises. But the rival premises are such that we possess no rational way of weighing the claims of one as against another. For each premise employs some quite different normative or evaluative concept from the others, so that the claims made upon us are of quite different kinds.
>
> It is precisely because there is in our society no established way of deciding between these claims that moral argument appears to be necessarily interminable. From our rival conclusions we can argue back to our rival premises; but when we do arrive at our premises argument ceases and the invocation of one premise against another becomes a matter of pure assertion and counter-assertion. Hence perhaps the slightly shrill tone of so much moral debate.

What follows is an attempt at a non-shrill contribution.

Abortion

The official policy of the New Democratic Party of Canada, with respect to abortion is that the decision to have an abortion is a private decision to be made by a woman in consultation with her doctor or, in other words, the pro-choice position.

This is not a policy with which I have ever been comfortable for a variety of reasons. Indeed, in the federal elections of 1979, 1980, and 1984, I made it clear to those who inquired of my views on this issue, both publicly and privately, that I did not support the Party policy in this case, that I did not support abortion on demand, and that I was very concerned about some of the implications of such a policy, both in terms of an increased number of abortions and in terms of the arguments advanced in favour of the pro-choice position in so far as some of the assumptions which underlie these arguments reflect values that, in my view, are questionable and have not been thought through by the pro-choice movement, however well-intentioned they may be and are.

I am a critic of what might be called the cosmology of the pro-choice movement, about which I will have more to say later. Therefore, I will not be supporting the amendment which was moved on behalf of the majority of the NDP caucus today by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Ms. Dewar). I appreciate the tolerance which has been extended to me by my Leader and caucus colleagues to put before the House a position different from theirs.

• (0050)

Life has always been cheap but it has been a feature of capitalism to rationalize and sanctify the devaluation of human life by introducing an economic ethic that reduces persons to things, to commodities exchanged in the market-place. Thus, if we wish to fight for the sanctity of life we must fight for it on all fronts, and in particular at the source of all current exemplifications, which in my view is the materialistic and technological view of humanity implicit in advanced capitalist societies.

The question for New Democrats is, as I see it, whether on the issue of abortion we have with the best of intentions ended up buying a piece of the very world view we otherwise oppose. Therefore, with fear and trembling, knowing that one's position on abortion has become for many on the left the litmus test of whether one is truly progressive, I will offer arguments against uncritical acceptance of the pro-choice position.

First, I would like to say a word about why I have not been a supporter of the pro-life position or the movement associated with it, for a number of reasons. I do not like their cosmology either. I was reminded of another way in which this is the case when I heard the Hon. Member for Surrey—White Rock—North Delta (Mr. Friesen) this evening use the language of contract to describe marriage, how liberal and commercial the language of Christian pro-lifers has become, using the language of the market-place and of contract instead of the deeper, biblical concept of covenant to speak about the relationship between men and women. That reflects a deeper malaise that I do not have time to go into tonight.

I have been critical of the pro-life movement because, in the first place, it was always unrealistic for pro-lifers to expect abortion to be as restricted as they wanted it to be. In light of the Supreme Court's action, I think it is now even more unrealistic to expect severe restrictions on the availability of abortions at all stages, particularly in the earlier stages. Neither if it were achievable would such an almost total ban on abortions be desirable. Abortions would continue. Back alley butchers would be back in business. Poor women would be put in comparably more danger than women who could afford to travel to where abortions could be performed safely.

My personal moral preference is for a world in which no one chooses abortion as a solution to a difficult situation, but that does not blind me to this reality. Morality also demands that, knowing what we know, we make decisions on that basis and not as if we did not know or as if it were not the case.

I have also been critical, among other things, of the extent to which the pro-life movement has been associated in general with a right wing politics whose passion for children seems to end at birth, after which they have to take whatever the free enterprise system dishes out to them and their families according to the law of the market-place. From the safety of their mother's womb that certain pro-life MPs would wish on them, some babies are then to be cast out by these same Members into ramshackle housing and cut-backs in lunch programs in inner city schools. Such ideologically selective compassion is unacceptable to me and is really only anti-abortion without being comprehensively pro-life.

This criticism does not apply to the Roman Catholic Church which has on occasion been articulately critical of free enterprise. However, it most certainly applies to some fundamentalist Protestant pro-lifers and to many of my colleagues on the other side of the House whose real God, I would suggest, on occasion is the market-place, or, idol if you prefer.

My problem with Roman Catholic teaching on this issue is in another area and that is with respect to its rigid attitude toward contraception and the fact that it often seems to counsel its members to vote on only one issue, i.e., abortion, when on issues of peace and economic justice, domestically and globally, there is little difference at all between the views of the NDP and the views of the Canadian Catholic Bishops. Are the deaths caused by the lack of global and domestic economic justice that both the bishops and the NDP are calling for relevant to our political choices? I hope not.

The abortion issue is also used by some on occasion just to create anti-NDP feelings for larger political purposes. The recent provincial election in Manitoba is a good example of this. I know many in my area were encouraged to vote Liberal in the mistaken view that this would be an anti-abortion vote. The irony, of course, is that in Liberal Ontario and Liberal Quebec, Doctor Morgentaler operated freely long before the Supreme Court decision. It was an NDP Government that would not tolerate his illegal activities. New Democrats, many of whom wanted the law changed, at least respected the law and did not try to impose their view by default or neglect.

I have tried to be an honest critic of both sides of this debate and in doing so I think I have been in tune with a lot of Canadians who have felt that neither Morgentaler nor Borowski spoke for them. This has meant that I have received criticism from both sides, but I am quite willing to accept such criticism rather than artificially choosing sides and then plugging my ears to other arguments.

If, as some pro-lifers have said recently, one is not totally with them, then one is against them, then I accept the judgment that I am against them. I take my stand with what I would call the humble majority who, like me, are interested in finding a policy that is an acceptable compromise, who realize that what we are talking about here is part of the tragic imperfectability of the human condition, who do not envision a world without sin as the pro-life people do, or a world without guilt as the pro-choice people do.

This humble majority realizes that a compromise is in order which reflects the reality that abortion will be sought and will be obtained, but wants to maintain a value context in which abortion is still something that people are expected to have good reasons for, even if in practice this will not always be the case.

As I understand the Supreme Court decision, it does speak of the need to balance the rights of the woman with the rights of the unborn child. The implication seems to be that some rule which restricted the time frame within a pregnancy in which abortion would be permissible on request might well stand up in court. Whether such a rule either would or should take the form of a criminal sanction against individual women is debatable. I have never been happy about making criminals of women who, for whatever reason, good or bad, feel they must have an abortion. This, incidentally, is what I understand to be the historical essence of the NDP position.

However, whether it be through the Criminal Code or an abortion Act with sanctions, or preferably in some other way outside the Criminal Code altogether, it is obvious that some regulation or restrictions are in order. I agree with those who argue, both in terms of the Supreme Court judgment or separately from it, that abortion has not and should not be established as an absolute right. For me it is a question of establishing what policy we will have in Canada to address the conflicting claims of both women and the unborn, a policy which needs to be determined in Parliament so that abortion is dealt with the same in all provinces, with all Canadian women treated equally, having equal access to those abortions determined to be legal by Parliament.

I am informed that even Doctor Morgentaler will not perform abortions after 12 to 14 weeks, for whatever reason, which is chronologically well in advance of viability and may be just a range that might be acceptable as the time before which, for now, and I stress for now, it is purely a matter of choice and beyond which good reasons, to be determined in the Bill which should follow the passage of the government motion, but which we will probably never get to as a result of the election, must be had for seeking an abortion.

Beyond this time, and particularly after the time of viability, a time which is earlier due to modern technology, perhaps only something of the magnitude of a genuine threat to the physical life of the mother, or a gross deformity of the foetus detectable only at a later stage, should be grounds for an abortion. It is at the point of viability that I am convinced that law should come into play. Before the earlier deadline before which choice and viability will be the rule, there may well be a grey area where good reasons will have to be given but only regulation will be necessary. This three-stage policy would not satisfy those who feel that life at conception is equal in value to life at birth, at 20 weeks or at 12 weeks, but it may be near the compromise that in my judgment will be necessary as well as advisable.

• (0100)

I am not sure whether the government motion calls for a two-stage or for a three-stage policy. This is part of the problem. It is unclear in this respect and it is unclear as to what the words "further conditions" might entail.

All that I have said so far is said in view of what I regard to be the political and judicial reality of Canadian society in 1988 and of what is possible in a democratic society that has deep divisions within it about the value and status of unborn life, in which choice when it comes to abortion has become a symbol for many women and indeed for many men of real freedom for women to shape their own lives, when for others, getting tough on abortion is seen as a symbol of taking a final stand against the creeping amorality of the age.

This political reality is a fact of life, not just for Canadian politicians but for all Canadians. In my judgment, pro-lifers have to accept this reality without accepting various pro-choice arguments which I myself question. One such argument is, for instance, that society does not have a right to impose its morality on individual decisions. Obviously society does this all the time. It is how we handle an issue over which there is fundamental disagreement that is the question.

In my view, morality is what politics is all about. It is not just about abortion or about issues like capital punishment. It is also about our economy and how we organize our economy. I reject the view that morality is somehow only a private or individual matter restricted to a small range of issues.

I also reject the pro-choice argument that abortion is only a health issue. This unacceptably reduces what is involved in the decision to have an abortion and in my view is a contradiction of the argument also made by the pro-choice advocates that women should be able to choose abortion for whatever reason they personally choose it for, unless of course the concept of health is used so broadly as to make no distinction between needs and wants, a distinction which is too often blurred in our consumer society. Therefore, I am not morally indifferent to all the abortions that will be chosen by women if the Supreme Court decision leads to abortion on demand up to a prescribed number of weeks.

Many of the abortions that will follow from this decision and the federal law which follows from it will be abortions that in my view are unjustified, wrong, and tragic. However, I cannot bring myself to single out pregnant women who feel that they absolutely must have abortions as objects of moral outrage or punishment. In my judgment, they are to be perceived more as victims, not necessarily of men or of themselves in any simplistic reference to sexual behaviour, but victims of a society that all of us are responsible for, a society which encourages irresponsible sex, underspends on research and development into contraception, and tolerates social and economic policies which make choosing life very, very difficult for many women.

Nevertheless, abortions which are chosen purely in order not to inconvenience the life of the potential mother or couple or as a form of birth control are wrong, in my view, but so are all the decisions that all of us make when, for reasons of convenience, we make decisions that deny life to others.

Without making any strict comparisons, I ask Hon. Members to think of the fact that every cent we spend individually or collectively as a country on unnecessary items is money that could be spent to save dying children somewhere in the world, including Canada, but we do not propose laws to make frugality compulsory or tithing mandatory. We are all murderers in the name of convenience, to use the language of the pro-life movement. We have all sinned and fallen short of the glory of God, to use the language of St. Paul. Let he or she who is without sin in regard to putting his or her own personal convenience over the rights of starving and/or diseased children be the first to demand of pregnant women that they display a morality higher than that which we expect of ourselves or our country.

Enforcing such a demand would be even more spiritually pretentious. Nevertheless, I believe that a good abortion policy would provide for the kind of balanced counselling in which women contemplating abortion would be exposed to the variety of views that exist on abortion, including those that condemn it, and to the alternatives to abortion, provided that society is serious about supporting such alternatives.

Having said this, I also want to say that the debate over abortion to date has centred almost exclusively on whether or not a woman has the right to choose an abortion based on her own personal judgment of whether or not she wants to have a child. Unfortunately, regardless of what one's views are or have been on this question, the issue has become much more complicated of late with the growth of technologies that may make it possible to predict with considerable certainty various characteristics of the child the foetus will become if brought to birth.

I see that you are indicating to me, Mr. Speaker, that I have only one more minute left. I wonder if I could beg the indulgence of the House to continue my remarks and finish my speech.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to allow reasonable time for the Hon. Member to complete his remarks?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Blaikie: We have now a new debate, hardly begun, about whether or not, if personal choice is to be favoured, this personal choice extends to making choices not about whether or not to have a child but what kind of child to have. The prospect of women having abortions, not because they do not want children but because they want different children than those conceived, opens up a whole new arena of decision making which, in my view, should not be uncritically assumed even by pro-choice people to be adequately dealt with within the moral framework of personal choice even at the earliest stages of pregnancy.

Are pro-choice people, whose arguments may have been overtaken by genetic diagnosis and technology, really saying that the community is not entitled to have any say about any standards or regulations for what will be acceptable in this whole new range of possibilities? The possibility of gender selection becoming an acceptable practice is certainly one possibility, but there may be others. The extension of the consumer ethic to babies is something that I oppose. Designer babies should not be the wave of the future.

This is a dimension which I think the pro-choice community has not thought through and which I hope it will think through very soon, as indeed all of us should, for it is an area of new developments which have been largely left to the no doubt well intentioned but *ad hoc* decisions of doctors and scientists.

The National Action Committee on the Status of Women has called for a Royal commission into all the questions posed by new reproductive technologies, and I think such a study is now absolutely necessary, precisely because there are questions to be answered that neither pro-life nor pro-choice people have addressed. The compromise we have before us is a compromise based on the current state of the debate, a debate which may be dated by new technologies.

The question of the use of foetal tissue for medical purposes is another issue. The government motion which provides effectively for abortion on demand in the earliest stage has not addressed these new realities. It is in this respect that I am tempted to vote against it. However, I have not made up my mind.

I will not be able to touch on all aspects of my thinking on this issue, but I would like to say a few more words about my critique of the assumptions and implications of the pro-choice rhetoric. For instance, some pro-choice rhetoric calls into question the validity of religious arguments *per se*. I may disagree with some of the religious arguments offered by my pro-life colleagues on the other side, but their arguments are not wrong just because they are religious. I have my own arguments from a religious viewpoint and I would not want them dismissed just because they are religious. All arguments are religious in the sense that they are based on some claim about ultimate reality, including the arguments of the pro-choice groups, unless they want to maintain that their arguments are just unfounded opinions. The attempt to make religious arguments inadmissible in public debate is something I will not support in any way.

• (0110)

In the end, such abortions as may be permitted by any new law can only be described as tragedies, certainly not as liberation; in some cases as sin as opposed to crime; and in many cases as reflection of a larger and more deep-seated pragmatism about human life that has its worst manifestation in the so-called "practical" dictates or a foreign and defence policy supported by many, although obviously not all, pro-life leaders of incinerating all the children of the world, born and unborn, in a nuclear war fought to preserve our standard of living based, as it is, on our privileged position in the global economy which makes many poor that we might continue to be affluent.

That would be the ultimate sin of material convenience and the mercy of God will be much less available to those who commit that sin than it is to the many women who have chosen abortion, as indeed was the mercy of Jesus himself much more available to the woman caught in adultery, an offence then punishable by death, than it was to the Pharisees or the powers and the principalities who were very good at seeing the sliver in the eyes of others but could not see the beam in their own.

The only people who have a self-righteous leg to stand on in this debate are those who live in voluntary poverty, who are against capital punishment, and who are pacifists on the issue of war. I do not fall into that category, nor do I claim to. It is only those who do who have what I would call a self-righteous leg to stand on.

There are many more things I could say, Mr. Speaker, and I regret that I am unable to do so. I would not want to push the tolerance of my colleagues any further than I have. I look forward to another opportunity to put the rest of what I have to say on the record.

Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, today and tomorrow we are debating Motion No. 36 in order to get the sense of the House on the abortion issue. This is a very complex issue. It is a sensitive, moral, and religious issue.

I do not believe in abortion on demand. I do not believe that abortion should be used as a method of birth control. I strongly believe that abortion is a matter between a woman, her God, and her physician, and it should be permitted up to and including the eighteenth week of pregnancy. Of course, if the mother's life is physically or mentally at risk at any time, termination of the pregnancy should be permitted. An abortion is a medical procedure and should only be performed by a licensed physician in a licensed facility.

For most women the decision to have an abortion is one of the most difficult they will ever make. It has implications for women and families, for people with deeply held religious views. It requires careful thought and analysis.

Counselling is extremely important and all women deserve to be informed about the effects of an abortion and other means available to carry on the pregnancy. However, once she and her God—her belief, her morals—decide to have the operation, it is her decision.

I cannot support the pro-life faction. I truly respect their views and admire them. However, the Government cannot propose legislation which would be struck down again by the Supreme Court of Canada. The Charter of Rights and Freedoms respects the rights of women. Women have the right to control their bodies.

In a dramatic and forward looking step the Supreme Court ruled last January that women have rights which must be satisfied and protected. The Supreme Court's decision on abortion is no more and no less than confirmation of a woman's right to choose without the interference of strangers. It is not a celebration of abortion, it is not an instruction to abort.

An unwanted pregnancy is a heartache that no Supreme Court decision can heal. The best way to prevent abortion is to make sure that there are no unwanted pregnancies and that women are never left in the position of having to make that last resort choice. We do not solve a problem by making it illegal.

Banning abortions might be a satisfying moral answer, but it would be unworkable. It would force women who seek abortions to travel to the United States, that is, those who could afford to, or worse, risk their health in back alley clinics. It would compound the tragedy and put women's safety at risk.

Family life education is truly a necessity in the school curriculum right across Canada. Young people are not being taught about life, love, sex, and the reproduction of the human body. Unfortunately, many children today know nothing, or that which they do know is incorrect.

I recognize that the school system is under provincial jurisdiction, but surely in 1988 a national program with both federal and provincial funding could be initiated. All the facts should be taught; what a female is, a male, intercourse, contraception, and responsibility—the responsibility of pregnancy, of parenting, and of love. Let us teach life.

The motion before us states:

> Such legislation should prohibit the performance of an abortion, subject to the following exceptions:
>
> When, during the earlier stages of pregnancy: a qualified medical practitioner is of the opinion that the continuation of the pregnancy of a woman would, or would be likely to, threaten her physical or mental well-being; when the woman in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner decides to terminate her pregnancy; and when the termination is performed by a qualified medical practitioner—

I would like to move an amendment to Motion No. 36, which will be seconded by the Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. James), as follows, that the motion be amended by deleting the words "during the earlier stages of pregnancy" and replacing them with the following: "up to and including the eighteenth week of pregnancy", so that the amended motion will now read: "When, up to and including the eighteenth week of pregnancy: a qualified medical practitioner . . . and when the termination is performed by a qualified medical practitioner; and". I tabled this amendment prior to the debate this evening. The reason for my amendment is that "earlier stages" means 12 weeks. Amniocentesis cannot be performed until the fourteenth or fifteenth week of pregnancy in order to find out if there is a genetic disorder, deformity, or serious malformation of the foetus. It takes approximately 10 days to two weeks to receive the results of this test. For those who live in a remote area, it probably takes three weeks, for a total of 18 weeks. Also, some women do not have regular periods. Indeed, the very young who would not realize or recognize early pregnancy symptoms would need up to the 18 weeks.

• (0120)

Female bodies are different from one another. We are not all the same. We have different times of ovulation, intermittent cycles with some at 24 days, some at 28 days, and some at 30 days. We are not a machine that operates according to a manual; we are human.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that I am pro-choice, with limitations. I do not support abortion on demand. It is up to a woman and her God and her doctor to make the decision, with counselling. I strongly believe that abortion should be permitted up to and including the eighteenth week of pregnancy, by a licenced physician in a licenced facility.

I spent this afternoon, this evening, and now the wee hours of the morning listening to the views of my colleagues. I recognize and value all the information I have received and heard. On Thursday there will be a free vote, a non-partisan democratic vote. I shall be here to vote my belief.

Mr. Pat Binns (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, not only are hundreds or thousands of abortions unacceptable, even one abortion of an unborn child is unacceptable. If we can begin by saving one life at a time we will have made progress in our society.

Despite my belief, I am concerned about why a woman believes she must reach a decision to abort her unborn child. Perhaps it is that society today is not giving the kind of support necessary for a woman who is carrying a child in order to go on with that pregnancy. There are a number of pressures that are brought to bear. Whether it is from the boyfriend, family, colleagues at work, but it must be addressed. We need more understanding and support for the woman who is carrying that child so that she will reach a different conclusion.

Unfortunately, there is not enough time tonight to discuss how we change attitudes and society in order to give support to the woman who faces that monumental decision in her life about whether to carry the child through to completion of her pregnancy or to have an abortion because the support is not there for the woman and her child.

I acknowledge from the outset that God is the giver of life and that, in my opinion, neither I nor anyone else has the right to take the life of that unborn child. The Bible says that man was made in the image of God, and everything I have learned tells me that each of us has a soul, a body and we inhabit spirit. We will be conscious beings through eternity. We are created by God and we have a responsibility to respect and protect others whom God has also created.

Many great leaders have acknowledged God's laws. U.S. President Thomas Jefferson, in 1776, said in Philadelphia: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men were created equal, they are endowed with certain unalienable rights; among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness". I believe that the unborn child has these same rights and that its life is also inalienable.

When God called Jeremiah to be a prophet he said: "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; before thou came forth out of the womb, I sanctified thee . . . ". Those words establish in my mind beyond a shadow of a doubt that the foetus is important to God from the point of conception onward.

I am disturbed when I hear some people say that while they agree abortion on demand is wrong, the unborn child with some form of physical or mental defect is perhaps a different case and aborting that life would be acceptable. I do not believe it is.

When God called Moses at the burning bush and wanted him to speak to the people of Israel, Moses was not very enthusiastic and told God that he was slow of speech and of a slow tongue, indicating that he probably was not the person to speak to the people of Israel. But God answered Moses by saying:

> "Who hath made man's mouth or maketh the dumb or the deaf or the seeing or the blind? Have not I", sayeth the Lord?

Whether we like it or not, it seems to me that God makes what we might call the perfect and the imperfect. I do not think God makes a mistake in that regard.

How many Members in this House have lived with a retarded or perhaps a severely handicapped person? Everyone who has would recognize and reinforce my belief that those people are special in this world and in fact enrich our daily lives. They give us insight and experience that we would otherwise never have. We gain some kind of appreciation for life by seeing the difficulties that some people live with. They are simply glad to be here on this earth, to be able to enjoy it and live with us. That makes us better and makes our communities stronger.

Some Members have talked about development before birth. Let me reiterate some of the comments that have been made. There has been much development well before the mother even is sure she is pregnant. By 18 to 25 days, the heart is already beating. At 45 days brainwaves can be detected. By nine to 10 weeks, the baby can squint, swallow, and move its tongue. By 13 weeks it can suck its thumb. Doctors accept that by at least six months the baby can survive outside the womb.

That leads me to the question of viability, about which I hear many people talking today. People seem to suggest that the foetus should be protected once it is viable, but up to that point protection is not so important. I cannot accept the argument of viability. After all, if we accept the definition of viability as being able to survive on one's own, who is viable? Is the newborn baby viable? Of course not. It could not live without the mother to feed it or a nurse to take care of it in the hospital.

We could ask if the one-year old could survive alone. It could not. Could a three-year old survive? Could it feed itself, provide clothes, or build a house? Of course not.

I do not think you or I could survive if we did not have our society to help us provide an interrelationship. We could not survive without friends and colleagues to provide a sense of purposefulness in life. We are interrelated from conception onward.

How did we let ourselves be stampeded into the belief that abortion is somehow acceptable? At some point it seemed that people began believing that the quality of human life gained respectability at the expense of human life itself. But many of these arguments are without foundation. Thousands of women were said to be dying each year at the hands of criminal abortionists. In the United States in the mid-1960s, some estimated that 10,000 women died each year of illegal abortion. However, on closer scrutiny, the U.S. Public Health Service reported that from all abortions, legal and illegal, only 189 deaths occurred in 1966, and 160 deaths in 1967.

• (0130)

It seems to me that inflation hit the abortion statistics perhaps before it hit the economy. Part of the problem today when we speak of abortion relates to terminology. It used to be said that an expectant mother was with child. Today, people who are pro-abortion and many scientists will only talk about the foetus. They talk about aborting the foetus. But, in reality we should be talking about killing children.

Where are we today? As everyone knows, the Supreme Court has struck down the abortion law we had in this country. In fact, right up until the moment of delivery abortion would seem to be acceptable because of the fact we do not have an abortion law. That is why we are here. We have a responsibility to bring in a new law.

I believe that the legalization of abortion on demand, if it is not reversed, will some day be looked upon by historians as the last turning point of our materialistic society in abandoning the advantages that came to our society from a Christian-Judaeo heritage in favour of a change in our culture where an unreal concern about materialism and personal freedom replaced our traditional view of the sanctity of life. I am afraid that it takes almost nothing to move from abortion, which is the killing of an unborn baby, to the killing of the retarded, the crippled, the sick, and the elderly. We have to show leadership in returning our society to the belief that the highest level of culture is when we protect the sanctity of human life.

Great nations in which freedom and justice have governed the affairs of the people have upheld this principle. This principle is the bedrock of our civilization. It is a principle which has distinguished free and democratic systems. When the moral foundations of our country are being shaken as they are now, it is time for us to act. I think that just as ancient Rome and other nations have died when they ceased to live by great principles, so can we.

Our choice is clear. We have to believe that we have the power to overcome the pro-abortion decision which was recently taken because of the Supreme Court action. I believe we have to do this since no nation can survive if it abandons natural moral leadership and embraces a doctrine of death. Some of my colleagues who have already spoken earlier today have moved true pro-life amendments and I look forward to supporting those amendments.

Mr. Geoff Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, the subject of this motion and the amendments proposed concern an issue which, in the words of *The Ottawa Citizen* editorial of Monday of this week "no Government can settle easily and uncontroversially. It is a question of feeling and faith more than logic and science, and divisions must surely cut across all Party lines". I would like to say at the outset that the vast majority of my constituents, like most Canadians, are opposed to abortion on demand, and with this position I agree. I could not, as a matter of conscience, vote for any proposal that would allow for a termination of pregnancy simply upon request. Yet that is the present situation in Canada as a result of the Morgentaler decision rendered in January of this year.

The decision of the Supreme Court of Canada struck down the old law as being inconsistent with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the majority of judges having found that Section 251 of the Criminal Code deprived a pregnant woman of the right to security of person under Section 7 of the Charter. We are, of course, aware that the Borowski case will soon be heard by the Supreme Court. Presumably, the justices will take that opportunity to define the rights of the unborn human. Pending that decision, and given the significance of the Charter, Parliament, in a very real sense, is left in limbo. That is why I commend the Government for bringing forward this debate to enable individual Members of Parliament to express their positions and ultimately to seek consensus on the preferred direction legislation might take.

This issue touches in the most profound way the absolute fundamentals of an individual's concept of life itself. It is the kind of issue that Members will decide freely, without Party discipline and irrespective of the representations of lobby groups, but Members will answer to their constituents. In this regard, I disagree with Edmund Burke. I believe that where there is a clear-cut expression of opinion within a constituency, under the circumstances of a free vote each Member ought to respect the wishes of the majority of his constituents.

Back in early 1985 I included an abortion questionnaire to be inserted in a householder and received over 1,500 responses at a time when this issue was not on the front burner. Some 80 per cent of my constituents rejected the idea of abortion on demand. Seventy-seven per cent felt that the law should give rights to the unborn child, and abortion was rejected in all situations other than where there was an imminent threat to the mother's life. With this direction, last year I voted in favour of the private Member's Bill put forward by the Hon. Member for Grey—Simcoe (Mr. Mitges) which sought to afford to the unborn human protection under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Recently, after the Supreme Court of Canada decision on Morgentaler, I canvassed my constituents on the basis of three possible courses of action: first, to permit abortions only where the mother's life or physical health was in danger; second, to permit abortion without restriction; and, third, to permit abortion without restrictions during the first 16 weeks of pregnancy and thereafter only when the mother's life or physical health was in danger. Sixty-four per cent of my constituents chose option one. Only 9 per cent chose option two and 24 per cent chose option three. A clear majority of people in my riding believe that abortion should only be allowed if the mother's life or physical health is in danger. Most important, 68 per cent of women supported this position as compared to 59 per cent of the men. Given that this subject has been termed by some as a woman's issue, I regard this feminine response as most significant.

On many occasions when responding to constituents, I have indicated that I am against abortion on demand, that I am against free-standing abortion clinics, and that it would be my intention to support legislation that best restricts abortion to situations wherein the life of the mother is endangered. I have not always held these views. These are views which have evolved over a considerable period of time.

This debate obliges us to ask ourselves difficult questions. When does life begin? What is the nature of human life? What is the value of the individual? Who should choose between the life of a woman and her child? Does a woman's individual freedom override the life of an unborn human? What is the role of the state in all of this? The abortion

question is only a part of a larger issue that is now just beginning to be examined as a result of technological and scientific advances. These advances, if indeed they can be called that, raise for the first time questions concerning genetic manipulation, research into recombinant DNA, fertility drugs, *in vitro* fertilization, multiple births and the accompanying issue of pregnancy reduction, transplants, implants, surrogate motherhood, and the experimental use of foetal tissue. I need not elaborate or speculate as to some of the bizarre possibilities inherent in some of these procedures. Suffice it to say that we must have some rules, some prohibitions and some sanctions.

• (0140)

I should now like to recognize my colleague, the Hon. Member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore (Mr. Boyer) who as a private Member's initiative proposed a human life Act in an attempt to deal with these issues as well as those of euthanasia, suicide and all issues of intentional intervention in the human life cycle. The common theme linking these matters is the sanctity of human life and, as such, abortion is only one dimension which begs for resolution on moral, legal and ethical grounds.

The Government of West Germany has announced plans to ban research on human embryos, to outlaw surrogate motherhood, to curb artificial insemination, to prohibit production of foetal tissue for experimentation and to forbid choice of the child's sex in artificial insemination. It may be that a Royal commission should be struck in this country to receive evidence and to hear witnesses, to listen to experts and to examine in detail all aspects of these human life issues. I believe also, Mr. Speaker, that efforts have to be made educationally toward heightened individual responsibility and that further efforts have to be made to assist and improve adoption procedures. In passing, I cannot help but note how ironic it is that here in Canada, a vast nation in physical terms but short of population, we hear people supporting termination of life while at the same time complaining about what they see as rising immigration and lax refugee determination procedures. In fact, we should be encouraging a high birth rate in Canada in order to increase our population and our domestic consumption.

The recent Morgentaler Supreme Court decision and the comments of Madam Justice Wilson suggest a gestational approach wherein the relative value of the unborn presumably increases as the pregnancy advances. Under this approach the value of the foetus would eventually outweigh the freedom of the woman to decide as to her person. With the greatest respect, I say that the gestational approach is nothing more than abortion on demand. Whether the cut-off is 16 weeks or 20 weeks, whether you decide that life exists at 21 weeks and not at 20 or, conversely, whether you decide at 21 weeks the rights of the mother are extinguished in favour of the foetus seems illogical. A hard decision has to be made. It cannot be papered over. It will not go away. Either you have life or you do not, you have life at 20 weeks, at 18 weeks, or 16 weeks, or at eight weeks. It seems to me that eventually you get back to the moment of conception and that life springs from that moment. I repeat that the compromise motion, the gestational approach is in my mind abortion on demand. This approach does nothing whatsoever for security of the person. It represents abortion on demand and would legalize fully 95 per cent of all abortions. With the greatest respect I say that you cannot say you oppose opening wide the door to abortion and then in the same breath say that up to 20 or 24 weeks it is a matter of choice. That, surely, is a direct contradiction.

It is now 1.45 a.m. Mr. Speaker. I have listened with interest and with the greatest respect to the views that have been put forward by a number of Members in this House yesterday afternoon and evening and early this morning. Finally, I want to say that as a Christian and as one whose personal philosophy is first and foremost the basic work of the individual, the sanctity of human life and the primacy of the family in our society, I have to take a decision and I choose life. In so far as possible, every human life from conception should be given a chance. If I am in error, I have to err on the side of the unborn human being.

Feeling as I do, and with the reassurance that I am supported in this by the clear majority of my constituents, I certainly cannot support the main motion. I will support proposals that best protect the unborn human. I will support the amendment proposed by the Hon. Member for Grey—Simcoe (Mr. Mitges) which I believe would restrict abortion to those situations wherein the life of the mother is endangered. Should that motion fail, I would support the motion placed by another of my colleagues, the Hon. Member for Kitchener (Mr. Reimer) to the effect that abortion be permitted only where the mother's life or physical health is endangered. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity to contribute to the discussion and the debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Duvernay (Mr. Della Noce) to be followed by the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Vincent Della Noce (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State and Minister responsible for Multiculturalism): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to participate in this evening's work, which has become this morning's work since it is now 1:46 a.m. It isn't Tuesday anymore, it's Wednesday. And on behalf of my consituents in Duvernay, I felt I had a duty to speak this morning. Even though almost all of those contituents must be asleep now because they have to go to work in the morning, they can sleep in peace because I have a duty to perform and it is a pleasure to rise in their name and debate an issue that over that past three or four days has become quite an important matter in Duvernay. A number of people have been doing nothing but tell us what they want, what they would like us to do for them; the churches have taken a hand, the parish priests, all parishioners were expected to sign postcards. In the space of those few days I have once again received 3,000 postcards. I have here 2,910 of them, received in three days, and that, Mr. Speaker, shows the level of interest in the riding of Duvernay and perhaps the whole City of Laval.

I have checked all these letters and cards—we have received a lot of letters from our fellow citizens, and quite apart from that there were 300 phone calls to our office from people who wanted to be heard. The most interesting thing is that the people who signed these cards weren't afraid to sign their names, their addresses, their postal code, and I shall make a point of getting back to all of them with my comments on the vote we will be holding this Thursday at noon.

Mr. Speaker, it isn't easy to reach a consensus. Probably we will never have one here in the House. The majority of my constituents oppose abortion. I believe that here in Parliament the majority also oppose abortion. As my colleague, the Hon. Member for Outremont (Mrs. Pépin) said earlier: because some people claim that free choice would be their choice, just because someone is in favour of the freedom to choose, doesn't mean they like the idea of abortion.

There is another think that struck me just now, because when I discussed this question with a number of women in my riding, and in particular with my wife, almost every time I heard the comment, "It's a bunch of men, a bunch of chest-thumpers, who are trying to settle a woman's problem . . . " Certainly, if the wives or the mothers of some of the MPs who have spoken this evening had spoken in their place, I can promise you the speeches would not have been the same. I'm sure they would have been very different! Nobody is "for" abortion, Mr. Speaker, and I am certain that women who have had abortions must regret it. It isn't easy to make a choice, it isn't easy for an MP when he sees the feelings that have been expressed over the past three days. For example, on Monday more than 350 letters and cards were brought to me in my office, signed by residents of my riding. That has to be respected, Mr. Speaker, because normally scarcely 1 or 2 per cent of the population express their views by one means or another, either by mail or by phone, and when it seems to be so difficult for people to take one minute to make themselves heard, then when more than 2,000, 3,000, 4,000 letters arrive in our offices you have to take five minutes and read them and pay attention. Sometimes it's easy to read them because all of them say roughly the same things, or usually there's a standard card that gets repeated over and over.

• (0150)

Mr. Speaker, soon we will be voting on the question of abortion, and it's going to be one of the most difficult and even agonizing, choices I have ever had to make in my whole career.

Like many of us, I'm sure, I find myself confronted with the necessity to make a choice that conflicts, be it even partially, with my personal convictions. It seems to me that in all intellectual honesty, I must place myself on the side of the opinion expressed by a majority of my constituents, several thousands of them. I have a duty to reflect the general opinion, the consensus, that has become obvious in the riding of Duvernay, and to follow the avenues and the explicit indications and the will clearly expressed by my voters in Duvernay, that is, to vote against the motion introduced by the government which we are considering here today. But I would be ready to vote for the amendment moved by my colleague the Hon. Member for Kitchener (Mr. Reimer), Amendment A, which I would like to read into the record for the benefit of my fellow citizens:

> That all of the words in the motion after the words "to protect the unborn; and" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:
>
> Such legislation, giving pre-eminence to the protection of the foetus, should prohibit the performance of an abortion except when:
>
> —two independent qualified medical practitioners have, in good faith and on reasonable grounds, stated that in their opinion the continuation of the pregnancy would, or would be likely to, endanger the life of the pregnant woman or seriously and substantially endanger her health and there is no other commonly accepted medical procedure for effectively treating the health risk; but grounds for such opinions are not to include
>
> (I) the effects of stress or anxiety which may accompany an unexpected or unwanted pregnancy, or
>
> (II) social or economic considerations.

Mr. Speaker, Amendment A, by my colleague the Hon. Member for Kitchener, seems to me to be very reasonable.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, even though I have received many very very touching letters, and some people even sent us videos, very touching photographs, associations that wrote, like SOS Bébé, the association of Quebec physicians for life . . . We even had certain people, American groups, who sent us their views, who asked us to be very careful before we made a decision. I also had a letter from a group represented by a Mr. Mongeau in my riding, and I'd like to read a paragraph of it:

> "Dear Mr. Della Noce,
>
> The lawyers, doctors and nurses of "Respect de la Vie", with whom we are working very seriously, provided us with figures in the past few weeks showing there were approximately 700 abortions every week in Quebec. In Ontario it is worse, approximately 1,100 per week. And the rest of Canada accounts for the remaining cases, out of a total of 110,000 abortions a year.
>
> Canada = a great country dying."

This letter was sent to me in July of 1988 and it's signed by Mr. Mongeau, who asks me very earnestly to think long and hard before voting and to take into account all the petitions and letters that have been sent to us, and he finishes his letter by saying,

> "Vote thoughtfully. Thank you."

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, it's getting very late and I know there are still people who want to speak. It seems obvious to me that in my capacity as representative for Duvernay, I have a duty to set aside, in all honesty, my personal convictions and express those of the majority whose voice I am here today, as I did in the vote on the death penalty. I have a great deal of respect for my constituents, because as an MP we have to wear the MP's hat. We aren't ordinary citizens any longer, we are citizens at the service of our community, and I say to my community, "I am here to say what you have told me to say. Even though it's 1:55 in the morning and you're asleep, my duty is to do what you have asked me to do. And that is what I have done today in this House, with all due respect." I know there will be some people who won't agree with my choice. It is impossible that everybody could approve.

I see certain people who have argued in favour of the right to freedom of choice. I respect that too. It troubles me to see so many abortions in Canada. Who will perform them once a Bill is passed strictly forbidding abortion? A great deal remains to be done, and I hope that we will be able to do everything possible so that those girls and women can get help one way or another, and I say to my fellow citizens, "I have done my duty. It doesn't always reflect my personal thinking. I'm not here as an individual, I'm here for you, and I have made the choice you asked me to make, and I will be voting against the motion that is on the Table today."

[*English*]

Mr. Robert Wenman (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, it is now 2 a.m. in the House of Commons in Ottawa. When we walk out of these doors tonight into the streets of Ottawa we will find that it is very much closed down. There will be other areas open tonight in Ottawa, and they are the Ottawa hospitals. If one were to visit the wards, in every one of those hospitals one would find expectant mothers. Many babies are being born right now in Ottawa, in Vancouver, and other places in Canada. Many expectant mothers are waiting for the birth of their first, second, or third child. They are waiting with different emotions.

I am sure that there is at least one expectant mother who has an expectant father pacing the hallway in anticipation, who has an excited family waiting at home for the news and for the father to phone home. In fact, they are waiting for a child with a home that is full of love and opportunity surrounding that mother, child, and family. I am sure there is an expectant grandfather and grandmother waiting for that call, no matter how late at night. They waited to hear that very call in that same expectant way for their child and they now await for their grandchild. I am sure there are expectant mothers with emotions like that.

Perhaps in the next bed there is an expectant mother who is more alone than we are, the four or five of us present in the House of Commons tonight. Perhaps there is no father in the home, or perhaps not knowing who the father is. Perhaps there are no parents to give support to that mother expecting that child. Perhaps the mother is jobless and faces raising a child on welfare as a single parent, alone, afraid, but perhaps also committed to giving that child life and letting that child find its potential in its society. It might be because of some religious feeling that she has, or simply that that mother feels it is just not right to take the life of the child inside her.

I am sure there is another expectant mother who probably will not be delivering that child because she has made the decision, after looking at a series of circumstances, that she will not give life to her child, but that she will ask the doctor to take the life of her child from her, to kill that child. One might want to put it in nicer words, but that is the reality.

• (0200)

I feel very different emotions in response to all three. The first mother will share her joy with that very wanted child. For the second mother I have an empathy, and a sorrow that I as a Parliamentarian have been unsuccessful in creating the kind of society that would not see even her child be a joy to her. We have not provided opportunities for adoption, we have not provided opportunities to support that mother to help her raise that child to its full potential. We have not created the social atmosphere where life and children are valuable and needed in our society. We should try to provide for that mother and her child the extended family or the kind of support mechanisms that would replace that extended family if it is not there for that mother.

I am disappointed in myself and in this House of Commons, and I am pleased that we are starting now to talk about child care and alternatives for child care so that all children can be more welcomed into this world.

For mother number three I feel great sorrow. I feel compassion for her in her decision. I feel sorrow for her and know that out of her decision can come nothing but more sorrow, as well as the death of the child, the sorrow of the mother, the hurt for that mother, because no mother makes that choice easily, or happily. She really is making the choice on the basis of what she believes, her conditioning, her values, her circumstances. I would say to her that freedom of choice is broadened, not limited, when one opts for life.

We must consider not just the choices of the mother; we must consider the choices of all of the partners in creating life, in creating and nurturing life and children. We must consider not only the mother but, of course, the child. As the Supreme Court said, "we must consider". We must consider the rights of the mother, the rights of the child, the rights of the father, the rights of society to that child and, of course, we must consider the other partner, the God of that child.

The last time I spoke in this House I spoke about an issue, about life. I spoke in support of an environmental issue, asking that this House of Commons preserve and add to the Pacific Rim National Park, a primitive wilderness area containing the tallest Sitka spruce trees known in the world. I listened in this House of Commons to the Liberal speakers, the NDP speakers, the Conservative speakers. I listened to all speakers without one word of dissent, saying yes, we must save the lives of the giant spruce trees in the Carmanah watershed. Everyone agreed.

I do not understand how this same House of Commons which said "save the trees", can say a few days later "kill the child". "Save the trees, kill the child". Where is our value? Where is our sense of priority? Somehow we should be able to teach those who believe the value of a balanced environment that part of that balance is a balance of population. If we cannot reach that group on the basis of their moral feelings or their other kinds of values, let us talk environmentally about the balance of ages of people of our society.

In Canada right now we have 10 people working for every one person that is retired, 10 people who will work and raise money and pay the pensions and social benefits of our society. By the year 2000, there will not be 10 people working for every one retired, but only five people working for every one who is retired. How will those five people be able to work and support that one?

It gets even more frightening than that if you look into the early 2000s and you find out that in Canada there will only be three people working for each one retired. The reason is that our low end, the children in our society, are not being replaced, which is another kind of social value that young Canadians are going to have to look at. We are going to have to replace that young end of children coming into our society, hopefully through wanted pregnancies of Canadian people. Where the Canadian people cannot produce that young end of our population, we will have to import that on the basis of immigration, because we cannot exist economically on a ratio of three people working for one retired.

At the same time as we see the problem coming we eliminate—no. Not eliminate. That is not the right word. We kill one million potential Canadian babies. We rob that potential and we destroy that population age balance in our society. It does not matter whether you are talking common sense, whether you are talking moral values, whether you are talking human values, we need children in our society for a multitude of reasons that relate to all of those things.

I have spoken in this House of Commons on this issue before. I have voted in this House of Commons in two different Parliaments; on the Constitution and for pro-life amendments. I have voted for the amendment of the Hon. Member for Grey-Simcoe (Mr. Mitges). He is a courageous man who has made further amendments that I will vote for again.

It comes down to what is Canada all about. What is it that we value and that we respect? If we do not respect life, if we do not want to nurture life, it is not the kind of Canada that I came here to speak about, to protect, to preserve, to develop. I came here to encourage my children and my grandchildren to continue the great building of this nation, and I want them to build it for and with life. That is why I will vote for life motions in this House of Commons and why I appreciate this opportunity to stand here and express this view, which I believe is a view of myself, my family and my community.

Mr. Jim Edwards (Edmonton South): Mr. Speaker, it is a lonely night—not just with regard to the numbers in the House—but it is a lonely night because this is a lonely issue. It is an issue in which we stand alone, some of us, because there are those of us who will differ with our constituents. There are those who have not accurately been able to ascertain the views of their constituents because it is an issue on which the country is rather deeply divided.

• (0210)

It is lonely for me because I am about to declare myself. It is not a new position for me but it is the first time that I have had the opportunity to declare myself in this House. I did so during the last election campaign, and I do so now, partly as a father of three daughters of child bearing age. We have been served until January 28 of this year by the 1969 law, Section 251 of the Criminal Code, which in the 1960s was deemed by the then Minister of Justice, presently the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Turner), to be an appropriate compromise in perhaps the classic Canadian mode. However, time and events have overtaken that Section of the Criminal Code because we now have the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

On January 28 the Supreme Court, by a five to two majority judgment, held that Section 251 contravenes the rights of a pregnant woman under Section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The majority of the judges further held that this breach could not be saved by the reasonable limitation clause under Section 1 of the Charter of Rights and therefore concluded that the abortion legislation was invalid.

Since the rendering of that decision there seems to have been some division in interpretation of the ramifications of the Supreme Court judgment. Pro-choice advocates celebrated a decision they believed would give a woman complete control of her body. Anti-abortion groups mourned the ruling as a devastating defeat which said that women could now get abortions anywhere at any time. The truth of the matter, Sir, is that both sides are mistaken, the Supreme Court ruling says neither of those things. The majority did not rule that women have an unconditional right to abortion under the Charter. On the contrary, the Supreme Court merely concluded that Section 251 impaired irretrievably a pregnant woman's right to security of the person embodied in Section 7 of the Charter.

Justices Beetz, Estey and Wilson expressly state that law restricting abortions might yet be consistent with the Charter and that at some point in the later stages of pregnancy the state's interest in protecting the foetus might be sufficiently compelling to override the rights that women otherwise have under the Charter. This approach is not inconsistent with that taken by most other western nations. In fact, abortion based on gestation appears to be the currently preferred route. Indeed, the motion before us would take us down that road. However, is the world-wide trend the way to go? Should Canada instead seek her own way?

There is a dissent from the Supreme Court judgment written by Mr. Justice McIntyre and concurred in by Mr. Justice La Forest. I am going to quote selectively and I hope with reasonable representation from Justice McIntyre's dissent.

In my view, he wrote, the Chief Justice's whole position depends for its validity upon a proposition that interference with the right constitutes an infringement of her right to security of the person. All laws, it must be noted, have the potential for interference with individual priorities and aspirations. In fact, the very purpose of most legislation is to cause such interference. It is only when such legislation goes beyond interfering with priorities and aspirations, and abridges rights, that courts may intervene.

In my view, he said, it is clear that before it could be concluded that any enactment infringed the concept of security of the person it would have to infringe some underlying right included in or protected by the concept. The proposition that women enjoy a constitutional right to have an abortion is devoid of support in the language of Section 7 of the Charter or any other section. It cannot be said that the history, traditions and underlying philosophies of our society would support the proposition that a right to abortion can be implied in the charter.

Finally, he said in so far as it may be said that the administrative scheme of the Act has operated efficiently, a proposition which may be highly questionable, it is caused principally by forces external to the statute, the external circumstances being a general demand for abortion irrespective of the provisions of Section 251. It is not open to the courts in his view to strike down a statutory provision on this basis.

Prior to 1969, and indeed since that time, women in this country have been to a greater or lesser extent unduly deprived of their proper rights. The Charter goes a long way toward establishing in our minds, our laws, and in our hearts, that women are in the fullest sense of the word persons under the law. That principle was first established as recently as 58 years ago in the famous Persons case, in which my kinswoman took part.

However, we must also look at whether or not there is personhood in the unborn. I would like to look at two possible approaches to that particular consideration, one logical and one scientific. I quote first from the research paper *Is The Human Embryo a Person?* by John Gallagher of the Human Life Research Institute. He states:

> The principle of economy states that one should not posit the existence of some further reality to explain phenomena when the phenomena can be explained just as well by the realities one already knows to exist. To posit the existence of this further reality which is not demanded by the phenomena is to go beyond the available evidence, to be fanciful rather than realistic.
>
> To be a particular human person is to be a particular living organism. This human person began to live when this organism began to live. We can consider two possible explanations: first, that the human person begins to live at the time of fertilization; second, that the human person begins to live at some time later than fertilization. The first explanation is the more economical one. It holds that the phenomena are explained by the gradual changes which we know take place, without any change of first being in which a non-personal organism ceases to exist and a new organism, a human person, begins to exist. The second explanation posits the additional reality of this change in first being. Clearly we should hold to the first, more economical, explanation unless there is evidence requiring the positing of this additional reality, the change in first being.

Pretty heavy stuff but indeed science points in the same direction. Paul Ramsey has written:

> Indeed, microgenetics seems to have demonstrated what religion never could; and biological science, to have resolved an ancient theological dispute. The human individual comes into existence first as a minute information speck, drawn at random from many other minute informational specks his parents possessed out of the common human gene pool. This took place at the moment of impregnation . . . Thus it can be said that the individual is whoever he is going to become from the moment of impregnation. Thereafter, his subsequent development may be described as a process of becoming the one he already is. Genetics teaches that we were from the beginning what we essentially still are in every cell and in every human attribute.

Is abortion then wrong? Where is it that we are going in considering an unfettered access to abortion or even a reasonably available access to abortion? I quote now from an article by Mr. Richard Bastien who is the author of the book *La Solution Canadienne*. He says:

> For freedom to remain alive, two ingredients are necessary. The first is the notion that we all are responsible for one another. This is a basic tenet of Western culture. From it we learn the importance of interdependence and the truth that the individual achieves his own fulfilment in service to others.
>
> The second ingredient is the notion that every human life has an inherent value. This idea constitutes the basis for individual rights; it lies at the very heart of our political traditions.
>
> The pro-choice stance is incompatible with both ideas. By asserting that abortion is a private matter, it denies we have any responsibility for each other. By defining life's value only in relation to society or those affected by a life, it denies life's inherent value. It is impossible to support a pro-choice position without at the same time arguing that certain human lives should be sacrificed to the privacy or convenience of others.
>
> This is the utilitarian view of life, which holds that whatever solves a problem on the practical level must be considered acceptable. No action is right or wrong as such. The morality of an act is to be determined only by the desirability of its effect. In short, the end justifies the means.

● (0220)

There are many in society who sincerely believe that because we have now a more and more pluralistic society in its origins and in its beliefs, therefore we must seek the lowest common denominator in our moral standards. I quote from a research paper done by a distinguished barrister and solicitor, Iain T. Benson, Chairman of the Civil Liberties Section of the British Columbia branch of the Canadian Bar Association. Benson writes:

> The statement is sometimes made that Canada is a pluralistic country and that, therefore, one must acknowledge each person's differing beliefs.
>
> As a recognition of Canada's multi-cultural make-up this statement is accurate; where it becomes unacceptable is when a valid recognition of cultural diversity is confused with *moral* pluralism. To postulate moral pluralism from ethnic and social diversity amounts to stating that because different groups have different cultural and ethnic beliefs and practices, *morality* is various and, therefore relative . . .
>
> Throughout the centuries many of the greatest thinkers have discussed the importance of learning and preserving the central truths which define the society. These truths are not relative or subjective but transcendent. Michael Polanyi has written that:
>
> . . . the adherents of a great tradition are largely unaware of their own premises, which lie deeply embedded in the unconscious foundations of practice . . . if the citizens are dedicated to certain transcendent obligations and particularly to such general ideals as truth, justice, charity, and these are embodied in the tradition of the community to which allegiance is maintained, a great many issues between, citizens and all to some extent, can be left—and are necessarily left—for the individual consciences to decide. The moment, however, a community ceases to be dedicated through its members to transcendent ideals, it can continue to exist undisrupted only by submission to a single centre of unlimited secular power.

I made a declaration when I ran for Parliament in 1984 that I stood for the preservation of life and that I opposed abortion on demand. Now that the highest court in the land has spoken, the door is open for legislation which strikes a balance between the rights of the expectant mother and those of the unborn child.

My duty, as I see it, is twofold. First it is to work for the reduction of the number of abortions by reducing the demand for them and second, it is to deal with the availability question through appropriate legislation which would preserve and protect as many unborn lives as possible.

Notwithstanding my declared position on the issue, I took it upon myself earlier this year to ascertain the views of my constituents. I concede that this is not a statistically valid survey in that only those who are interested in the issue chose to respond. This survey is based on a sample of 2,319 responses.

Should abortion be available on demand: yes, 47 per cent; no, 48 per cent; not sure, 3 per cent. Should the mother's rights prevail over those of the unborn child: yes, 53 per cent; no, 36 per cent; not sure, 6 per cent. Should all unborn children have legal status: yes, 38 per cent; no, 47 per cent; not sure, 10 per cent. Should the law recognize that both the mother and the unborn have some rights: yes, 61 per cent; no, 27 per cent; not sure, 9 per cent. So we see that there is profound division on the issue.

Now the question arises: if abortions are restricted, what will be the consequences? I received in my office not long ago a letter from a distinguished Edmonton pathologist, Dr. T. A. Kasper, and I will quote briefly from it. He writes:

> As a pathologist, I feel it is my duty to advise you of some very misleading statements that I have heard vocalized by a variety of pro-abortion activists . . .
>
> The most deceptive statement of all goes something like this. "Before abortion on demand, there were 30,000 or 40,000 women dying every year as a result of botched up back alley abortions"...I worked for over ten years performing or supervising autopsies in the busiest morgue in the City of Edmonton . . .
>
> Over that time, I personally could not recall a single case of a death due to an illegal abortion.

That statement of Dr. Kasper appears to be borne out by a study conducted by Ian Gentles of the Human Life Research Institute which concluded the following:

> Maternal deaths from abortion declined steadily from 1940 or earlier. The legalization of abortion in the late 1960s had little effect upon a trend that had already been established for over a quarter of a century. It was not legalization but improved treatment of infection that virtually eliminated abortion deaths between 1940 and 1980.

I intend to follow this debate very carefully. I intend to listen to the arguments that are made. I intend to study all the amendments which are before us.

Like my colleague from Duvernay, I am attracted in a way to the amendment put forward by the Hon. Member for Kitchener (Mr. Reimer). I think that that is perhaps where many of us will end up. I intend, though, to see whether there is not a way to have a more restrictive law, but hand in hand with that law I think must go some clear, valid and funded alternatives to the choice of abortion which I suspect most women undertake as a last resort.

Our society does not provide adequate resources to see a woman through to the end of a pregnancy, a single woman particularly, an abandoned woman, a woman who may already have a number of dependants of her own. Our attitudes, to be honest, do not sustain that woman either. However, I am somewhat reassured by correspondence I have received from a distinguished lawyer in my constituency who practises family law. She tells me that the demand for children by would-be adoptive parents is such that the normal channels are not satisfying the demand. Indeed, those who have waited four to five years for adoptive children are now seeking the private route rather than the public route.

I find that the main motion does not satisfy the issue. The main motion is couched in the kind of moral relativism that the 1969 law is couched in. Only if we recognize and embrace a broader, positive social agenda for enhancing procreative choice can we begin to find lines of strategy that will simultaneously bring about both less reliance on abortion and less resort to coercion of women and enforced childbearing.

I believe we should not be seeking a legal compromise but that we should be looking for a truly moral solution.

• (0230)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Carole Jacques (Montreal—Mercier): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the House to speak on abortion, a very difficult and sensitive subject and one that has provoked a great deal of controversy. Abortion is a very personal choice, which belongs to the woman, who often finds herself faced with a decision that cannot be reconciled with her religion, her moral values, her family life and her convictions.

Mr. Speaker, as parliamentarians we have to make a decision that will affect the rights of women as well as the rights of the foetus, and we must try to balance those rights.

The motion before this House approaches the problem from three angles. There is the pro-life angle, formally forbidding abortion even when the health or life of the mother is at stake. It is certainly a right-to-life position, Mr. Speaker. But what about the rights of the woman when her health is in danger? I think this position has lost its relevance in the evolution of our free and democratic society. We are no longer in an archaic society. That position would take us back to the quacks and the knitting needles.

The second approach, from the pro-choice angle, would permit abortion at any stage of pregnancy. This position seems to me irrational. The right to life of both the woman and the foetus cannot be reconciled with a woman's being able to terminate her pregnancy at any point, for no matter what reason, good or bad.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is the moderate position, allowing a woman to interrupt her pregnancy in the early stages if she so decides, and also allowing abortion in the later stages of the pregnancy when two doctors agree and the mother's health is in danger.

Taking that as our basis, Mr. Speaker, we would have to be careful to define very clearly in our legislation the concept of health, which in my opinion should include both physical and mental health. This would be in accordance with the United Nations definition.

We would also have to legislate on the question of what exactly are the early stages of pregnancy and what are the later stages.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that in Canada only 0.03 abortions are performed in the last trimester of pregnancy, because of serious problems for the mother of foetal abnormality.

The state should make certain services available to pregnant women, which in the case of certain women could influence their decision to terminate the pregnancy or not. The federal and provincial Governments should also provide a basic educational system so that young people and our society generally would be better informed about contraception.

The decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Morgentaler case, as expressed by Chief Justice Brian Dickson, and I quote, "Forcing a woman, by threat of criminal sanction, to carry a foetus to term unless she meets certain criteria unrelated to her own priorities and aspirations, is a profound interference with a woman's body and thus an infringement of security of the person."

In the Morgentaler case Mr. Justice Wilson said, and I quote, "The right to "liberty" contained in s.7 guarantees to every individual a degree of personal autonomy over important decisions intimately affecting his or her private life. Liberty in a free and democratic society does not require the state to approve such decisions, but it does require the state to respect them."

"The decision whether or not to terminate a pregnancy is essentially a moral decision, and in a free and democratic society the conscience of the individual must be paramount to that of the state."

Mr. Speaker, the state must be sensitive to the rights of the pregnant woman. The state must also achieve a balance: the Charter of Rights and Freedoms gives every individual, which includes all Canadian women, the right to see to their own protection, both physical and mental, which for a woman necessarily involves the right to make decisions about her personal life, her capabilities, her psychological and physical fitness for bringing a child into the world.

Think, Mr. Speaker, of the woman whose pregnancy endangers her physical or mental health. Think of the woman who becomes pregnant as the result of rape or incest. In such cases, does the state have the right to make criminals of these women when they get abortions?

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of my position as a woman and a Member of Parliament, the middle-of-the-road position seems to me to be the most reasonable. It is the position of the majority of the voters I represent. The decision to terminate a pregnancy during its early stages is a personal decision that lies with the woman.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Since it is now 2:35 a.m., pursuant to the Order passed earlier, the debate and the House will adjourn until 2:00 p.m. today, pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 2:35 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, July 27, 1988

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—WATER RESOURCES

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, from newspaper reports it would appear that the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) has finally understood that Canadian water is threatened by the Prime Minister's (Mr. Mulroney) trade deal.

We learned today that an amendment to the trade deal will likely be made by the Government so as to exclude Canadian water from the trade Bill and prevent exports and diversions. This would be a welcome development. Yet, to be effective, the Minister should take the advice of Mel Clark, a former GATT negotiator for Canada, and Don Gamble of the Rawson Academy of Aquatic Sciences, and amend the trade agreement itself.

• (1405)

Unfortunately, the Minister said he will not amend the agreement. In light of that decision, the Prime Minister could save us all a lot of time and energy by calling an election and letting Canadians decide whether or not the Government should sell our water down the river.

* * *

PROFESSIONAL SECRETARIES INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION

CANADIAN'S ELECTION AS PRESIDENT

Mrs. Shirley Martin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, today in Kansas City, Missouri, Sandra Brown of the city of Stoney Creek in Lincoln riding will be elected international President of the Professional Secretaries International Association. The association represents 40,000 professionals from 65 countries around the world. It has been 21 years since a Canadian held this position.

Sandra's contribution and involvement in the association for the last 16 years will serve her well in her upcoming leadership role. Her election is an example of the ever increasing involvement of Canadians in shaping policies in global organizations. Lincoln is proud of Sandra and wishes her well.

* * *

PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS

BRITISH COLUMBIA—SPYING OPERATION ON CONCERNED CITIZENS FOR CHOICE ON ABORTION

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, British Columbians were shocked and outraged yesterday to learn that former Social Credit Attorney General, Brian Smith, had hired four private detectives to infiltrate and spy on Concerned Citizens for Choice on Abortion. Over $12,000 of public funds were spent on this sleazy operation which involved, among other things, secretly taping conversations and stealing membership lists.

The operation was co-ordinated through the Vancouver law offices of Farris, Vaughan, Wills and Murphy and, in particular, by Smith's legal henchman, Jack Giles. Brian Smith says he reported regularly to the office of Premier Bill Vander Zalm through principal secretary David Poole.

It is absolutely disgusting that government power should be abused in this way to spy on a respected group of citizens seeking to establish a free-standing clinic offering abortion and other reproductive health services in British Columbia. The current Attorney General should immediately turn over all records collected in this immoral operation.

I call upon Conservative Members of Parliament to join with me and my colleagues, and the vast majority of British Columbians, in saying to the discredited, collapsing, unethical Vander Zalm Government, in the name of God, go!

* * *

AGRICULTURE

CROP INSURANCE—PROVISION OF DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

Mr. Geoff Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, there is a cash flow problem facing those prairie

farmers in drought areas who will have little or no crop this year. The per bushel price guarantee under crop insurance is well below market. At the same time higher prices will likely preclude another Canada Special Grains Program. Therefore, some assistance is needed to bridge the shortfall.

I urge the Federal-Provincial Drought Committee to strongly consider utilizing crop insurance as the vehicle to ensure the fair and equitable distribution of any possible drought assistance to grain and oilseed producers.

* * *

TAX REFORM

RETIREMENT SAVINGS—DRAFT LEGISLATION

Miss Aideen Nicholson (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1988, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) released "Draft Legislation—Retirement Savings". You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Hockin) recently said we can have either a fair or a simple tax system, not both. Indeed, the legislation on retirement savings is not simple.

The Board of Trade of Metropolitan Toronto has stated that the Department of Finance is adding complexity and confusion. One feature of the new system will be that anyone who is covered by a pension plan, who is also able to contribute to an RRSP, will have to rely on Revenue Canada for information about how much can be deducted each year for an RRSP contribution. This is because the new system is so complex that only actuaries will be able to quantify the annual entitlement.

We await the tabling of the Bill, which may now be delayed until after an election. Meanwhile we have pension plan administrators and pension contributors around the country readying themselves for the implementation of nightmarish new rules that may not even be passed into law in the foreseeable future.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) has just given the Farm Credit Corporation $400 million in assistance that will help restore its finances; this makes clear that he supports this organization. Furthermore, the Minister announced that additional funds would be invested in the FCC over the next three years.

Last December, the Prime Minister gave $100 million to wipe out the FCC's losses, in addition to the other funds given so that it could fully participate in the farm debt review process.

Over the last four years, the Government has taken measures worth nearly $10 billion for the food and agriculture sector.

This shows once again that the Conservative Government cares about Canadian agriculture. These achievements in agriculture are unequaled and are intended to ensure that farmers have all the tools they need to prosper.

* * *

[*English*]

WESTERN DIVERSIFICATION FUND

GRANT MADE TO COBRA ENTERPRISES LIMITED

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, the Western Diversification Program has been announced and reannounced on an almost daily basis by Conservatives in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia as a fund wholly and solely for western Canada, but it is our tax dollars provided to projects which will diversify our western economy.

We learn this month that to Conservatives "western" means Ontario and "diversification" means moving industry from the West to Ontario. This Conservative Government in Ottawa has chosen to give $750,000 from the Western Diversification Fund to Cobra Enterprises Limited which moved from Vancouver to Markham, Ontario, two months ago. This company makes anti-theft alarms for automobiles. Too bad there is not a similar alarm attached to the Western Diversification Fund.

• (1410)

The next time the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) crows about the Western Diversification Fund, those of us who live in the West will remember Cobra. We might even drive by the empty Cobra headquarters in Vancouver and remember that with the Conservatives at the till the Western Diversification Fund is to help steal western jobs and businesses to the east.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—SUPPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I was interested to read the July-August issue of *Small Business*. The magazine features free trade. Its editorials illustrate that Canada's business community overwhelmingly gives the green light to the free trade agreement.

The magazine shows that the vast majority of small businesses agree on one thing—Canada will benefit from free trade. They are not afraid to compete in the largest market in the world.

This issue of *Small Business* should be placed on the summer reading list of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner).

I know that the Hon. Member from Canada's best example of free trade, Oshawa, will also be interested in what ordinary businessmen have to say.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—EFFECT ON GRAPE GROWERS

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, we have heard the Hon. Member for Lincoln (Mrs. Martin). We have heard the Hon. Member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Nicholson). I would like to throw them a challenge.

Will the Conservatives sink to a new low as they have done with the free trade deal? These Members in the Niagara Peninsula and in the Okanagan Valley are so afraid of competition from opposition in the election that they have actually written a clause into the grape deal which states that no Member of Parliament can actually take advantage of the deal.

What that is saying is that members of the agricultural community who have a legitimate battle to fight, who have grapes that they will have to bury over the next few weeks as they are ripening on the vines, with no market, do not have the right to run for Parliament because they will not be able to participate in the Government's pay-out on the free trade deal to the grape farmers.

That is a fact. The Government knows that it is a fact. The reason it has put it into place is because areas such as the Niagara Peninsula and the Okanagan Valley will reject the Conservatives totally.

I would like to give the grape farmers a chance to have their say. I would like to give the grape farmers a chance to run. Go to it!

* * *

THE FRANCHISE

PENITENTIARY INMATES—ONTARIO COURT DECISION

Mr. Jim Jepson (London East): Mr. Speaker, last week, like many other Canadians, I read in *The Toronto Star* that Mr. Justice Bowlby of the Ontario Supreme Court struck down as unconstitutional Section 16 of the Ontario Elections Act which disqualified federal and provincial inmates, taking away their right to vote, and feels that these men and women should have the right to vote. Like many other Canadians, I am appalled by this thought. I believe, as many other Canadians do, that when prisoners enter prison they lose their right to vote and other rights as normal citizens.

I call upon the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) to call upon his provincial counterparts to encourage the provincial Attorneys General to have the Crown appeal this decision.

* * *

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

POSITION OF PARTI QUÉBÉCOIS LEADER

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Parti Quebeçois is quoted in today's press as advocating tax discrimination against companies that obtain federal funds to provide services in English in Quebec.

He also expressed concern that non-profit groups which run shelters for battered women and day care centres, which are forced to operate on very limited budgets, might be tempted to hire bilingual staff in order to increase their revenues. "That's frightening", he says, "to subject people to such temptations."

We understand and appreciate the desire to establish French as the language of public life in Quebec. But hundreds of thousands of Anglophone Quebecers would appreciate services in their own language. And, if they become the only bilingual people in Québec, surely it would not be unfair for the federal Government to assist in their employment and the resulting service in both French and English.

Canadian history reveals so many instances of the refusal of English-speaking majorities to respect the rights of linguistic minorities, especially the French-speaking communities outside Quebec. I look forward to the day when the people of Quebec, secure in the vigour of their French, will be ready to accept the use of English in their province as well.

* * *

• (1415)

[*Translation*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—POSITION OF SENATE

Mr. Gabriel Fontaine (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, the unelected Senate wants an election on free trade. In 1949, did the unelected Senate demand elections on Canada's entry into NATO? In 1959, did the unelected Senate demand elections on the NORAD agreement? In 1982, did the Senate demand

elections on the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms? Did it demand elections on the patriation of the Canadian Constitution? Do the unelected Senators promise to resign if the people say no to the Senate and yes to free trade in the election?

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

OPPORTUNITY TO MAINTAIN EARLY RETIREMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, more than two years ago, the Conservative Government abolished the early retirement program that existed to help workers 55 and over in the textile, footwear and clothing industries and even in outlying regions.

Unfortunately, for two years, this Government has been unable to reach an agreement with the provincial governments to give older workers who are in difficulty as a result of the free trade agreement and who lose their jobs an early retirement program so that people of 50 and older could have a decent income.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) will ask the Minister of Labour to end these negotiations and to restore the former program that existed under the Liberals, which helped older workers have decent incomes.

* * *

[*English*]

MINES AND MINING

FUTURE OF WAWA IRON ORE MINE

Mr. Aurèle Gervais (Timmins—Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, the offer by Dofasco Inc. on July 18 to buy Algoma Steel Corporation Ltd. has raised some grave concerns on the part of Wawa residents about its impact on the iron ore mine there.

Both Dofasco President, Paul Phoenix, and Algoma President, Peter Nixon, have stated that Algoma Steel Corporation will continue to operate independently as a wholly owned subsidiary and have assured Wawa residents that the Dofasco offer does not change anything with regard to the future of the Algoma Ore Division operation in Wawa.

PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS

BRITISH COLUMBIA—SPYING OPERATION ON CITIZENS COALITION FOR CHOICE ON ABORTION

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, the latest undemocratic anti-women tactics of the Socred Government of B.C. smell of totalitarianism. They are an affront to those who are struggling to provide options for women who seek medical abortions.

The government tactics of infiltrating the concerned Citizens for Choice on Abortion, in order to steal mailing lists and spy on plans for an abortion clinic, are a denial of civil rights and the constitutional right of assembly.

Since the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in the Morgentaler case, abortion clinics are now legal. In Québec and Ontario they provide safer, more cost effective, more accessible abortion services, with counselling.

Costs of abortion should be covered under the Canada Health Act. The Vander Zalm Government was proven wrong when it refused medical coverage for hospital abortions. It continues to ignore the Supreme Court decision by allowing unconstitutional therapeutic abortion committees. Now we learn that the government will stoop to any tactics to carry out the Premier's personal anti-women, anti-choice agenda. It should resign and go to the people for judgment.

* * *

THE ANTARCTIC

CONVENTION ON REGULATION OF MINERAL RESOURCE ACTIVITIES

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, in order to provide for the orderly exploitation of Antarctic hydrocarbon and mineral resources, the "Convention on the Regulation of Antarctic Mineral Resource Activities" was negotiated last June under the auspices of the United Nations.

Canadian oil, gas, and mining companies are world leaders in polar operations.

Under the Convention it is up to the state party thereto to represent the commercial applicant for the purposes of acquiring exploration and production rights.

Therefore, the Government of Canada should expeditiously put in place a mechanism so that Canadian companies can get in on the ground floor with respect to these new Antarctic opportunities.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TRIBUTE TO PAGE STAFF

Mr. Speaker: I know that Hon. Members would want me to take a moment to thank our 42 parliamentary Pages.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1420)

Mr. Speaker: I can say to the Pages that I was going to read a bit of a statement, but I think that the House has expressed itself very well indeed.

I do want to say to all of the Pages that we are very impressed with your service this year, even though I understand that your skill at either hockey or softball is not that of the assembled Members of Parliament!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much for everything you have done. *Bonne Chance!*

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—TERMS OF U.S. LEGISLATION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the Minister for International Trade does not want to confuse himself with the facts by reading essential documents. I wonder if he has had an opportunity yet to read the final version of the U.S. Bill implementing the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement, particularly those sections which I think that most Canadians will find outrageous and will find out that they have been substantially misled by the Government in all its guarantees and assurances.

There is now provision within that legislation to authorize the President to begin negotiating new measures dealing with investment in energy and culture, to eliminate all the clauses that have been grandfathered in the agreement, to begin to develop brand new regimes that would eliminate all the assurances that we have received.

Considering that that is now the U.S. agenda, does the Canadian Government agree to the negotiation of new measures in energy and culture? Is that part of the deal, that we have agreed to further give away and further sell out these crucial parts of the Canadian integrity?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the premises of the hon. gentleman's question are

entirely incorrect. In the U.S. legislation, in the Statement of Administrative Action that accompanies it, it is said in several areas that the Congress would like the President to discuss with or negotiate with Canada certain other matters. Of course, it takes two people to negotiate.

We intend to be negotiating with the United States at the GATT negotiations. We intend to be negotiating with 96 other countries in the GATT round of negotiations. We are not going to negotiate or refuse to discuss with the United States matters that it might want to discuss, and we have matters that we want to discuss with it.

The hon. gentleman's statements about what is in the U.S. legislation otherwise are completely erroneous. If he is such a great reader and such an astute reader, would he refer to one specific item that I can then deal with, and not these wild, unfounded scurrilous, nonsensical pieces of nonsense that he gets on with?

He dealt with his own colleague, the Hon. Member for Montréal—Sainte-Marie this morning. No wonder he is irritable, because there now appear to be two trade critics in the Liberal Party.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to help the Hon. Minister with his remedial reading program, because I know that he needs all the help that he can get.

Section 304(B) states that the President is authorized to begin negotiations "to the extension of the principles of the Agreement to energy and cultural industries, to the extent such industries are not currently covered by the Agreement". That is written in black and white in the U.S. legislation, and the Minister may want to take the time to read it.

By saying in the House that it is now in agreement to conduct negotiations, why is the Government agreeing to a further elimination of protection for our cultural industries, further elimination of protection for our energy industries? Are we now agreed that we are now in a new bilateral negotiation giving away more that we gave away the last time?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman better get somebody to give him a slide show. He does not understand what he reads.

This states that Congress would like the President to negotiate. Naturally they want the President to negotiate because the President did not get very much from Canada in the free trade agreement that is now before Parliament, so they want to continue negotiating, and we intend to continue negotiating. So does the Liberal Party, because the Hon. Member for Montréal—Sainte-Marie said today: "The Liberals will tell Canadians we won't negotiate one deal with the U.S. but several deals with other countries. We won't put all our eggs in one basket".

The Liberals are not going to negotiate just with the United States, but with all countries. Then we discover later on today in another statement the hon. gentleman says that a Liberal Government would not seek unilateral free trade agreements.

• (1425)

EAST COAST FISHING INDUSTRY

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Just to correct the Minister again, the legislation specifically reads "The President is authorized"—"not we would like"—he is authorized to enter into these negotiations.

Further, we had received assurances in this House that the whole question of the protection of the East Coast fishery would be established. Yet under this agreement, Section 305, the United States Government clearly takes on the power to undertake retaliatory action against any effort by Canada to apply control on unprocessed fish.

Some Hon. Members: Read it properly.

Mr. Axworthy: Canada will no longer be able to provide for the processing of fish without retaliation from the United States. Do you call that free trade, Mr. Minister? You have just given away the whole East Coast fishing industry. Why are you allowing that to happen?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, luckily some Canadians are looking on so they can see the kind of spectacle we see every day in this House. The Hon. Member is raising unfounded fear. We protected the East Coast fishing industry, and in the U.S. legislation—

Mr. Axworthy: You better read the document.

Mr. Crosbie: They can outshout me, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: You can't read.

Mr. Axworthy: Bring your colouring book next time.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Minister has the floor.

Mr. Crosbie: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman didn't refer to any specific language in any clause to back up his point about the East Coast fishery. He completely ignored the fact that one section that did affect Canada in the proposed legislation has been completely removed, and that is the section having to do with lobsters and the size of lobsters. That has been taken out and removed from the final version of the U.S. legislation. The hon. gentleman does not mention that. He gets up and tries to mislead the House and the Canadian people about a clause to which he doesn't refer. It is a scurrilous performance, but it is his usual performance.

[*Translation*]

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—GUARANTEES—NEED FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Raymond Garneau (Laval-des-Rapides): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Right Hon. Prime Minister. The main objective of the talks with the United States was to give Canadian products secure access to American markets. We on this side of the House have said that the talks between Canada and the United States and the agreement that was before the House failed to meet this objective.

Mr. Speaker, President Reagan announced when he tabled his bill—that is what it says in the documents that accompanied the bill—that U.S. anti-dumping laws would continue to apply and that the Americans would continue to enforce other U.S. protectionist laws with respect to Canadian products. Unless the Prime Minister doesn't believe what President Reagan says, unless what comes out of the White House . . . this is no reporter, this is not some third-rate flunky, this is the President of the United States who has clearly set forth in a document the facts that I just mentioned . . . I want to ask the Prime Minister this: What is the purpose, what are the reasons for implementing an agreement that doesn't even guarantee the basic conditions for these negotiations? So why not call an election so that Canadians can pass judgement on the stories the Prime Minister has told us?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Montreal says that the Government failed to obtain access to the coveted U.S. market, and that is his complaint. However, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Quebec, the Hon. Robert Bourassa, says the exact opposite, namely that Canada and Quebec, as a result of the free trade agreement, have secured an historic and unique access for Quebec's and Canada's products, and that is one of the reasons why Mr. Bourassa and practically all businessmen and economic and social partners in Quebec are in favour of the free trade agreement.

CREDIBILITY OF UNITED STATES PRESIDENT AND OF CANADIAN PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Raymond Garneau (Laval-des-Rapides): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Canada can tell us his version of the story, but there is no agreement if the Americans disagree, and the President of the United States says so clearly in the document he tabled in the U.S. Congress.

And another thing: we were promised secure access, and we do not have it. We were told that elements of our cultural policy were not in the agreement, and they are, according to statements by the U.S. President. We were told that the Auto Pact was not on the table, but the Americans, through their President, tell us that it is. And furthermore, farmers are now . . . Mr. Speaker we have been . . . The U.S. President . . .

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Garneau: Mr. Speaker, when we look at the statement in Articles 706 and 703 of the documents tabled by the U.S. President, it says that the Reagan administration tried to eliminate all restrictions on exports of U.S. products to Canada, including chickens, eggs and egg products, all of which are subject to Canadian marketing boards, and which the Prime Minister himself said were not affected by the agreement. So who is telling the truth, the U.S President or the Prime Minister of Canada?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, yesterday's headline in *La Presse* said that:

> Business community launches violent attacks on Turner

We read the following:

> "The business community is flabbergasted by the decision of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. John Turner, to invoke the power of the Liberal majority in the Senate to block the passage of the free trade agreement.
>
> "I am thunderstruck", exclaimed Mr. Claude Garcia, President of the Montreal Chamber of Commerce."

Quebecers and the Government of Quebec have taken a position that is completely different from the views expressed by the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides, and I hope . . .

Some Hon. Members: Explain!

Mr. Mulroney: It is not my job to explain statements . . . it it is not up to me to explain decisions made by a non-Canadian. But I wish someone would explain the contradictory statements made by the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie and the Hon. Member for Winnipeg this morning!

• (1430)

[*English*]

WATER RESOURCES

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister for International Trade. For some weeks we on this side of the House have been warning the Minister that water is in fact included in the agreement which the Government has negotiated with the United States. The Minister denied this for many days and has now suddenly acknowledged that perhaps there is a legitimate concern.

The Minister has now acknowledged that there is at least potentially a problem with water and he is rumoured to be considering changing the wording. Could he tell us whether in his deliberations he is planning to make changes in the Bill which is actually before Parliament, or is thinking of making changes in the wording of the actual agreement negotiated between Canada and the United States?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I will try to explain the situation again to the Hon. Member. Water in its natural state is not included in the free trade agreement. There is nothing in the free trade agreement that compels Canadians, or even induces Canadians, to permit water in its natural form to be exported to the United States. If that were ever done it would be as a result of a decision of the government of the day that that was its policy. This Government has decided that that is not our policy, and that statement was made last November.

There has been a deliberate campaign of misinformation up and down this country by the two opposition Parties and others who wish to try to stop the free trade agreement. Therefore, I have said that if the majority of the committee believes that it might help to clear up the confusion which has been deliberately planted in the minds of the public to consider an amendment in the free trade legislation, that can be considered. There can be no amendment to the free trade agreement. The free trade agreement is set.

Such an amendment in the legislation is not necessary, but in order to lay to rest these unfounded rumours and insinuations I will be pleased to consider it.

I have in my hand a statement made yesterday by Mr. Yeutter, the U.S. trade negotiator. On July 26 on *Canada A.M.* he was asked about water.

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Some Hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Perhaps the Hon. Minister could come back to that in answering another question.

REQUEST THAT AGREEMENT BE CHANGED

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, the Minister has moved from denying the necessity for any change to saying that maybe there could be a change in the legislation. We know that he has extensive knowledge from his vast reading of the details of the agreement.

Will he acknowledge that any law we pass in the Parliament of Canada which contradicts the agreement in terms of subject matters pertinent to the agreement is in effect null and void and, therefore, if we really wish to protect water in the agreement itself it is absolutely essential to have a change in the wording of the agreement rather than in legislation introduced in the House of Commons?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to what was stated by the United States trade representative, Mr. Clayton Yeutter, who negotiated the agreement on behalf of the United States. He was asked yesterday, "There's a lot of concern expressed in Canada in the past few weeks about water and how it figures into the trade deal. Does it?". He said, "Well, as far as I'm concerned, it does not. Certainly we had no intent, as we negotiated the arrangements, to in any way involve ourselves in the water issue".

That is the answer of the United States trade representative. Water is not included. We agree with his statement. Both parties to the agreement agree that water is not included.

We know that bottled water is included as a tariff item in the schedule. We know that compressed air is included as a tariff item in the schedule. However, that does not mean that Canada must sell its air to the United States, although some of it, particularly that surrounding the hon. gentleman, might well be sold to the United States.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, quoting Mr. Yeutter on any aspect of the agreement as it pertains to Canada is like a chicken listening to a quote from Colonel Sanders and believing it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Yeutter is so convinced that water is not included, and the deputy chief negotiator for Canada, a former civil servant, has said that water is included, why will the Minister not put this question to Mr. Yeutter? If he is convinced water is not included, why will he not agree to a change in the agreement?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has not been here every day and perhaps he did not hear my answer of some days ago. Mr. Frank Stone of the Institute for Research on Public Policy, who was one of our major negotiators at the GATT and is very experienced, said in an article:

> The free trade agreement . . . has nothing at all to do with the diversion or inter-basin transfer of water.

He said:

> Water diversions have never been discussed in the GATT and any suggestion that GATT covers water diversions or inter-basin transfers would be hooted down in Geneva by the GATT member countries.

The hon. gentleman should not bother with chicken. He should bother about those who go around the country crying wolf when all they are trying to do is spread alarm and fear.

* * *

CHILD CARE

ACCESSIBILITY—NATIONAL OBJECTIVE

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. The Government has abdicated its responsibility and failed to ensure national standards through the Canada Child Care Bill. Yesterday the Minister of National Health and Welfare told this House that it was impossible to ensure national standards, that even the Canada Health Act did not have national standards but merely objectives.

Well, one of these objectives is accessibility, an objective sorely missing from the Canada Child Care Bill which does not mention children from lower to middle-income families.

Since the Minister chooses to play with words, will he commit himself and his Government to amending the Canada Child Care Bill to include the national objective of accessibility and to ensure a place for every child in this country?

• (1440)

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the Canada Child Care Act substantially increases the number of subsidized spaces in Canada by 200,000 over a seven-year period. The Hon. Member should recognize and acknowledge that. If she wants to compare it, for example, to health care, it has been a principle between the federal Government and the provinces that everyone should have access to health care.

The other point I think she should understand is that we developed a child care policy, and many Canadians do not agree that the same comparison either exists or that every child below a certain age, say six and under, should have a place or that there should be a formal day care space for it.

I think the Government, given its fiscal capacity and considering its agreements with the provinces, has moved this forward very substantially this year. The number of spaces has increased by 200,000, involving an increased expenditure of $6.4 billion, and the only people I hear who say it is not enough are the NDP and Liberals and those who wanted to see a different child care system, namely, a universal system fully paid for by the taxpayers. That is supported by less than 10 per cent of the public.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST FOR GUARANTEE DAY CARE CENTRES IN EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES WILL BE SUBSIDIZED

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we definitely do not agree on the statistics, because these 200,000 spaces over a seven-year period mean 28,000 spaces per year, shared among twelve provinces.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that 57 per cent of children between the ages of six and fourteen are without supervision after school. Quebecers is one of the few provinces that allows the use of school premises after school to supervise these children, and the Government of Quebec is concerned about this Bill. Why? Because the Bill tabled on Monday makes no mention at all of children between the ages of six and fourteen, and because they are actually excluded from the legislation, and I quote: Does not include any service relating wholly or substantially to education.

Will the Minister therefore guarantee that school day care will be subsidized in his new Bill?

[*English*]

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the issue of child care spaces within educational facilities has been a matter of discussion between the Government of Canada and the Government of Quebec. I am sure the Hon. Member recognizes the very clear and independent position the current and former Governments of Quebec have taken over a long period of time with respect to provincial rights over education.

What I can say to her is that some of the speculation in the French press over the last few days with respect to the percentages Quebec would receive is just that, speculation. The federal Government has very clearly said in its discussions with Quebec that the province will receive the 50 per cent plus factor, but with respect to school based child care, while we can I think negotiate some of the areas, the Child Care Act is not intended to extend sharing to education and health jurisdictions. That falls within Established Programs Financing. I think when we look at it seriously that is where it should be.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—CULTURAL INDUSTRIES

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Prime Minister. He is the person in the Government who said that cultural industries are exempt from the trade deal.

In the U.S. administration Statement of Action, which I have here, the U.S. says that any use of this exemption "would be regrettable" and the U.S. would take action "discouraging the exercise of and reliance on this clause in the future".

How can the Government say that culture is exempt when this very clear threat to the use of that exemption exists?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the Statement of Administrative Action filed in connection with this legislation is a wish list, a sop to individual Congressmen and Senators to get their support for the Bill. That is the way the congressional system works.

We have provisions in the agreement that exclude cultural industries from the free trade agreement except for a clause that protects us in the event there is some action taken by the U.S. It does not foreclose the U.S. from protesting. It does not foreclose the U.S. from trying to export its own goods and services. It does not foreclose the U.S. from expressing wishes. However, we will determine whether or not its wishes are ever acceded to.

There is nothing in the agreement that gives them any right to enforce any particular position with respect to cultural industries. They are fully defended under the agreement, and the hon. gentleman's lachrymose reading of a clause or wish from the Statement of Administrative Action does not change that, no matter how much he might want it to be changed. He is Chicken Little following Colonel Barney Sanders there.

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, the Minister should know that the administrative Statement of Action is a precise statement of what the U.S. Government will do, not what it wishes to do—what it will do—with respect to this agreement.

[*Translation*]

CULTURAL INDUSTRIES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): I have a supplementary. Will this Government get in touch with the U.S. administration to protest this American attack on our cultural industries?

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, when we look at the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement we have first to realize that both sides negotiated hard and got a good deal for their respective countries.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: However, in Canada we protected all of the industries we wished to protect, like the cultural industries and the supply-management system. It is a miracle that we have all of these achievements and reached our objectives as we did.

The hon. gentleman says this is what the U.S. will do. The U.S. is free to do what it wishes, to try to put forward its point of view, to make its arguments. However, when it comes to matters within our jurisdiction we will decide. They can express wishes, we will decide. The Opposition believes that a wish from the U.S. is something that someone must carry out, and probably they would if they were in our position. We believe a wish is to be considered, but we will decide the matters that come within our jurisdiction.

* * *

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

ALLEGED GANG RAPE

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that the Prime Minister will not answer why the Government has broken its commitment on culture. Maybe he will answer another question.

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Ms. Copps: All of us were disgusted to read the press reports in the last several days about the gang rape of a militia officer allegedly involving 15 Armed Forces personnel, including a corporal. We understand that the Associate Minister of National Defence has called for an internal investigation.

Given the seriousness of these allegations, and suggestions that this has been known on the Base for more than three years, does the Prime Minister not believe this warrants an independent investigation outside the Armed Forces?

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as soon as this allegation was made public the Associate Minister of National Defence ordered a full investigation by the Special Investigations Unit. They would have the authority and ability to lay charges. If there are any grounds to substantiate those charges, they will be laid.

I am as shocked as the Hon. Member that anyone would claim to have information about this for four years and take some four years before making it public. The Special Investigations Unit will pursue this fully. If there is any basis for criminal charges, they will be laid.

REQUEST FOR INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, we saw the results of the internal investigation into the RCMP incident where an officer of the Musical Ride was forced to leave that unit after she was filmed in a pornographic way by her fellow officers. Does the Prime Minister not feel that these allegations are serious enough that, to clear the air, we need an independent investigation outside the Armed Forces?

We are talking about allegations that a corporal was involved. We are talking about allegations that a whole Base stood silent for more than three years.

• (1450)

Will the Prime Minister clear the air and appoint an independent investigator outside the Armed Forces to put these allegations to rest or to proceed in a more definitive way?

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the Special Investigations Unit is from outside CFB Petawawa. If the Hon. Member is suggesting that the Armed Forces would condone or turn the other way—

Ms. Copps: Three years.

Mr. Beatty: —from actively pursuing a case in which rape, a criminal offence, took place—

Ms. Copps: They just did.

Mr. Beatty: If the Hon. Member has any evidence whatsoever suggesting there has been a cover-up by the Canadian Forces of a criminal activity, let her tender that information. Any such activity would be abhorrent to every member of the Canadian Forces and would be a breach of the Criminal Code of Canada. If there is any basis for charges being laid they will indeed be.

FISHERIES

DIXON ENTRANCE—INFRACTIONS BY U.S. FISHING VESSELS

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Right Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs. Since Dixon Entrance from the AB Line south is listed under Canadian law as our sovereign territorial sea and fishing zone, will the Minister assure the House that it is the policy of the Government of Canada to have enforcement officers on site to board immediately and arrest any U.S. vessel fishing without authority and refusing to comply with the Canadian request to leave the area south of 54:40?

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member was very careful in phrasing his question, so I will be careful in answering it. We intend to take the required actions to enforce our jurisdiction.

ROLE OF ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, we know that the West Coast fishing industry was not protected under the free trade agreement. There is growing concern that there is a hidden agenda to the free trade agreement over water, fish, plywood and other items.

Why, on June 22, 1988, were federal enforcement personnel in British Columbia advised in writing that their enforcement and arrest powers had been delegated away from them and away from the responsible Ministers? In fact, they are ordered not to take any enforcement action until so instructed by the legal operations branch of External Affairs in Ottawa, even when they are at the scene of a flagrant violation of Canadian law.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I will determine the answer to that precise question and communicate it to the Hon. Member. However, he is trying to raise a false fear here about the capacity of the Government of Canada, or the willingness of the Government of Canada to enforce our jurisdiction. That is a false fear. Where there is a Canadian jurisdiction, we shall enforce it.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF KENYAN MINISTER FOR FINANCE

Mr. Speaker: I wish to draw to the attention of Members the presence in the gallery of the Honourable Professor George Saitoti, M.P., Minister for Finance, Republic of Kenya.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

TAX REFORM

PROVISION AFFECTING PARENTS WITH 18-YEAR OLD DEPENDANTS

Miss Aideen Nicholson (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Minister of Finance. It concerns the Government's so-called tax reform. Although there are tax credits available for post-secondary education, parents of 18-year olds who are still in high school or unemployed lose the existing exemption of $1,200 which is not replaced by a tax credit unless the young person is disabled. Will the Minister explain why the Government is making it harder for families with dependent young people?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is quite right. She makes the distinction between different classes as they are treated under tax reform.

The parliamentary committee will be looking at this in the next few weeks. We will see whether adjustments are justified.

I remind the Hon. Member that tuition can now be deducted by a parent, not by a student. This is a very important addition to tax reform, helping parents of students across the country.

Miss Nicholson (Trinity): You do not pay tuition in high school.

SITUATION OF SINGLE PARENTS

Miss Aideen Nicholson (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, a single parent who formerly claimed the equivalent-to-married deduction for a dependent child over 18, valued at $3,740 by the Department of Finance, can no longer do so. This is an even greater hardship for the single parent who is supporting an unemployed 18 or 19-year old and earning a very modest income. Does the Minister also intend to review that?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Speaker, in most categories of income in this country, single parents will do better under tax reform. As a matter of fact, they can be included in the more than eight out of ten Canadians who benefit from tax reform. The Hon. Member raises a specific issue within that, and I hope the committee will look at it carefully.

* * *

HEALTH

CHICKENS FED WITH IRRADIATED FEED

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. It concerns chickens but it has nothing to do with the earlier exchange between my Leader and the Minister for International Trade.

It deals with the fact that some 900 chickens have been fed irradiated feed at the University of Manitoba and are about to be sold to Manitoba consumers. Is the Minister aware that these chickens will not be required to be labelled in such a way as to indicate they have been fed with irradiated feed? If so, why is he prepared to allow these chickens to be sold to Manitoba consumers? Why has he allowed AECL and the University of Manitoba to contemplate releasing these chickens into the marketplace without such labelling?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows that before any new product that has been irradiated can be sold on the market, certain requirements must be met. Those were made public some time ago by the Government.

I will check into the specific case he mentions. I do not have details on it, but I will do that later this afternoon.

REQUEST THAT REGULATIONS BE AMENDED

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, the Minister does not seem to be aware that both the current labelling regulations and his proposed labelling regulations for irradiated food do not require labelling in the case of animals that have been fed irradiated food. Is he prepared to amend these regulations to ensure that any food that has had any irradiation involved in its life cycle or processing will be clearly labelled to that effect? The Minister does not seem to really understand what is going on in this experiment. It is time he got on top of it.

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, under the former regulations certain grains could be irradiated. The Hon. Member should know that. Also, certain flour could be irradiated and the Hon. Member should know that as well. As a person with a rural background, I am well aware of the food cycle and what animals are being fed.

As I said in my first answer, I will check this afternoon and report back to him.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM FOR EMBASSIES—TENDERING PROCESS

Mr. Barry Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Supply and Services. The Canadian On-line Secure Information and Communications System, or COSIC, is designed to provide a state of the art automation and communication system for Canadian embassies.

In light of the speculation and criticism that have arisen lately both in the press and in the House, will the Minister

explain why the RCMP commercial crime division is investigating this matter, and provide the House with any information that he may have regarding the alleged irregularities in the bidding process for this extremely important contract?

Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member knows, a couple of months ago one of the bidders in this very complex contract bid process, that is open and up front, raised some concerns. As a result, the Government of Canada initiated two independent but internal studies, both of which proved to show no wrong-doing.

The Hon. Member knows as well that a couple of weeks ago I confirmed that there indeed was an RCMP investigation into this matter. I want to report to the House that the Commissioner of the RCMP concluded in a letter dated July 22 that: "The investigation determined that the complaints received were totally unfounded. No evidence of any wrong-doing surfaced throughout the investigation". As a result, we are going to continue with our evaluation and proceed according to plan.

* * *

APARTHEID

TENNIS TOURNAMENT—PROPOSED PARTICIPATION BY WHITE SOUTH AFRICANS

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Yesterday I asked a question about the loophole which has been opened by the Conservative Government in Canada's policy on sports competitors from South Africa. I challenged the Government to stop trying a weak behind the scenes manoeuvre, and to act directly to exclude the two South African athletes who are intending to play in the Player's Tennis Tournament taking place next month in my riding.

• (1500)

Next week the Secretary of State for External Affairs will be in Toronto hosting a Commonwealth conference on South Africa. Will he now, in preparation for that meeting, accept the position of the Official Opposition, cut off diplomatic relations with South Africa, and close the Mulroney loophole in the Gleneagles Agreement so that these two athletes cannot perform?

Mr. McDermid: What a sleazebag!

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, not to emphasize it too much, it is simply false—if the rules of the House of Commons allowed me, I would use another phrase—it is simply false to suggest this gap was created by this Government. In fact, anyone who wants to compare the actions of the Government in which the Hon. Member was a Minister with the actions of this Government—

Ms. Copps: You initiated the sports policy in 1985.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): —with regard to fighting apartheid will know that the Government of Prime Minister Brian Mulroney has not only led this country but has led the world in fighting apartheid, and we intend to continue to do that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): With regard to the substance of the question there is a gap. We intend to close it.

Ms. Copps: That you opened in 1985.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): I expect to have it closed before the weekend.

[*Translation*]

DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH SOUTH AFRICA—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): I am delighted with the Minister's announcement, and I am waiting for further developments. My supplementary for the Minister is this: Could he explain to the House and to the people of this country why Canada continues to give credibility to South Africa, to a racist government, by allowing it to maintain diplomatic relations with Canada?

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I will repeat in French what I said before, namely that the Liberal Party's position on South Africa, when it was in power, was to accept apartheid. The position of the Progressive Conservative Government was and is to fight energetically against apartheid.

As far as diplomatic relations with South Africa are concerned this is an issue that has been discussed at length here in the House. The Canadian Government's position is clear. The Canadian Government's position is respected by the Blacks in Southern Africa as well as by individuals who are truly concerned about fighting apartheid. It may be that for partisan purposes, the Liberal Party would like to change the position it took as a Government . . . To us, it is a matter of principle. The Canadian Government is showing strong leadership in the fight against apartheid.

* * *

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

FRASER VALLEY—EMISSIONS FROM BURRARD THERMAL GENERATING PLANT

Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Recent research and air monitoring indicate that a very serious ozone pollution problem exists in the summertime and that the possible operation of two of the six generating

units in the Burrard Thermal Generating Plant will greatly increase the pollution. In fact, this would be the equivalent of adding 110,000 car emissions daily to the air in the Fraser Valley.

Will the Minister consider the effect on the environment in the valley, especially Chilliwack, when making the decision whether or not to reissue the permit to B.C. Hydro for energy exports using the Burrard Thermal Generating Plant?

Mr. Jack Shields (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the question of the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley East is indeed a good one. He has made good representations to the Government on a number of occasions. I would like to remind him that in 1980, B.C. Hydro applied for export permits to export electricity to the United States. At that time the Government issued the necessary permits through the National Energy Board but would not allow exports to come from the Burrard plant because it lacked pollution controls.

Since that time pollution controls have been put in place and they have been issued the necessary permits and licence from the British Columbia Government. As recently as last month the National Energy Board agreed to increase the exports from B.C. Hydro using the Burrard plant because it had installed these necessary pollution controls. The Minister is now looking at that decision.

* * *

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

HALIFAX HARBOUR SEWAGE PROJECT

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Right Hon. Prime Minister. It concerns a matter that crosses departmental jurisdiction. On February 5, 1987, the Minister of Finance said in the House that municipal infrastructure is the responsibility of the municipalities and the provinces. Yesterday we had the announcement in Halifax of a much needed municipal sewage treatment facility paid for in part by the federal Government. Given that the Canadian Federation of Municipalities has been calling for a federal-provincial-municipal program like the one the Government developed for Halifax for every city in this country, would the Prime Minister now agree that the time has come to help rebuild our cities?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Finance have made the Government's position clear on this matter. The particular circumstances in Halifax were quite unique, and the Hon. Member knows the uniqueness behind the Halifax example.

Mr. Broadbent: Yes, a provincial election.

REQUEST FOR FEDERAL FUNDING TO ASSIST MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, the community I come from is also putting raw sewage into the harbours of the Great Lakes. There are other cities which are doing the same thing. Each city has unique reasons for needing federal help. Is it not now time for the federal Government to accept its responsibility on environmental aspects and provide municipalities with the necessary funds to clean up our water, whether it is what we send out or take in, to ensure our cities are healthy and safe?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows full well that what is being done for the Halifax harbour is a technological prototype of major importance for Canada. We are delighted for what it means as a demonstration project for Canada. We are delighted for what it means for the harbour of Halifax.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Welland on a single question.

* * *

TRADE

LIBERAL POLICY

Mr. Allan Pietz (Welland): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Official Opposition first said he would tear up the free trade agreement. Then he said he would renegotiate it. Then he said there would be no bilateral agreement. The Hon. Member for Montreal—Saint-Marie now says they would negotiate bilateral agreements with many countries. Could the Minister for International Trade clarify for the Canadian public what the Liberal policy on trade really is?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Robinson: Order Paper!

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have ever been asked to perform a miracle in this House. It is impossible to tell what policy they have with respect to free trade because, for example, the Liberal Whip saw some irony in the thought that Mr. Turner, who wanted to rip up the free trade agreement in Washington, is now going to—

Some Hon. Members: More, more!

Mr. Broadbent: That's pretty good, John.

Mr. Crosbie: I was surprised I got this far.

Mr. Speaker: It was a good try.

Point of Order—Mr. Axworthy

POINTS OF ORDER

USE OF UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a point of order. The Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie), in his normal modest, limited, restricted, moderate way, found himself using a word which is contrary to the rules of debate according to Beauchesne at page 110, the word is "scurrilous". I know the Minister cannot spell it, nor can he understand it, but he did use it and I would like him to withdraw it.

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the word "scurrilous" and say "contemptible".

Mr. Axworthy: I want to check that one out, too.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Earlier this day I distinctly heard the Hon. Member for Brampton—Georgetown (Mr. McDermid) refer to one of my colleagues as a sleazebag while a question was being asked.

Mr. Crosbie: Which one was it?

Mr. Boudria: He referred that way to the Hon. Member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan). Some two weeks ago a similar remark from the same Hon. Member was made towards myself and reported in *Hansard*. I do not recall anyone on this side ever describing that Member with similar remarks. I would hope you, Mr. Speaker, would ask the Hon. Member for Brampton—Georgetown to learn to control himself and at least to withdraw those two remarks.

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the remarks. I am surprised the Hon. Member would recognize which Member I referred to.

• (1510)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to ten petitions numbered as follows: 332-5028 to 332-5030 inclusive, 332-5032 to 332-5035 inclusive and 332-5148 to 332-5150.

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

* * *

[*English*]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

PRESENTATION OF FIFTEENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Miss Aideen Nicholson (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fifteenth report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

In its twelfth report on May 4 the committee recommended the creation of a new standing committee to review government expenditures before they are made. Such a new budget committee would parallel the work of the Public Accounts Committee which reviews expenditures after the fact.

Today, we are announcing that we have asked the committee staff to carry out a study of the Estimates and budgetary process. The Public Accounts study will focus on ways to relax the non-confidence convention so that Estimates might be changed or reduced, where warranted, without bringing down the Government. The study will seek ways to balance the right of the Government of the day to govern and conduct its business in a planned way with Parliament's right to grant supply, that is, to authorize expenditures.

This study will also consider the connection between the supply process and the Ways and Means process, that is, the link between the Government's proposals for spending and the manner in which Government raises its revenues.

By considering how to improve the opportunities parliamentarians have to comment on government spending, the committee is seeking ways to improve the Government's management of the public's money.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

PROTECTION OF ROUGE RIVER VALLEY WILDERNESS AREA

Mrs. Pauline Browes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to present to the House of Commons today a petition from a number of residents of Scarborough who are petitioning Parliament. They state that the Rouge River Valley in Scarborough is a unique and precious natural area and that protecting the endangered wildlife and wilderness areas is in the national interest.

The petitioners join with the federal Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan), the Scarborough City Council

and Alderman for the City Council, Marilyn Mushinski, who is in the gallery today, the Save the Rouge Valley System and the Coalition of Scarborough Community Associations, in asking the Government of Canada to work with the Government of Ontario to establish the Rouge River Valley as Canadian heritage land or a provincial park.

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to have the opportunity to present a petition on behalf of constituents from Surrey, Langley, Aldergrove and White Rock, British Columbia, who believe that the Government lacks a mandate from the people of Canada to conclude a trade agreement with the United States. They believe that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) promised in the course of the trade negotiation that Canadian sovereignty would not be compromised. They believe our sovereignty in fact is compromised.

They believe that the trade deal would deny Canada the policy freedom to determine it own economic future and would undermine our ability as a country to build a society distinct from that of the United States of America.

They believe that the appropriate thing to do now would be for Parliament to dissolve to allow the people of Canada the opportunity to accept or reject the proposed trade deal during a national general election.

OPPOSITION TO REMOVAL OF FEDERAL WHARF AT SNUG COVE, B.C.

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and privilege to present to you a number of petitions from residents of Bowen Island and other residents of British Columbia.

For the past year people have been trying to get the successive Ministers of Transport to give guarantees that the federal dock at Snug Cove will not be removed in favour of a private dock and that all users will continue to be able to tie up in this area.

The petitions call upon Parliament to preserve the government wharf, floats and moorage at Snug Cove, Bowen Island, for the benefit of all users, and to oppose any development plans which would result in the removal of the government wharf, floats or moorage.

REQUEST FOR FUNDING FOR ALASKA HIGHWAY

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and pleasure to introduce petitions signed by over 200 residents of Watson Lake, the Yukon, Ross River, Lower Post and Dawson Creek, B.C., who have taken the opportunity, among many others, as has the territorial Government and myself, to petition the federal Government to recognize the importance of the Alaska Highway as an important transportation link for the territory. Given that the present condition of this highway is negatively impacting on the transportation industry and the tourism industry, the petitioners call upon the Parliament of Canada to approve immediately and to restore funding for this international highway.

[*Translation*]

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and privilege to present to the House of Commons petitions signed by some 400 citizens from the riding of Hull—Aylmer, which is so well representd in the House, from the riding of Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle and from Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, who ask the House to have the Parliament of Canada pass a law giving all unborn children full legal protection from the moment of conception.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 327, 354, 368, 370, 375, 378, 379, 382, and 383.

[*Text*]

CANADIAN FORCES MARITIME EXPERIMENT AND TEST RANGES

Question No. 327—**Mr. Manly:**

1. Are radiation monitoring procedures conducted at the Canadian Forces Maritime Experiment and Test Ranges (CFMETR) and, if so (*a*) with what frequency (*b*) by whom (*c*) in what areas?

2. Are chemicals stored on the base and, if so (*a*) in what manner (*b*) what procedures are in place (i) for spill prevention (ii) in the case of a toxic spill, and in the latter case, what notification would be given to area residents?

3. Are procedures in place for emergency response to radiological accidents related to the presence of nuclear-propelled or nuclear weapons capable vessels at CFMETR and, if so (*a*) what are they (*b*) do they interface with those of municipal and provincial agencies and, if so, in what ways?

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes.

(a) Each March and September.

(b) The Department of National Defence.

(c) In areas where nuclear powered ships berth and also from designated upstream and downstream locations.

2. Yes.

(a) Chemicals are stored on the base in barrels and in underground tanks.

(b) The barrels are stored in a locked concrete pad complete with a diked compound, surrounded by a six-foot wire fence topped with barbed wire. A drain in the pad connects to two 250-gallon underground tanks isolated from the surrounding environment. Diesel fuel, unleaded gasoline, and jet fuel are

stored in standard underground tanks with standard above ground pumps.

(i) The base maintains prescribed clothing and filter masks to permit personnel to quickly contain and clean up spills of toxic materials, such as cleaning fluids and OTTO Fuel II (a self-oxidizing fuel used in torpedos). A standard oil pollution control plan exists and it is similar to those in existence at other bases.

(ii) If necessary, local residents would be notified of spills in accordance with the alerting procedures established for Nuclear Emergency Response.

3. Yes.

(a) This response is provided by the Nuclear Emergency Response Team which consists of: radiation safety officer; on-scene controller; radiation monitors; decontamination personnel; security; firefighting (including fire and tug boat crews); medical personnel; construction engineering personnel; information services personnel; and other specialist staff as required. Their responsibilities are: to provide an immediate coordinated response of trained personnel to a nuclear emergency; to carry out rescue, firefighting and medical support; to cordon off the area, deny access to all unauthorized persons and ensure those personnel within the cordon are controlled and accounted for; to provide communications facilities between the emergency site, the Command Post and between the various response sections; to provide support and assistance to the base and foreign Emergency Response teams; to ensure contamination control at the scene of the emergency; to conduct radiation surveys; to carry out decontamination at the scene of the emergency of affected personnel to levels set by the Surgeon General; to provide damage control and repair facilities; to restore the scene of the emergency to normal; and to collect data which may be required for future medical or legal purposes.

(b) To ensure that Nuclear Emergency Response Team procedures interface with municipal and provincial agencies, the Region Commander organizes and chairs a local Authorities Committee which meets annually. This Committee consists of the following: civil defence co-ordination; local government; local health officials; local police departments; RCMP; provincial radiation protection services; regional surgeon; base operations; and applicable command.

JOB CREATION IN CONSTITUENCY OF WINDSOR—WALKERVILLE

Question No. 354—**Mr. McCurdy:**

Since September 4, 1984, have jobs been created in the constituency of Windsor—Walkerville as a direct result of government expenditures and, if so (*a*) what is the number of (i) jobs (ii) full-time positions created (*b*) what occupations are represented?

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission and the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion as follows:

In so far as the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission is concerned:

(a) and (b) The Canadian Jobs Strategy was introduced in September, 1985, in response to a realization that there was a need to deal more effectively with the problems of the most disavantaged members of the labour market. The previous approach of compensation for cyclical periods of unemployment with short-term, make-work projects, as typified by programs like Canada Works, was phased out. In its place, the emphasis was put on providing training that would prepare people to take advantage of jobs created by the activities of the economy.

Consequently, it is not possible to respond fully to the question of how many jobs have been created in the constituency of Windsor—Walkerville as a direct result of government expenditures since September 4, 1984.

It is perhaps arguable that participants in pre-Canadian Jobs Strategy programs, like Canada Works, occupied jobs created as a direct result of government expenditures. It should be noted, however, that in most, if not all, of these cases, while jobs would have been full-time, they would have lasted for a fixed, short period of time only, so at best it is probably a moot point whether or not these constitute "jobs".

Programs of the Canadian Jobs Strategy, as already indicated, do not "create jobs"; they prepare people for permanent jobs which are created as a result of other economic activities. Hence, the questions asked do not, strictly speaking, apply.

Below is a list of "participants" in all programs, old and new since April 1, 1984.

(i) Participants		Amounts
1984/85:	878	$3,708,293
1985/86:	1,358	$6,071,235
1986/87:	1,101	$5,388,247
1987/88:	901 *	$4,310,136

* not final year-end figures.

In so far as the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion is concerned:

(a) During the period of September 4, 1984 to March 31, 1988, 12 projects were approved for total authorized contributions of $242,215 under programs administered by the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion, creating an estimated 40 positions and maintaining an estimated 19 positions. Our records do not distinguish between full-time and part-time positions.

(b) Our records do not contain information on what occupations are represented.

REPRESENTATIONS REGARDING CRIMINAL CODE

Question No. 368—**Mr. Kaplan:**

Have any national associations indicated their position regarding Bill C-54, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and other Acts in consequence thereof and, if so, which ones (*a*) support (*b*) oppose the Bill?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): A large number of representations have been received from groups and individuals regarding Bill C-54. Indeed, the associations who have provided their views have done so in the context of analysis of the Bill in whole or in part and it would therefore be inappropriate and unfair for me as Minister of Justice to characterize their representations as either categorically for or categorically against Bill C-54.

AECL—GRANTS AND/OR LOANS WITHIN METROPOLITAN TORONTO

Question No. 370—**Mr. Redway:**

Since September 4, 1984, did Atomic Energy of Canada Limited make grants and/or loans to persons or corporations, non-governmental organizations and governments within Metropolitan Toronto and, if so, to which ones and, in each case, in what amount and for what purpose?

Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Atomic Energy of Canada Limited reports as follows:

During the period September 4, 1984, to June 2, 1988, AECL has made an annual contribution of $30,000 to the Centre for Nuclear Engineering at the University of Toronto. These contributions have been made in support of the University's nuclear education and research programs.

ST. CLAIR RIVER—DIOXIN LEVEL MONITORING

Question No. 375—**Mr. Langdon:**

Since September, 1985, have dioxin level-monitoring procedures been carried out for the St. Clair River, and, if so (*a*) with what frequency (*b*) by what groups or individuals (*c*) with what results?

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of the Environment and of Fisheries and Oceans as follows:

In so far as the Department of the Environment is concerned: no.

It is the responsibility of the Ontario Ministry of Environment to conduct dioxin monitoring procedures in the St. Clair River, particularly with respect to drinking water.

Under the Canada/U.S. Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, the Department of the Environment is responsible for the monitoring of conventional parameters and contaminants of the open lakes. The Department of the Environment is also developing analytical technology and methods to accurately measure chemicals such as dioxin.

In so far as the Department of Fisheries and Oceans is concerned:

Since 1977, DFO has carried out a contaminants monitoring program on fish and other biota of the Great Lakes in response to federal commitments respecting the 1972 and 1978 Canada/U.S. Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement.

DFO has carried out periodic contaminants monitoring programs on the St. Clair/Detroit River system since 1981. Contaminant burdens, including dioxin, have been measured in whole fish samples of top predator and bottom feeding species. The analysis of the most current (1987) samples has been delayed pending the completion of the priority national pulp mill dioxin/furan survey. There has therefore been no dioxin analysis of fish samples from this area collected since September, 1985.

RURAL DIGNITY

Question No. 378—**Mr. Rodriguez:**

Has Canada Post Corporation arranged for people to follow the group known as Rural Dignity as it travels across Canada to gather signatures of Canadians opposed to Canada Post's policies in rural Canada and, if so (*a*) on what date did these people begin following Rural Dignity (*b*) what number of individuals was involved in this activity (*c*) what are their names (*d*) were they regular employees of Canada Post and, if not, what were (i) the conditions of their employment (ii) the name of any third party involved in their hiring (*e*) what was the total cost of their (i) wages (ii) living expenses (including meals (iii) travel expenses (*f*) did they file any reports with Canada Post and, if so, will Canada Post make these reports available to Parliamentarians on request?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Rural Dignity—a special interest group representing the interests of the rural postmasters' union—is opposed to Canada Post's program to improve and expand postal services in rural Canada. They are seeking to maintain the high costs and inefficiencies associated with the current network of rural post offices.

Canada Post's rural restructuring program means improved service. As a result, Rural Dignity and other vested interest groups, have had to target their efforts in communities where the program has not yet been implemented; by making unfounded allegations about proposed reductions in local service, spreading misinformation, and creating fear. These groups recently sponsored a cross-country drive to seek support for the preservation of the status quo.

Canada Post, like any other business organization, had to respond to this campaign of misinformation. Our customers were being subjected to threats regarding the future of their local postal service. In order to ensure that the true story about improvements in rural postal services was heard, Canada Post personnel made themselves available to local media, community leaders, and the general public as the drive progressed across the country, from May 18 to June 7, 1988.

This effort was entirely undertaken by regular employees doing their regular work.

PROPOSED GOVERNMENT FUNDING FOR STORA INDUSTRIES

Question No. 379—**Mr. Caccia:**

Has Stora Industries applied for government funding to assist with their proposal to build a pulp mill in Cape Breton and, if so (*a*) what amount is (i)

being requested (ii) already approved (*b*) will an environmental impact assessment of the project be a requirement for government assistance?

Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology): The Department of Regional Industrial Expansion cannot divulge whether an application has been made or any details regarding such a possible application since all applications for funding remain confidential until such time as an agreement is concluded. Environmental considerations are a part of every project assessment process.

CANADA PENSION PLAN DISABILITY BENEFITS

Question No. 382—**Ms. Copps:**

During each of the last five years, what number of (*a*) Canadians applied for a disability pension under the provisions of the plan (*b*) applicants had their request denied by the director of the Canada Pension Plan (*c*) applicants who were denied a pension by the director of the plan appealed the decision to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (*d*) applicants who were granted a disability pension by the director had their application appealed to the Minister by government officials (*e*) applicant-initiated appeals of the director's decision were denied by the Minister (*f*) government appeals of the director's decision were upheld by the Minister (*g*) applicants whose appeals were denied by the director or the Minister or both requested a further appeal to the Review Committee (*h*) disability pension appeals did the Review Committee not support (*i*) disability pension applicants whose applications were upheld by the Review Committee had their disability pension applications appealed by government officials to the Pension Appeals Board (*j*) pension applicants whose applications were rejected by the Review Committee appealed the decision to the Pension Appeals Board (*k*) diability pension applications heard before the Pension Appeals Board were upheld (*l*) Canadians who applied for a disability pension under the provisions of the Canada Pension Plan had their application eventually accepted?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare):

(a)

1983-1984	48,468
1984-1985	52,708
1985-1986	60,355
1986-1987	64,040
1987-1988	57,966

(b)

1983-1984	12,806
1984-1985	15,996
1985-1986	17,608
1986-1987	23,135
1987-1988	23,854

(c)

1983-1984	3,124
1984-1985	6,648
1985-1986	7,909
1986-1987	10,299
1987-1988	11,809

(d) Not applicable. The Director's decisions are not appealable by departmental officials at the first level of appeal.

(e)

1983-1984	1,017
1984-1985	1,351
1985-1986	2,636
1986-1987	4,514
1987-1988	5,613

(f) Not applicable. The Director's decisions are not appealable by departmental officials at the first level of appeal.

(g)

1983-1984	278
1984-1985	634
1985-1986	986
1986-1987	1,590
1987-1988	2,390

(h)

1983-1984	40
1984-1985	62
1985-1986	97
1986-1987	173
1987-1988	231

(i)

1983-1984	30
1984-1985	34
1985-1986	64
1986-1987	111
1987-1988	144

(j)

1983-1984	4
1984-1985	4
1985-1986	23
1986-1987	49
1987-1988	88

(k)

	in favour of Minister	in favour of Applicant
1983-1984	11	0
1984-1985	7	0
1985-1986	30	1
1986-1987	39	2
1987-1988	65	2

(l)

	Initial Application	First Level Appeals	Second Level Appeals	Pension Appeals Board*
1983-1984	30,193	2,748	213	13
1984-1985	27,464	4,224	281	7
1985-1986	37,365	4,176	527	7
1986-1987	32,505	3,857	630	43
1987-1988	30,055	3,291	873	48

It should be noted that the statistics for the various stages of the application and appeal process do not correspond directly. Many decisions rendered in one year were for applications and appeals received in the previous year and, similarily, decisions on many initial applications and appeals received in 1988 will be rendered during the current fiscal year.

It should also be noted that the great majority of appeals received at the second stage (Review Committee appeals) do not require a hearing. The reasons for this are various: for example, new medical information previously unavailable permits, in the majority of cases, our medical advisers to arrive at a favourable decision; also, many appellants return to work and withdraw their appeal.

* These numbers include cases which were resolved prior to the Pension Appeals Board Hearing.

RURAL DIGNITY

Question No. 383—**Mr. Keeper:**

Did Canada Post Corporation make any expenditure of funds on (*a*) salaries (*b*) per diem payments (*c*) lodging (*d*) rental of vehicles (*e*) other items to have officials present at the Rural Dignity "Coast to Coast for Rural Post" cross-Canada caravan and if so, in each case, in what amount?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Rural Dignity—a special interest group representing the interests of the rural postmasters' union—is opposed to Canada Post's program to improve and expand postal services in rural Canada. They are seeking to maintain the high costs and inefficiencies associated with the current network of rural post offices.

Canada Post's rural restructuring program means improved service. As a result, Rural Dignity and other vested interest groups, have had to target their efforts in communities where the program has not yet been implemented; by making unfounded allegations about proposed reductions in local service, spreading misinformation, and creating fear. These groups recently sponsored a cross-country drive to seek support for the preservation of the status quo.

Canada Post, like any other business organization, had to respond to this campaign of misinformation. Our customers were being subjected to threats regarding the future of their local postal service. In order to ensure that the true story about improvements in rural postal services was heard, Canada Post personnel made themselves available to local media, community leaders, and the general public as the drive progressed across the country, from May 18 to June 7, 1988.

This effort was entirely undertaken by regular employees doing their regular work.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The questions as enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Motion for the Production of Papers No. P-9 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton).

CANADA-UNITED STATES FISHERIES ISSUES

Motion No. P-9—**Mr. Fulton:**

That an humble Address be presented to Her Excellency praying that she will cause to be laid before this House copies of all reports, memos, papers, letters, telexes, telegrams, and any other form of communication between government Departments and between the Government and the Government of the United States, including the White House, with regard to the October, 1985 proposal of the United States Secretary of State, that Canada and the United States appoint a Special Representative to oversee discussions and possible negotiations on outstanding common maritime boundary and fisheries issues, starting with west coast boundaries.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, the documents requested under Motion No. P-9 contain information, the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to be injurious to the conduct by the Government of Canada of federal-provincial affairs or international affairs or both. I would therefore ask the Hon. Member to withdraw the motion.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I would ask that since this is in relation to the international boundary in my constituency, it be transferred for debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Transferred for debate.

LABRADOR INUIT LAND CLAIMS

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Motion for the Production of Papers No. P-10.

Motion No. P-10—**Mr. Fulton:**

That an humble Address be presented to Her Excellency praying that she will cause to be laid before this House a copy of the bilateral memorandum of understanding between the Government and the Government of Newfoundland with respect to Labrador Inuit land claims.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, this document cannot be released pursuant to Section 69 of the Access to Information Act. Therefore, I would ask the Hon. Member to withdraw the motion.

Abortion

• (1520)

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Since these are documents in relation to a bilateral agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada with respect to the Labrador Inuit land claims, and are important to my role as their advocate in this Chamber, I would ask that it be transferred for debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Transferred for debate.

SURVEYS ON PRIVATIZATION OF AIR CANADA

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Motion for the Production of Papers No. P-13.

Motion No. P-13—**Mr. Riis:**

That an humble Address be presented to Her Excellency praying that she will cause to be laid before this House copies of all public opinion surveys carried out by Air Canada on the privatization of the airline.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the papers requested are the private information of Air Canada.

I therefore ask the Hon. Member to withdraw his motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, those are surveys from Air Canada. It is privileged information to Air Canada rather than to the Government.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): This important issue was a call for papers regarding various surveys that the Government had taken on the public's interest in the privatization of this company. Therefore, I would ask that it be transferred for debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Transferred for debate.

MR. SANTOKH SINGH BAGGA

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Motion for the Production of Papers No. P-17.

Motion No. P-17—**Mr. Heap:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence, minutes of meetings, telephone logs, telexes, telegrams, memoranda, notes or any other form of communication written on behalf of the former Minister of Employment and Immigration, the Hon. Benoît Bouchard, to the Chairman of the Refugee Status Advisory Committee or any other members of the RSAC, with respect to the granting of refugee status to Mr. Santokh Singh Bagga, a former Indian Army Major.

Mr. Hawkes: On P-17 the documents requested cannot be released pursuant to section 26 of the Privacy Act. I would therefore ask the Hon. Member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I ask that it be transferred for debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Transferred for debate.

NUCLEAR SUBMARINE PROGRAM

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Motion for the Production of Papers No. P-19.

Motion No. P-19—**Ms. Jewett:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all evaluation reports concerning the costing, operations, nuclear safety, and industrial benefits of the nuclear submarine program prepared by officials of the Department of Supply and Services, the Department of National Defence and the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion for the Area Review Board comprised of officials of the above ministries to be completed by June 30, 1988.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, the report for the area review board does not yet exist. It will contain information pertaining to the most closely guarded military and proprietary secrets of the United Kingdom and France, and thus is highly classified. Accordingly, it will not be available for release. Therefore, I ask the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis), who is acting as an agent on behalf of the Hon. Member for New Westminster—Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett), to withdraw the motion.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, as an agent for the Hon. Member for New Westminster—Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett), I know how seriously the Hon. Member feels about this issue, so I would like to ask that it be transferred for debate at the appropriate time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Transferred for debate.

Shall all other Motions for Papers stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

ABORTION

PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

The House resumed from Tuesday, July 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Lewis:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Supreme Court of Canada having declared that the provisions of the *Criminal Code* relating to abortion are inconsistent with the provisions of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and are therefore of no force or effect, the government should

prepare and introduce legislation, consistent with the *Constitution of Canada*, including the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, which reflects the fundamental value and inherent dignity of each human being and the inherent worth of human life, and which achieves a balance between the right of a woman to liberty and security of her person and the responsibility of society to protect the unborn; and

Such legislation should prohibit the performance of an abortion, subject to the following exceptions:

When, during the earlier stages of pregnancy: a qualified medical practitioner is of the opinion that the continuation of the pregnancy of a woman would, or would be likely to, threaten her physical or mental well-being; when the woman in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner decides to terminate her pregnancy; and when the termination is performed by a qualified medical practitioner; and

When, during the subsequent stages of pregnancy: the termination of the pregnancy satisfies further conditions, including a condition that after a certain point in time, the termination would only be permitted where, in the opinion of two qualified medical practitioners, the continuation of the pregnancy would, or would be likely to, endanger the woman's life or seriously endanger her health.

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Hull—Aylmer): Mr. Speaker, it is with something less than enthusiasm that I welcome this opportunity today to speak to the motion on the subject of abortion tabled by the Government.

First of all, I must say quite frankly that the motion as it stands contains many ambiguities. It refers to the earlier stages of pregnancy. I wonder exactly what that means. Does it mean fifteen weeks, eighteen weeks or twenty weeks? I heard some Members say it was eighteen weeks, others that it was twenty weeks. There is considerable confusion about this.

There is also the matter of qualified mediacl practitioners. Exactly what does that mean? Would an ophthalmologist like our hon. colleague from Oxford (Mr. Halliday) be qualified to do an abortion?

The motion also refers to the subsequent stages of pregnancy. What are those subsequent stages? Twenty weeks or eighteen weeks or thirty weeks?

In any case, Mr. Speaker, I think the motion is "either fish nor fowl". It was simply tabled to keep Hon. Members busy before sending them off on a one-week holiday. There will be no follow-up on the motion and, as far as I know, I don't think any legislation will be tabled subsequent to the many discussions we have had in this House.

So in my opinion, it is quite futile. Frankly, this exercise should never have taken place and the Government should have shouldered its responsibilities by bringing in a Bill on this subject. Following the conversations and speeches that we have heard, people are saying that after the elections, the Government may bring in legislation on this. But Mr. Speaker, if the Conservative Government, with 211 Members, cannot manage to bring forth a Bill, I am sure there will never be an abortion law, because I have the feeling that they will not come back with 211 Members. I am sure of it. They will come back with many fewer. So if they cannot do something with 211 Members, they are even less likely to do something with a much smaller number of Members.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps we should recall what happened and why the last bill concerning the Criminal Code amendment was passed. You must remember that in 1966, the Canadian Medical Association, which then represented nearly all physicians in Canada, together with the Canadian Bar Association, asked the Government to pass a law so that physicians, whose duty is to save lives and to perform operations like abortions to save the life of a mother who is in danger, would not be prosecuted for performing such an act to save a life.

It is simply the Canadian Medical Association's desire on this subject and there was nothing else. In 1969, a Criminal Code amendment to protect physicians was tabled, but of course many other proposals were added to it at that time. There was a Committee on which I sat that studied the whole subject of abortion. On the Committee, we heard witnesses from across the country, from religious groups and other organizations and everyone who was concerned with this issue, and finally, after months of deliberation, an amendment to the Criminal Code was adopted, and we know what has happened since the Supreme Court decision in February.

Mr. Speaker, abortion is contrary to nature. It is unnatural and that is why I personally will always be against abortion, except in cases where the mother's life is in serious danger.

So I do not see why . . . it is simple, the latest amendment to the Criminal Code resulted in ambiguity and opened a large loophole for abortion; it has become abortion on demand.

The reason I am telling you these things, Mr. Speaker, is that I have some experience. As a physican, I have helped bring some 8,000 children into the world and I was always delighted to see how happy women were to give birth. And I also remember that many of them may have had unwanted pregnancies, but once they had given birth, how happy they were! Furthermore, I saw them again maybe twenty years later and how proud they were of the son or daughter they had brought into the world!

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that since time immemorial in the history of the world, say 4,600 years before Christ, people were generally against abortion because even though they did not have computers in those days they were convinced that it was an act against nature. Some people did resort to abortion to keep the birth rate in check, but as a rule they had very strict legislation against it.

As I see it, the main problem we are facing today in this whole semantic end emotional issue of abortion is that when people did legislate in ancient days they would always be very careful to say that it did not matter whether the foetus was living or not. Aristotle, St. Alphonse de Liguori, Innocent III, Pope Gregory XIV, and St. Thomas Aquinas all maintained that abortion was not allowed when the foetus showed signs of life. Some people said that the soul does not enter the embryo at the time of conception but only 30, 40 or 160 after—80 days after in the case of female children. Mr. Speaker, particularly

in ancien Rome abortion was used in all kinds of circumstances, not only to keep the population from expanding too quickly but also to keep young girls beautiful and attractive. Christianism finally put an end to such inordinate numbers of abortion which, for all practical purposes, signaled the beginning of the decadent era of the Roman empire and, ultimately, its demise.

There are a number of quotations concerning abortion, especially with respect to living and non-living foetuses, and something had to be done to clear the issue. I think that contemporary scientists and biologists finally demonstrated that life began at conception, contrary to the teachings of St. Alphonse de Liguori, St. Thomas Aquinas, and others.

So if life begins at conception, and this is undeniable, I am automatically against abortion because the foetus will grow to become a human being, and I should think that nobody would want to destroy a human life, even at the foetus stage. There, I suggest lies the whole problem. Had people in the early days of history known what we know today they would not have advocated abortion when the foetus is inanimate, there would have been no legislation to protect abortion, and all those people who preceded us in history and all thoses laws would not have condoned abortion. My time has expired, Mr. Speaker.

• (1530)

Mrs. Gabrielle Bertrand (Brome—Missisquoi): This week, Mr. Speaker, Ottawa is the focus of attention of thousands, if not millions of Canadians. They are eager and anxious to find out the position of each and every Member from both sides of the House on this most complex, vital and controversial issue of abortion.

They will probably make up a list and in two separate columns the names of those for and those against will appear.

For months now, the media have been calling up to find out about our views in order to be able to write our names on the pro or side.

If I have the privilege and honour to rise in the House today, it is because I am one of 29 women who were elected by their constituents to sit among this group of mostly male Parliamentarians. I am an elected representative of a Party, I am part of the Government, but I am first and foremost a woman. What is more, a Christian, practicing Catholic woman who is the mother of seven children, all wanted and loved. My children in turn have given me eight grand-children, again all wanted and all loved. I am principled. I have definite opinions. I have deep rooted convictions. Tomorrow, I will have to indicate through my vote how I can reconcile my personal opinions and my legislative responsibilities.

All of us, as Parliamentarians, will have to live up to these responsibilities. We represent a society which is already quite divided on this issue.

I have already received by mail or by phone hundreds of messages from individual men and women, from couples and such organizations as the *Filles d'Isabelle*, from a number of my constituents living in such communities as Magog, Cowansville, Henryville, Brigham and Omerville. I have read all of them and thought all of them over.

I have just returned from my riding where I spent several days trying to ponder further upon the matter. I sought the opinions of physicians, family mothers, theologians, my own children and, after a great many discussions, we parted company without having ruled out anything. They could only offer me their best wishes.

Probably like a great many others, I find myself still struggling with my personal convictions as a Christian and Catholic woman. I also have a responsibility as a parliamentarian, and I am part of a Government that is looking for a better solution, for better legislation in line with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and in the best interests of the society this Government was elected to govern.

I totally disagree with the Opposition's charges that the today's parliamentary exercise is useless and futile. This Government wanted Members of all three political Parties to have an opportunity to express their views and to vote according to their conscience.

I would like to recall an event in Quebec's political history which may provide an analogy for today's situation. In 1967 or 1968, the Minister of Justice at the time, Jean-Jacques Bertrand, introduced legislation to make civil marriages possible. He knew this reflected the new concerns of couples in a new society. Although his personal convictions as a practising Catholic might have stood in the way, he managed to reconcile his personal convictions with his responsibilities as a legislator. He knew that his role was not to pass judgment and to be a disciplinarian but to understand and respect the views of others. He made a distinction between his personal convictions and his duty as a legislator, recognizing the diversity of peoples' views and the complexity of the situation. Twenty years later, I am in a similar situation, but the issue is far more sensitive.

The role of the legislator is to legislate, in other words to adopt the laws by which the country is governed. Any law passed by Parliament has to be enforceable and be politically, socially and economically feasible. If the chosen solution is not enforceable, the result is non-compliance which brings us a step closer to anarchy.

I must consider a motion that gives me three options to vote on: one compromise option and two more extreme positions.

Mr. Speaker, I could not vote for any of the options, and I will explain why. The compromise option prohibits the performance of an abortion, subject to certain exceptions. If abortion is prohibited, one assumes there will have to be legislation. If there is legislation, it must be enforceable and

enforced. If the legislation is not enforced and complied with, there will have to be be sanctions and penalties.

Every woman has her own conscience. Every woman has her own freedom. I must show understanding, which means I must respect any woman who, for reasons of her own and according to her conscience, holds convictions that are different from mine.

Mr. Speaker, who am I to say that a woman, who for reasons of her own that are different from mine decides to terminate a pregnancy, is a criminal?

I am quite prepared to defend my own convictions which are dictated by my religious principles, but I am equally unwilling to impose them on others. I am against abortion, but I refuse to condemn any girl, any woman in distress who may be trying to cope with circumstances such as poverty, unemployment, family breakup, poor health, or rape or incest, as the pro-life option would have me do.

The Government and Parliament cannot and should not tell women what they can think and do.

The Government's role should be to help these women opt for life, for a child, for a family. The role of the State is not to act as a substitute for their conscience and to make this difficult and sensitive choice in their stead.

Neither can I support a certain overly doctrinaire approach of the pro-choice option, because its backers give precedence to a woman's freedom to do what she likes with her own body over the right to life of the unborn child. For me, this is quite incompatible with simple human morality. Is this life in the making not the main issue and our main concern in this debate? We women who have had one or more children know the difficulties, the physical suffering, the anguish, the strain of pregnancy and childbirth. But above all, we know the indescribable joys of seeing a child come into the world.

Personally, I spent months, if not more than a year, in hospital when I was pregnant. The fourth time, I felt near death and thought of terminating the pregnancy. With my family's help, I brought seven children to term. When my husband died prematurely, I can assure you that all of my seven children helped me through that difficult period.

A fetous brought to term is an asset for the family and for society. Perhaps we are not sufficiently convinced of that and today more than ever legislators have the opportunity to think about their real responsibilities and maybe even take some blame, instead of passing coercive legislation to eliminate the tragedy of more than 60,000 abortions a year in our country.

Is it not high time to put forward a real family policy reflecting the realities and needs that young couples and single-parent families face?

On June 16, Senator Paul David, in a masterful speech which I suggest everyone read, tried to develop for us a coherent, generous and dynamic family policy.

Since children are our nation's most precious asset, he said, "the time may have come for better ways to revise our laws, our structures, our housing strategies, our tax system, our day care system—we have already begun to do that—as well as maternity leave, hours of work and benefits for mothers who stay at home and for those who work outside."

The motion before the House today is not sufficiently clear and comprehensive in this respect. I refuse to close ranks with either the pro-choice or the pro-life groups that are polarizing women today. I believe women should get together and work with men to develop solutions and legislation that promote respect for women, for the life of the child and for the family.

In 1984, this Government said to Canadians that it would be a government of reconciliation. Today, faced with a sensitive and controversial issue, it must try and reconcile various positions. It may be a perilous undertaking, but I think it is also a very rewarding one.

All parliamentarians—whether they are Conservatives, Liberals or New Democrats—and all Canadians have a duty to find better ways, through legislation and as I see it, through legislation outside the Criminal Code, to way we are prepared to welcome new life.

We must educate our young people and demystify sexuality. We must offer women in distress, whose only option seems to be abortion, the moral, financial and psychological support they so urgently need. Not everyone has the privilege of enjoying the kind of support that I have had.

If we spend millions of dollars to keep unfortunate AIDS victims alive—something I support wholeheartedly—is it not worth spending at least as much on the unborn?

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will continue to express their views while leaving aside all political and partisan consideration. This is a matter of conscience that should be discussed free of any partisan overtones.

• (1540)

[*English*]

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the previous speaker for her very fine remarks. I hope I can express mine as eloquently.

I come to this difficult debate with mixed emotions and opinions that many people have had and have expressed. I do not, however, come to this debate as pro-abortion. I do not come to this debate as anti-life. All of us, I think, share a common objective, that of making this world, this life, a better place for those who are in it and those who will be in it. When

it comes to the issue of the role of a legislator the challenge I would say is to decide when to make laws and to decide when not to make laws. Abortion law of all laws in my experience—and this is something I have dealt with for over 30 years, as a mother and a grandmother, generations within my own family have grappled with it too—perhaps exemplifies most what we can call man-made law. Abortion, of all issues, is indeed a women's issue. And I am not a person who believes that there are a whole set of women's issues. Child care is everyone's issue. The economy is everyone's issue. But abortion, of all issues, is perhaps closest to women because they are most affected. Historically, whether 4,500 years, ago as one speaker has said, whether it is today, or whether it was in 1969, abortion law has been man-made law.

The motion before us is seeking the opinion of the House about the fundamental value and inherent dignity of each human being and the inherent worth of human life. I would like to make a few comments on that, Mr. Speaker. This is not a debate in which one side convinces the other. I gave that up many years ago. However, as a legislator I think it is important to look at the objectives we are trying to reach and the methods of achieving them. The objective, I believe, is a common one, that is, to celebrate life, to respect life, and to reduce the number of abortions. That is something with which, I think, all sides can agree. The question is how to do that.

• (1550)

One side of the argument says that it is done by criminal sanctions, by enforcing criminal law. The motion under discussion today talks about legislation. It does not say whether the intent is criminal legislation or health legislation. However, in the past, laws respecting abortion have been under criminal legislation. I do not need to remind the House that criminal legislation has criminal sanctions. That is one way to address this issue.

Another way to address the issue is through a comprehensive public policy which includes such things as sex education, adequate financial resources, and genuine support for the family through the tax system, a comprehensive child care plan, and so on. A further way to address the issue is through improved research and technology, improved research and development on birth control methods and, in addition, enactment of laws. In the short time I have been in this House we have discussed laws about whether fathers will qualify for certain aspects of unemployment insurance. Many of our laws do not take into account the unity of the family and the role of the father in the family and his importance in that role.

Does our society today really reflect a respect for human life? I would say it does not. It is so much easier to stand up and legislate than it is to bend down and give your hand to a child who has been abused, a mother who is tormented, or an unemployed father who is wondering how he is going to feed his family.

Let us examine respect for life in our family. A single parent and child on social assistance in Canada today receives about $8 a day for food and incidentals. Incidentals include clothing and all other necessities. Those who have been following the news lately will know that foster parents are very concerned about the amount of money they are receiving per day, and well they should be. I am well aware of the challenges which foster parents face in this society to assist these very sad children who have often had very traumatic experiences in their families. However, the average foster parent in our society receives more than a parent does to look after his or her own child. A foster parent receives about $10 a day.

As one foster parent recently pointed out, when she went to board her dog it cost $13 a day. I think that example indicates what kind of respect we have for human life, what kind of respect we have for the born.

When we are debating this important issue and sounding out opinions, when we see a person sleeping on the street or we hand out canned goods at a food bank, when we avert our eyes from the 13-year-old prostitute standing on the corner, the group of young adults whom we call street kids, as though being a street kid was simply a way of life rather than a tragedy, it behooves us as legislators to look at the human pain and the human questions with which one must deal.

When I was at the Children's Aid Society a number of years ago as a social worker I saw an 18-month-old who was disciplined by being seated on an electric burner. I went to a house where I saw a six-month-old girl who had been burned by cigarette butts. I spoke to a 10-year-old girl who had been sexually abused by her father for 10 years. There were no marches for those children. There were no pickets. There were no people calling the offices to say, "Let me help that child, that child who is here among us".

When we as legislators talk to these people, we are talking about the rights of the born and are exemplifying what respect for life our society has shown them.

When Mother Teresa came to Canada a few months ago she spoke very eloquently about the issue of abortion. Her position is not necessarily mine, but I respect tremendously her right to present that position because Mother Teresa at least lives her philosophy. She is on the streets with the people who are unwanted. She is working for them. She is enacting what her philosophy of life is. Would that many of us would do the same thing.

Let us talk about legislation. Criminal legislation as proposed here means criminal sanctions; fines and putting people in jail. Let us look for a moment at the practical consequences. Exactly what kind of criminal sanctions would we have? Will we put women and doctors in jail? Will we put them under house arrest? Will we have a 24-hour guard with them? Just how would we deal with this proposed criminal legislation?

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that as recently as 1969 our society said that attempting suicide was a criminal offence. At that time I happened to be at the Vanier Reformatory for Women. There was a woman there who was incarcerated for having attempted suicide. We believed at that time that the way to prevent the taking of that life was to jail that person. Since then we have rethought the issue, and now attempted suicide is no longer in the Criminal Code.

Anyone who has been following the issue lately knows that suicide is the most common cause of death for young people in our society between the ages of 15 and 21. The majority of suicide victims are male. Are we to address that issue by putting all males between the ages of 15 and 21 in jail? Will we fine them? It sounds almost ludicrous even to be suggesting such sanctions today because we know that there is something much deeper wrong with our society. We must find help and caring in our society which we do not presently have.

What are the alternatives? I have mentioned that medical research on safe contraceptives could offer much to this debate. We need more counselling and education to provide real alternatives to families. We need adequate financial compensation in order for families to live in our society with dignity and to raise their children, not as second-class citizens but as members of our society who can contribute to society.

In many ways the debate we are having today is a debate of the past. When I went to a school recently a young man said to me, "Why is it that so many of the people in Parliament are so old?" Well, that is not very flattering but in fact we are old in the eyes of much of the Canadian population. Very often we debate such issues as this on our experience in the past as opposed to the issues of today which, in this particular debate, are those of reproductive technology and of the very serious questions which have not been answered by my Party or others of the use of foetal tissue and surrogate motherhood. There are many issues with which society has not come to grips. In a sense, my Party would certainly support a royal commission on reproductive technology because I think this deals with the issues of today and tomorrow.

• (1600)

My Party has taken a very clear stand on this issue, and as a result we filed a motion with this House which I would like to read into the record. It outlines our position, a position which is not unanimous in our Party but it is the position of the majority. It says:

> That in the opinion of this House the Supreme Court of Canada having declared that provisions of the Criminal Code relating to abortion are inconsistent with the provisions of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and are therefore of no force or effect, that the motion be amended by deleting all the words following the word "effect" in the first paragraph and the following substituted therefor:
>
> law and government policy should respect the principle that the decision whether or not to terminate a pregnancy should be that of the woman involved in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner, and that the procedure should be performed by a qualified medical practitioner; and further should ensure that the Canada Health Act and regulations are amended to ensure equality of access throughout Canada.

That, I believe, addresses the issue of greatest concern to everyone, no matter what side of the argument one is on. It is important that even if we cannot agree at either end of the poles, which unfortunately has come to be, people being very divided, perhaps we can at least agree on working together for that kind of public health policy which will make this society a truly caring society, one which shows its respect for life. It is not enough simply to open our mouths. We have to open our hearts. It is very easy to mouth rhetoric.

History has shown that for all cultures abortion has been an issue of conflict. I do not believe, and my Party does not believe, that making the sanctions for abortion so strong will prevent abortions. They never have. I am old enough to remember the sadness and horror of women who used coat-hangers and vacuum cleaners. It is not a very attractive picture, but this is real life. This is not lawyers talk about precedent and what is or is not. This is what is. One thing all of these cultures have had in common with their folk remedies and variety of methods of abortion is that in the end result a high number of women have died. That is not respect for life. It is not respect for the dignity of life.

As for this motion, I cannot support it. I have presented the amendment which I think is more appropriate to address the issue. I respect the opinions of others. It is not something we will agree on. Probably it is not something that we will ever agree on in this country. I hope that we can agree, however, that we must renew our efforts.

Probably the most important thing that could come out of this renewed debate is that, as a society, as legislators, and as individuals, we renew our efforts to ensure that we do not accept homelessness; we do not accept one in six children in Canada living in poverty; we do not accept food banks; but that we do accept supporting the family and seeing that the family is encouraged and supported to enjoy their children. Children are an important part of our society. They are our future and we are willing to invest in them.

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words, and I will try to be relatively brief with respect to this motion and this very troublesome issue of abortion.

Some people say, and I know you have heard them say it, that this is a debate in which men should not really be involved. This is a woman's issue and men should not be discussing it and voting on it. I suppose I might agree with that, and it would be easy for me to duck the issue and say we will leave it to the women in this House to make this decision, because it certainly substantially involves women. However, as you know, you and I were elected by the people of our ridings and we are expected to take stands on difficult issues. We are expected to be and we are, as you know, accountable for the stands we take with respect to those issues. I am participating in this debate and will be voting tomorrow with that clearly in mind.

I was nominated to run federally, as I think you know, back in November, 1982. From then until the election of 1984, I spent a good deal of time knocking on doors and talking to my constituents. Almost invariably I would be confronted with this question of where I stood on abortion and the question of pro-choice or pro-life. The issue did not arise just over the last few months. It has been with us for a long, long time and, as many of the speakers in this debate have pointed out, it is not going to go away with this debate. In my view, it is certainly going to go on and we are going to hear about it on and on into the future.

When I was involved in the election campaign I made my views quite clear on the issue. I indicated quite clearly that I have a pro-life stand and that I am a pro-life person. Since the election campaign, and I know you have been here on many of the occasions I have spoken in this House, I have had the opportunity to voice my own opinions on this subject. I have, on a number of occasions, set out my views with respect to the abortion issue and my pro life stand. Those views have not only been presented in this House but reported to my constituents through newspapers and other means.

My pro-life view that life begins with conception is based on what I believe are undisputed medical facts. They are as follows:

One, immediately upon the union of a man's sperm with a woman's egg, that is fertilization, cellular development begins.

Two, that the sex is determined at the single cell stage by the *x* and *y* chromosomes carried in the father's sperm cell. At the single cell stage the egg is alive and is human and has a sex, either male or female. It immediately begins the growth process which continues from then on until adulthood.

Three, that in the first week the divisions of the cells continue.

Four, that in the third week the foundation of the nervous system has been established. By the end of the week the heart is beating. Five, that in the sixth week brain waves can be measured and the skeleton is complete. The hands and feet are beginning to grow.

Six, that in the eighth week it responds to pain. Feet and hands with fingerprints are formed. The heartbeat is audible on an office instrument. In the tenth week the body is completely formed, and by the twelfth week all organ systems are functioning. It continues to grow and mature.

You and I know that the medical profession is now able to operate on the brain and urinary tract of an unborn child and that the foetus can be kept alive in hospital outside the mother's womb just 26 weeks from conception.

• (1610)

I do not believe any of those medical facts are disputed in any way by either side in this debate. But it is on that basis that I have come to my conclusion on my position as a supporter of right to life.

I believe that the question of abortion involves two lives, not just one, and that both lives need protection. My feelings in this respect are reflected as well in the United Nations 1959 Declaration on the Rights of the Child, which states as follows: "The child, by reason of his or her physical and mental immaturity, needs special protection and care, including appropriate legal protection before as well as after birth". That is the United Nations 1959 Declaration of Rights of the Child.

It is based on those facts that I came to my conclusion and my position with respect to this issue. Certainly I will be supporting the pro-life amendments that have been put forward. No doubt, others will be put forward in the course of this debate.

There is one item that I do not believe has been put forward to date with respect to this issue. It is something that is missing but which I feel very strongly should be included in the debate. It is known as a conscience clause. It is the question of a health care worker's conscience. Many doctors, nurses and other health care workers firmly believe that in caring for pregnant women they actually have two patients, a mother and her unborn child. They do not want to participate in a procedure to terminate a pregnancy because it would conflict with their own moral beliefs and moral values.

There are many hospitals that recognize and respect those views of health care workers. The ones that do, permit health care workers to arrange their assignments to exclude participation in abortion procedures. However, there is no legal obligation at the moment and, to the best of my knowledge, there never has been a legal obligation for a hospital not to discriminate against a health care worker who refuses to assist in an abortion. That is not the case in other countries. I believe in 44 states of the United States, and in the United Kingdom there is such a conscience clause written into legislation to protect health care workers in that sort of situation.

In order to make it clear that there should be this protection, and to ensure that there is this protection, both explicitly and legally, to protect health care workers from discrimination, I have presented to the table the following motion that I trust will be dealt with tomorrow. It states that the following be added to the motion: "And that no person shall be under any duty, whether by contract or by any statutory or other legal requirement to participate in the termination of a pregnancy to which he or she has a conscientious objection".

I put that forward in the firm hope that no matter what the stand may be of any individual Member of Parliament, whether they intend to vote for a pro-life position, pro-choice position or any other position, they would surely not find that sort of conscientious clause for health care workers offensive in any way. Surely such a proposition could be supported by all Members of the House. I hope that it will be the case,

irrespective of the individual Member's stand with respect to the main motion or any other amendments.

Hopefully, when we vote tomorrow we will have support for that amendment so that regardless of what else is passed there will be a provision in the law that will prohibit discrimination against health care workers who do not want to participate in terminating pregnancies based on their personal beliefs and moral values.

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of obligation that I rise to join my colleagues in the House who spoke before me in debating the issue of abortion. It is an issue which has always aroused the interests and passions of a people and which does so again today.

While I have personally been disappointed that after six months following the Supreme Court ruling which brought down the previous law governing abortions, the Government managed only to introduce a weak and very vague motion that is void of any serious investment of thought, the motion nonetheless focuses the attention of Canadians on the very delicate principles at stake and offers the opportunity for this Parliament to establish the parameters for subsequent legislation.

I believe it is fitting that while this session of Parliament struggles with the most important of constitutional matters through Meech Lake, and struggles with the most important of economic matters through the economic trade agreement with the United States, this Parliament also struggles as we do now, and as we did in the debate on capital punishment a few months ago, with the most important of moral challenges facing Canadians and our country, namely the question of life or death.

While the labelling of certain positions taken by Members or others on such a fundamentally and complex issue can be both misleading and confusing, I must say at the outset that I am firmly opposed to the answers that are promoted by the pro-choice, free-choice, and abortion on demand supporters. As well, I am troubled and perplexed by the pursuit of the middle ground which, for me, emerges as a frustrating and fuzzy mirage, and which is shaped by numerous and different definitions.

I wonder out loud if we cannot be more honest with our emotions and ask ourselves whether this so-called middle ground does and can exist.

I am opposed to the general, free application of abortion. However, I do believe strongly that there exist three compelling circumstances in which society ought to recognize that terminating a pregnancy, while not pleasant, becomes necessary.

The first is when the mother's life is in danger and seriously threatened. Whether it is cancer of the cervix, whereby chemotherapy treatment would likely cause the death of her unborn child, or ectopic pregnancy, where the child has developed in the Fallopian tubes instead of in the uterus, in which case the child would have to be removed to protect the mother, the onus in such situations must be to ensure the safety and well-being of the mother. For me, one cannot justify losing one, sure life, for a possible new life that may never be. Second, where a pregnancy is the result of rape, and third, where the pregnancy is the result of incest, I believe it would be just for a woman, on her and her family's own choice, not to proceed with the birth.

For me and countless Canadians, of course, both rape and incest are ugly, repugnant and often violent acts which offend the gift of birth and undignifies the beauty of motherhood.

I know that my position will not be shared by many and that it will no doubt frustrate those with opposing viewpoints. But it is a position that eases the very depths of my own conscience and I believe complements the overwhelming and countless discussions, calls, letters and petitions which I have received from my constituents and citizens of York West and from people across the country.

• (1620)

I profoundly believe in the position I am taking this afternoon. Making the decision to have an abortion is a deeply personal feeling and a very troubling and agonizing decision for a woman. It is a matter which ultimately must transcend that individual preference. Yes, abortion is very much a woman's issue, but it is also an issue that involves the men in this society. It is also a family issue. Above all, it is a societal issue. Therefore, inherent in any question on the start and end of life is an obligation to weigh the collective interests. There must be this allowance, otherwise we as a people and as a society will lose our moral compasses and drift aimlessly without moral bearing or direction.

Complicating this is a world which is becoming increasingly more unsettled, where crime, terrorism, drugs, murders, robberies, assaults, vandalism, torture and war contributes to the feeling that the moral bedrock of our society is being slowly but surely and consistently chipped away. The values which should give clarity and purpose to our actions are falling by the wayside.

All of us, both elected and non-elected, should be concerned with the kind of society we want to pass on to our children. Every generation inherits a world it never made. In due course, every generation makes its own accounting to its own children. When our time comes, we all want to be proud to turn over a society which is better, safer and morally richer than the one we inherited. That is the intent in all the affairs of this great nation as it is for all the individual families of our country.

For me, loosening or redefining the sanctity of life would render meaningless all the other values we cherish and hold dear and would create a world and a society which would have no moral benchmarks. If we begin to provide life with a price-tag, everything and anything will be up for sale at a certain

price. For me and for many others, that would be a dangerous and precarious corner to turn as a country.

Some would argue that the last six months, during which time there has been no law on abortion in this country, has not been chaotic and, therefore, we should not worry about the future implications. I disagree with that. To allow this present *carte blanche* to continue would, in my opinion, only establish new and lower forms of attitudes and standards that with time and circumstance would become entrenched and accepted. Surely, the world has seen enough of violence and hate. Surely we have seen enough of the attempts to justify present injustices and we cannot punish an injustice by making the world more unjust. I believe we all know in our hearts, even in great times of personal discomfort and difficulty, that to add to the injustice by not protecting the life of the unborn is to burden our lives and mortgage the soul of our country.

Only a few months ago, our Party, reflecting what I believe is a caring, tolerant temperament, supported the dominance of life in the debate on capital punishment. I was one of those Members who cast my ballot to uphold that principle, as tempting as it was to be repulsed, and, therefore, vindictive by the cruelties of the travesties committed by our fellow men and women in this nation.

In the same vein, if we can draw from that Canadian fabric in Canada which recognizes, respects, values and protects human life under any circumstances, how can we not apply that same prevailing sentiment in protecting the life of the unborn child? Just as sanctioning murder by the state would not have made for a better, more civilized world, the killing of the unborn child will not solve the trying dilemmas which are part of a woman's decision process. As well, we as a society are moved to feed our hungry, house our homeless, care for our sick, reassure our handicapped, give strength to the weak, help the poor and disadvantaged in our communities and respect our senior citizens. Are we not caring and capable enough to protect life and to speak up for the unborn?

How is abortion seen as a solution? What about the hurt, sometimes the guilt, the sense of loss and the sense of sadness that often set in long after an unborn child has been aborted? What about the physical and psychological scars that unexpectedly are inflicted and remain etched in the soul of many of our women, our wives and mothers?

There are all too many women who, unfortunately, live with this innermost feeling of depression. Where are their voices in this debate and, more important, what lessons can we draw from these silent and lonely cries? Sure, there are those in my community who approach me asking: "Mr. Marchi, what should I do if my 14-year old daughter becomes pregnant? Should I let her go ahead and give birth at that young age?" Clearly that is a situation which no parent ever wants to face. Yet it is a dilemma, I suggest, that cuts both ways. Is there not a sense of loss which may set in for that girl and that family if an abortion is performed? Is there not a sense of loss that that 14-year old girl will feel possibly when she becomes a 34 year old woman and mother? Is there not the stigma of having ended the life of an unborn child?

If there is an argument between the stigma of a young girl giving birth or of a young girl having an abortion, then I would suggest that in this day and age a pregnancy at a young age is no longer that evil and outcast issue it was many years ago. While it should, of course, not be encouraged, it does at the very least become tolerable. If that young girl were to support life and give birth to a child that will eventually find a warm and wanted home, that pregnancy not only becomes tolerable but becomes bearable for that girl and that girl's family. Let us not look at abortion as a solution because abortion generates other and more complicated problems.

I am not advocating that a pregnancy should stop or prevent the young girl or young woman from having an academic career, social or recreational pursuits. But who says we cannot advance the rights and interests of both mother and child? Who says we cannot develop a caring and pragmatic adoption program that can find willing and loving parents for that child? Why should 60,000 abortions continue when there are hundreds and hundreds of couples in Canada, thousands in North America, who cannot have children and who are willing and anxious to enjoy the beauty and richness of parenthood through adoption?

Why should a couple in Canada, for instance, have to wait, four, five, six or more years to adopt a child? Why should those very same couples have to travel the globe in order to adopt their first child and even then face years of red tape? Surely if we pride ourselves on being a progressive and technologically advanced society then we can apply those features on a human level whereby the interests of our women, the interests of our unborn children and the interests of the would-be parents who are ready to adopt are all protected and enhanced. Nor do I seek to deprive women of their legitimate and full rights and opportunities. Rather, I am proposing that our laws deal with how to adjudicate and balance the rights of the mother and the rights of the unborn child. In the same breath we cannot argue for the protection of life without displaying more concern and tangible support for women who are experiencing an unplanned and unwanted pregnancy.

• (1630)

To ignore their emotional and human needs would be sheer hypocrisy and self-defeating. It is frustrating for me to know that while some form of abortion services are generally and readily available, resources and support for the birth option are comparatively sparse. All too often there is little support for the individual woman who genuinely desires to give her unborn child that special gift of life.

If there exists a lack of resources and support for that birth alternative, and I believe that to be the reality as we speak today, then how many of the 60,000 abortions were really the result of a free choice? How many of those abortions were a direct, inevitable and desperate result of a futile search for

support or counselling or for proper advice? Were there two options or was there only one?

Women should and must be given a real alternative so that an unwanted pregnancy does not have to mean an unwanted baby. We must, as a caring community, provide practical support to the problems of women who contemplate abortion which have for far too long been overlooked. Ironically, sometimes, we tend to stereotype, we tend to assume, for example, that college-educated, career-oriented middle-class women are not the problem because either they know how to avoid the problem or they know how to cope with the situation. Yet our statistics show us the very opposite.

Women who are most apt to have an abortion have earned at least a high school diploma, are between the ages of 20 and 26 and are unmarried. It is in the midst of their education or their careers that many women—not all—view a continued pregnancy as an interruption or as a barrier or as a threat. If we are to overcome the traumatic circumstances of these women in these predicaments, and if we want to encourage and convince women that they can and should give life to their unborn without having to jeopardize their own lives, then we must provide the professional guidance to help them face the many difficult questions that will ensue.

We must provide more effective counselling to help rebuild a woman's self-esteem and confidence that could be threatened or shattered in the process. We must provide nurturing and homes for women whose families do not accept an unwanted pregnancy. We must provide medical assistance to address and meet a sudden new set of physical and medical needs by competent doctors and nurses. We must provide career and educational programs to allow those women to resume their careers or their academic pursuits. Finally, we must provide the financial assistance for the many expenses associated with a pregnancy in our society.

The price for the energy and the efforts for establishing such a human and comprehensive response to women is not only a price worth paying because those women deserve that care and that human outreach, it is also a prerequisite when we compare it to the emotional price that is being paid by those lonely women or the incalculable price of the loss of life.

We should not delude ourselves into believing that a quick fix exists to such a fundamentally important issue. Yes, the issue is divisive in the country. Yes, no clear consensus has yet emerged. Yes, it pits members of the same family, sometimes husband and wife, and sometimes followers and worshippers of the same religion, against each other. Yes, there is nothing more difficult for Parliament to tackle than a matter which truly involves the matter of life or death.

However, I remain firm that there is a humane answer and that this solution is rooted in the indisputable fact that no one likes abortion and that no one looks to it with satisfaction or pleasure. It is this accepted viewpoint, coupled with the recognition and the supremacy of life, that provides us with the foundation upon which a solution can begin to be built.

The challenge before us as a Parliament, as a people and as a country that prides itself in its tolerance and in its progressive views is to embrace an unborn child as a member of the human family, to nurture a mother facing an unwanted pregnancy within an environment of care and protection so that women can give their children a future without giving up their own, to be unified and to respond to a childless couple who is desperate in its desire for parenthood through adoption and, finally, to build and promote a society with the confidence and security of knowing that its moral fibre is strong and unshakeable.

The central premise to these four challenges should and must be the recognition that life is to be cherished, to be loved and to be protected. We recognize all of us and accept that science and technology are indispensable in this day and age. But if they are divorced from the moral values that breathe full meaning into life, then they diminish what we call our civilized society.

I personally believe that no problem of human destiny is beyond human beings. The problem of abortion was created by men and women, and therefore it is the same men and women who can and will have to solve it. The human spirit has displayed repeatedly throughout the greatest chapters of our history that it can often solve what has seemed to be unsolvable. I believe that the crisis and that the problem involving abortion in our generation can and will be overcome.

There must be a better way to abortion. That better way I believe is living in each of us.

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to participate in this debate. Initially, I would like to say a few words about the process.

One thing on which I think I can agree with everyone with respect to this topic is that it is a very difficult one for everyone in the House of Commons. I appreciate the fact that Members of Parliament on this difficult issue are allowed to speak and vote according to their conscience. In that regard I would like to commend the efforts of the Deputy House Leader for bringing this motion forward. As well, I would like to compliment our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney). I believe this is another example of his commitment to parliamentary reform because, certainly, this debate is in the best tradition of British parliamentary democracy.

We are here for a reason. The reason is that in January of 1988 the Supreme Court of Canada struck down Section 251 of the Criminal Code. I believe that there have been some misconceptions about what the Supreme Court of Canada said in that decision.

Many individuals have tried to use that decision, I would suggest, for their own purposes, to back up their own arguments. But I think one thing is clear, and I think that this point has been made by other speakers as well. No one judge spoke for the majority. There are several majority opinions within the *Regina v. Morgentaler* case, and none is conclusive as to

what Parliament can and cannot do on this very sensitive issue. I have heard the arguments of those who say that this prohibits us from passing pro-life legislation. I disagree with that. I believe that this is an improper interpretation. I would suggest that it is taken exclusively from the majority decision of one of the judges in that particular case.

• (1640)

What we have here is a situation where we as Parliament have been given the responsibility, one which this Chamber has had for decades since its inception, to do what we as parliamentarians believe is right and just. I cannot and do not accept the idea that our Constitution in any way prohibits us from passing legislation that would protect unborn children. I would go further and say that our Constitution places responsibility on us to do all we can to protect those who cannot speak for themselves.

I had mixed feelings about the former section being struck down. Since its inception I believed that it was completely inadequate and should not have been introduced in the first place. One of its many problems was lack of enforcement of it provisions. In some jurisdictions in this country no attempt whatsoever was made to enforce even the limited sanctions within that section. In other areas officials gave up. Sometimes there was a half-hearted attempt to enforce the provisions. It was very inadequate.

The fears that I had about Section 251 are the same fears that I have about the present motion before the House. I do not think any Members should be under any illusions about it. There were 60,000 to 80,000 abortions under Section 251, and there will be 60,000 to 80,000 abortions under the motion presented here to the House. In one instance there will be one doctor signing the paper to permit the abortion, and in Dr. Morgentaler's case he will pass it over to his buddy in the later stages and the two of them will sign it. I believe it is inadequate. I oppose it. I hope other Members of Parliament will take the opportunity to defeat the motion tomorrow. I will be supporting a motion that will finally, again, in Canada give complete protection to unborn children from conception to the moment of birth.

You have heard, Mr. Speaker, many emotional and sensitive comments made so far in this debate. All of us bring our own upbringing and experiences to this problem. For me, the issue was not difficult. Since I was a boy in the late 1960s when this became an issue of national discussion, I was always dissatisfied with the arguments made in favour of permitting abortions. One of those arguments which is heard today is the viability question. Somehow after a certain number of weeks in the womb of a mother the unborn child picks up rights that he did not have before that. The idea was that if the child could live outside the mother's womb he should have all those rights that are inherent in all human beings, but if the child is before that period of time, then he has no rights whatsoever.

I am sure you are aware, Mr. Speaker, of the progression in the arguments on this issue. In the late 1960s or early 1970s it was 28 weeks, then we started having children born at 27 weeks, and another dilemma. Gradually in some jurisdictions in Europe it was pushed back. Surely every time it is pushed back it is pointing to the argument, the proposition that was obvious from the beginning, that human life begins at the moment of conception.

I find it distressing when people state that they must have control over their own body. We are not talking about their own body. This is not a tumour or a wart. It is a human being. We have heard medical testimony given by other Members in this Chamber to that effect. It is something that makes common sense to all of us. It is something very different growing inside the womb of a mother.

We have all heard horror stories of the moral dilemmas that this type of issue can cause. In a debate of this import we should remember some of them. I remember one that struck me about 10 years ago. It is a true incident. A woman checked into the hospital, all the papers were signed and sealed for her to have an abortion, and her doctor agreed to perform that abortion. The moment came for the abortion to take place. The operation took place and the child was born alive. How about that for a moral dilemma? This took everyone by surprise. Immediately a decision had to be made. Does this child who was born alive have all the rights, dignity, and worth of a human being, or is it something that can be disposed of because all the papers were signed and it was supposed to be an abortion? There was a hesitation in the operating room. Finally, a nurse stepped forward and said that the child must have oxygen if it was going to have a chance to live. She did that, and the child only had a few hours to live after that.

One of the other arguments that is always used by those who do not want to see us have legislation restricting abortion is what I call the tragic example. The tragic examples have changed a little over the years. When I was at Queen's University in my experience this was the first time that it became an issue. I spoke in favour of protecting unborn children, and this young man said to me: "What about the case where a woman has 11 children and she finds she is pregnant with the twelfth child, and her husband will beat her and leave her if she has any more children? What about that situation? Are you not worried about that woman?" That was one of the examples back in the 1960s when people had larger families. I hear different arguments now, but I always say the same thing. "Yes, my heart goes out to people in those circumstances, but do not compound one unfortunate situation with something else. Do not compound a tragedy by having an abortion permitted on top of that".

That leads me to the next argument that is always thrown out. People say that every child in Canada must be a wanted child. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, without fear of contradiction by anyone in this country that every child is a wanted child in Canada, if not by the natural mother, then by individuals who would give anything to adopt a child. There is

no one in this Chamber and no one who would read the debates of this House of Commons who is either a lawyer or social worker who does not know someone who would love to adopt a child.

In my short years of practice of law I remember on at least three different occasions people sitting in my office with tears in their eyes asking what they had to do to adopt a child. The simple answer is 60,000 abortions in Canada every year make their dreams unfulfilled. I say to people who do not want children, "Please put them up for adoption. Turn your unfortunate situation into someone else's joy".

Another argument that I have looked closely at is the one where people state we must provide abortions because women will die in childbirth. In the United Kingdom hundreds of thousands of abortions are performed each year. An analysis was done of those and it was discovered that six were performed to save the life of the mother, six out of approximately 200,000. I would suggest that any amendments before the House should provide for that, but let us be clear on what we are talking about. We are not talking about thousands and thousands of Canadian women who die because they do not have abortion on demand. That is not the case, and it is not the experience in the United Kingdom. I trust and hope that that will never be the experience in this country.

Another argument made to me is when people say: "Of course, you would permit abortions in the case where it was discovered that a child has a handicap". Well, I would suggest this, that any unborn child is no less a child of God because he has a handicap. There cannot be any second-class citizens in this country, one law for those who do not conform to our idea of good health and another law for those who do not. I do not accept that. I hope and pray that Canadians will never accept that.

• (1650)

In this debate there is, as in many of these very sensitive debates, discussion of public opinion and opinion polls. I was very proud and pleased to present to this House a petition signed by over 1,300 constituents in my riding of Niagara Falls, calling on Parliament to pass a law that would protect unborn children from the moment of conception, but I can tell you that I do not stand here because of public opinion polls. I remember being on an open-line radio station not long ago. Someone called in and said, "Mr. Nicholson, don't you realize that the majority of your constituents do not agree with the position that you had consistently taken on the subject of abortion?" All I can say to that is this: Public opinion polls are not a good reason for politicians to make their minds up on these very sensitive subjects. I would suggest to you that that is one of the reasons why politicians very often are held in contempt in this country, because of a suspicion on the part of individuals in Canada and in the United States, as well as throughout the western world, that somehow that is the motivational factor to politicians.

I suggest that this is something that is too sensitive, too important, and it touches the lives of so many of us that it cannot and should never be the subject of public opinion polls, and that no Member of Parliament should make up his or her mind on that basis. Therefore, I hope that I made my own position clear on this.

What we will be voting on tomorrow is advice to the Government. It is not a piece of legislation; it is advice to the Government on the kind of legislation that should be enacted in this House. I want to see that advice given to the Government, that we should enact legislation that will protect children from the moment of conception. A lot is at stake here. It is the lives, I believe, of thousands of unborn children in this country, children who cannot speak for themselves, who need individuals in Canada who will speak up on their behalf, and I am certainly proud to be a small part of that movement for them by speaking on their behalf.

This is a very difficult one, one that I know many Members of Parliament have difficulty with in making up their minds. One thing I would suggest to them: If we accept the arguments that you have heard in the pro-choice lobby, the pro-choice section, we will be on our way to a situation that already takes place in the United States, which I believe is happening here in Canada. The Hon. Member for Kitchener (Mr. Reimer) told me a couple of weeks ago that he was talking with a doctor in Kitchener and trying to discuss with him which of two or three different options was a better pro-life option. He said, "You politicians are talking about which is the best pro-life option. I had a young woman in here who said, 'I would like an abortion.'" He said, "Why would you like an abortion?" "Because I have had tests to tell me that it is a girl. I want an abortion because I have been told that I will have a girl, and I would like to have a boy. My husband and I would like to have a boy." That is what takes place thousands of times in the United States. That is what is going to take place in Canada. It will take place in Canada if this Parliament accepts the arguments of those who favour a pro-choice position.

I am very pleased to lay on the Table an amendment that will protect unborn children. It reads as follows: "That all the words in the motion after the words 'should prohibit the performance of an abortion' be deleted and the following substituted therefor: 'while allowing those medical treatments which are necessary to prevent the death of the mother, or to remedy a condition that, if left untreated, would cause the death of the mother".

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I am quite glad to have an opportunity to speak on this. It is not an easy matter to speak on well, or to vote on, as some of the previous Members have acknowledged, even though there are varying standpoints. I think that debate is necessary. I suppose you could say that it is overdue. I do not think it will be finished today or tomorrow or quickly, but I am glad that we are proceeding with it, because it is needed. I say that, even though

I honestly believe that the Government has based this motion that we are debating on the wrong assumption.

What seems to be implied in the assumption of the Government's motion is that the source of the problem that we have to grapple with here is women, that is, women who need to be controlled. I will come back to that later. I do not share that view. As a husband, as a father of seven children—one of them adopted—as a grandfather of 13, I believe that abortion indeed is sad. It is often injurious and it may possibly be the killing of a person. The problem is that, if the foetus is a person, it is nevertheless inside another person. That seems very obvious. Perhaps it seems too obvious to consider, but I think that it is a very important point that we have to take into account.

We cannot protect the foetus without either having the co-operation of the pregnant woman or else risking injury to her or to the foetus, or both, either by force and violence or by depriving them of adequate medical care. Therefore, I support the motion from the NDP caucus that was recently read by the Hon. Member for Yukon (Ms. McLaughlin). I support it because the government motion fails in what I think is a good, conscious purpose. I think it must fail, because it rests too absolutely on coercion. The words "prohibit the performance of an abortion", subject to the following exceptions, sound mild enough, but they stand against a background of prison. Although the Criminal Code is not mentioned in the motion, I think it is clearly implied. What it does is to continue an unfortunate pattern of focusing, by coercion, on one pregnant woman—or on many pregnant women—but one at a time, a problem that has been generated by society as a whole, and will not be resolved by only attributing it to one individual woman.

Yesterday in the debate, one of our colleagues from the other side of the House made a remark—since *Hansard* has not been distributed for the day, I cannot quote him exactly. The gist of it was that for those who have no ethical guidance systems left, the only thing remaining is the law. He went on to say further that the law is the last guide-post of morality. He identified morality with the word "ought", or "oughtness". There is no oughtness about the law, so we have to use the law, instead of "ought", for people who do not understand "ought". This is the same Member who last month said—and we find this on page 16348 of *Hansard*—and I quote: "Canada deserves some protection—we were talking about refugees—from people whose thought forms have changed if they no longer hold to absolute rights and wrongs". In other words, as was pointed out, the Member seemed to want to use our immigration service as a "thought police" to keep bad thoughts out of Canada.

• (1700)

Only a month later he seems to think that many people in Canada have bad thoughts anyway, even if they were born here. He seems to be committed, and I think there are others unfortunately who are committed, to a sort of fixed absolutist faith coercion, whether it is against refugees or against Canadians. That is where the Government's resolution has not been well enough thought out. The Government has not recognized that it continues to make pregnant women the scapegoats of a very complex fault in society as a whole. It is the fault of denying to children who have been born the same rights as some such as the previous speaker has insisted upon for children who have not been born.

The defence of children who have not been born would be more widely supported and would be more successful in a society that was willing to defend the rights of children who have been born. We do not have that. We have a society that sees nothing very wrong with paying women, many of them mothers, only two-thirds of what men are paid often for the very same work. We have a society that has food banks in Toronto whose clients are 40 per cent children. We have a society that supports the exploitation of sex in the multibillion dollar advertising industry and where one child in six lives in poverty and the majority of poor people are single mothers. We have a society that has for years tolerated the battering of women. Perhaps one in eight or one in ten of wives are battered with very little intervention or attention from our society. We have a society that restricts information and instruments of contraception, that restricts research for contraception, as this Government did by cutting grants for research. The Government cut grants for planned parenthood which did a proven useful job of reducing teenage pregnancies through education in sexuality. We have a society that maintains thousands of apartments in a city like Toronto as adult-only apartments where children are outlawed, not unborn children but born children who are told they have no right to live there. This is a society which, having required so many mothers to work in the workforce, has nevertheless neglected to provide enough day care spaces.

When I was in the army in 1945 our army education officer one day said, "We could be demobilized soon. Where will we get jobs? Most of the factory jobs are held by women. How will we get the women out of the factories?" To me it was an academic question literally because I was planning to go back to university and I would not be having to fight a woman for a factory job. I learned later on that there was a practical way of getting women out of the factories. Day care centres were closed that had been built when women were needed for war work. This is a society in other words that scrimps on the health and education needed by our children and mothers and by families in general.

I find this motion lacking in thought. It is particularly inappropriate coming from a Government which cut the family planning funds, a Government which added $1,000 to the tax burden of families and which neglected to provide the means of affordable housing. After all this neglect of born children and mothers, including pregnant mothers, our society cannot really expect to stop abortions just by punishing the pregnant woman or depriving her of good medical care. It won't work. The Government seems to believe that the threat of prison will

work that miracle, and yet our own experience in Canada tells us that it did not work before.

We find that Ireland, according to British statistics, has the highest per capita rate of abortion in the western world, yet abortions are banned in Ireland. Brazil bans abortions, yet it has 1 million abortions annually, 100,000 maternal deaths and 10,000 children born with serious abnormalities. The Government's method is based on the wrong understanding of the problem, and its method will not solve the problem.

I believe what we have to explore is something along the lines of the motion presented by the New Democratic Party. I will read it again:

> "That, in the opinion of this House, the Supreme Court of Canada having declared that the provisions of the Criminal Code relating to abortion are inconsistent with the provisions of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and are therefore of no force or effect . . ."

Then it reads:

> "—law and government policy should respect the principle that the decision whether or not to terminate a pregnancy should be that of the woman involved in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner, and that the procedure should be performed by a qualified medical practitioner; and further should ensure that the Canada Health Act and regulations are amended to ensure equality of access throughout Canada."

This does not solve all problems, but I think it is a more hopeful way of proceeding towards solving them. It rests on the assumption that women are not bad, at least by any contrast with men, nor are they weak by contrast with men, nor are they foolish by contrast with men. This is not a joke, Mr. Speaker. It has been an unfortunate error of teaching by some of the greatest theologians in western Europe in past centuries that women were less than men, physically, emotionally, mentally and spiritually. We are outgrowing that. But that is the problem. We are outgrowing thousands of years in which women were regarded more than anything else as breeding animals, thousands of years at least of civilized society.

Whether the uncivilized people, as we call them, treated women that way, I do not know but from my reading of everything from the Egyptians and the Babylonians on in our traditions, including the *Bible*, it is clear that women have been regarded as predominantly breeding animals.

Now their role and status is changing. I think that is great. I think that having women in the workforce is a necessary step forward to the liberation of women, men and children from a system of domination through the family that has perhaps been necessary in past ages but is not necessary and is harmful now. The point at which this becomes most difficult and critical is the question of the woman's role in childbirth and the woman's participation as an active, intelligent, responsible human being. What men are challenged for is to believe that women may be just as responsible as men. It shakes our egos a little bit but the facts seem to bear it out.

There are questions, such as, what about using foetal tissue for medical research and procuring abortions for that reason, such as was mentioned by the previous speaker, to decide to choose an abortion so as to determine negatively, at least, the sex of a child, such as other unworthy, and I would consider them quite unworthy, reasons for choosing abortion.

• (1710)

From my knowledge of my wife, my three daughters, my four sons, their mates, and their children, I believe that there will be better decisions on those issues if we allow the female half of the race to participate rather than telling them that father knows best.

There is evidence of this, this is not just a stray opinion. For almost 12 years in Quebec there has been no coercive law of the sort for which some people are asking. I hear that the rate of abortion did not zoom to the sky. The rate went up for a little while, as the statistics adjusted to the new law, and then went down. The rate of abortion in the last half year in Canada has been declining without coercion. I understand that there has been a decline in the rate of abortion since the Supreme Court took away coercion. In other words, women did not react mechanically by running to get abortions because there was no more coercion. They are making their decisions.

That is part of the reason for the results of a recent Gallup poll. The previous speaker scorns polls. I would certainly have never been elected had I relied entirely on polls. I had to be a dissident. However, a Gallup poll taken in April of this year tells us that in response to the question of whether the decision to have an abortion should rest with the woman in consultation with her doctor, 68.9 per cent of the people polled said yes. That is not by any means the only poll which points in that direction.

I believe that we have to try the co-operative approach rather than the coercive approach. The evidence shows that there will be fewer abortions and more healthy children, more healthy families, and more moral fibre in our country if we allow the woman the responsibility rather than taking that responsibility away from her.

Something which has been mentioned before and is worth mentioning more than once again is Planned Parenthood's proposed five ways to prevent abortion and one way that will not. The first of their five ways to prevent abortion is to make contraception more easily available. There are problems with contraception and we have to work them out. The second is to provide young people with a better teacher than experience. We must stop the prudery about education and sexuality in our schools at early ages.

The third way is to increase the part of men in this. That is happening at, I believe, a great rate in our country. We should be hopeful that the horror stories such as those to which the previous speaker referred will disappear into the past as we get a better standard of mutuality in family life. The fourth is to create new birth control methods because the existing ones are still unsatisfactory in many ways. For many they have been

better than nothing, but they should be better yet. The fifth is to make our country friendlier to children.

I have spoken about the ways in which our country is unfriendly. We all know the things which can be done with our country's wealth of resources to make our country friendly to children. If that is done, I believe we will find that abortion becomes manageable as a result of a co-operative approach rather than a coercive approach.

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the amendment proposed by the Hon. Member for Don Valley West (Mr. Bosley) that: "Motion No. 36 be amended as follows: By deleting all the words after paragraph 1 and substituting therefor: 'Such legislation should prohibit the performance of an abortion except when performed by a qualified medical practitioner' ".

I speak to this amendment on behalf of those women who have been faced with bearing a child not of their choosing. Many women who have been faced with this choice have taken the choice to bear a child they did not choose to conceive. They have chosen to bear it, have taken the responsibility, and have taken joy in that decision.

Others have made another choice, consciously, perhaps in desperation, but despite all the words, all the edicts, all the laws, over centuries women have made the choice not to bear a child—rich, poor, ignorant, sophisticated, in every culture, in every epoch, in every religion, by whatever means available.

Let us not be pretentious enough to think that when the debate is over in this Chamber the issue has been resolved. The issue began at the dawn of time and it will end when the earth ceases to circle the sun.

There has been a lot of talk in this Chamber about the morality of abortion. There is no question that it is a moral issue. The question is, who is to make that moral judgment; the court in its red robes and ermine, the church in its silk robes and rings, or politicians in the green Chamber, people like us, men and women of ideals and principle? I do not know one person who has ever run for public office who has done so without a kernel of ideals about why they want to be here.

In a democracy politicians are people of consensus who, with the best of ideals, over time represent the ebb and flow of public opinion. Why are any of us in a position to make this judgment best? Why is the woman who is carrying the child not the person who can make that judgment best? Do we honestly believe that she who has the life within her will make a worse decision than us?

A woman is a whole being. She has a body, an intellect, and a soul or a spirit, whatever the magic is that makes us a unique species. I remind you that frequently the body makes its own choice. The miscarriage of an unborn child is a natural abortion. It is the body saying "no".

Why, if the woman is a whole being, cannot her mind, her intellect, her spirit make that same decision?

In a free society we expect people to make choices, to exercise judgment, and to bear their responsibilities, sometimes at great personal sacrifice whatever that choice may be. We not only expect people to make choices, we must respect their ability to make those choices. Women do that. Women know that there are people who want to adopt a child. Women know that a handicapped child has the same rights as others. Women know that children born in less than perfect circumstances can still have a happy and successful life. They do not make these choices without knowing the things that we in this Chamber know. We cannot make the choice better than they can.

Society and religion, over the centuries, have had differing views on the mores of aborting, of killing an unborn child. Let us not be afraid of the vocabulary. Those views include such things as that the soul enters an unborn baby boy after 40 days and a girl after 80 days, that the soul enters the unborn child at the time of quickening, when the woman feels the foetus moving for the first time.

• (1720)

Many of us in this Chamber have spoken of life from the moment of conception. Tomorrow we may talk of life beginning when the sperm joins the egg in a solution at a certain temperature in a certain plastic container under controlled circumstances. God knows, the human species some day may not reproduce but be produced from elements as yet we know not what. But throughout history to our time and into the future as we can see it, the constant is the woman who carries the child, and despite threat of death and social isolation, castigation and damnation, women have exercised their choice to have the child or not to have it.

As a society and in our time, our epoch, we as parliamentarians and as Canadians can make the choice to bear the child an easier one as opposed to the choice not to have the child. We provide help for child care. We should provide better social and personal support. We provide job-training and housing and medical care when women are faced with this decision, with the terror, with the oppression, of bringing up a child in circumstances of uncertainty or loneliness or poverty. But at the end of the day, even if we provide perfection in all of the above, it is the mother who bears the ultimate responsibility and therefore ultimately must have the choice. And make no mistake, women make the right choice, a far better choice than you or I or all the pageantry of institutions that have been invented by human beings from the beginning of time.

They make the choice and the judgment based on the societal expectations of their time. They do not do this in isolation. They do it based on their own health, on the potential health of the unborn child, on their relationship with the father, on the basis of all their expectations, which may or may not be good ones based on what society and their own

circumstances have taught them. They do it based on their ability to deliver on the ongoing responsibility, and of course on their unique and individual caring sense of personal being and the being of their child.

Of course, society as always must make rules about the infringement of the rights of others. Of course, freedom is defined by a collective of what we all believe. Of course, as a nation we must have a view of the circumstances under which any abortion is to be allowed. Of course, we have a view of medical standards. But we must guard against our own ignorance, our own anecdotal evidence of horror stories we have heard, our inheritance of values from other times, and from all the things that make us meddle in other people's ability to judge.

Life is, of course, to this day still a mystery and some mysteries are eternal. Let us strive to understand them but let us not pretend that we do. Most of all, let us not judge those who bear the burden of the gift of child-bearing. Make no mistake, it is not a right, it is a gift. But how that gift is accepted can only be decided by the recipient who will judge best.

I have said before that I am a Minister of the Crown and not a minister of God, but I do have a calling. That is, that women in our society in Canada are contributors, are participants, have values that I respect and care for, and judgment that I bow to. I hear their voices, and these principles come from I know not where, but what they tell me is that my power to decide, like yours as a Member of this Chamber, has its limits. The ability to decide, not the right but the ability to decide, and the sensitivity, and the responsibility that is a part of what I am, not as a Member of Parliament but as a woman, as a part of what every woman is, and as a part of us as Canadians, is to be respected and is to be celebrated.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lawrence I. O'Neil (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso): Mr. Speaker, it is with some regret that I rise at this time to speak on this important issue. It is regrettable for a very simple reason. It is regrettable that we at this point in our history, the evolution of civilization as we call it, are still debating a very fundamental question, that of the value we place on life itself. That question has haunted us more in recent times than in the past. For in recent times there has developed a feeling, a viewpoint, that life can be segregated; you can divide life and place a value on it according to its stage of development. That of course is not a view that I share. Today I want to tell my colleagues in this House and all Canadians why I do not share that view.

I do not believe that we as a society can do anything but protect life from the moment of conception. I say this because I, for reasons that perhaps reflect my legal training, know that in other areas of law the unborn is protected from the abuse of alcohol and drugs. In other words, a family court judge in this country can move in to protect an unborn child from the alcohol or drug abuse of the mother. The laws of this country protect the right of the unborn child to inherit property. The laws of this country provide that a child may collect damages for prenatal injuries.

That is the body of law, but at this point in our history there is no law which says that the child is protected from the wilful taking of its life. That is the irony of the body of law in our country today and that is why we are discussing this issue. We must fill that void. To be consistent we must complete the body of law and the protections extended to the unborn child to protect the most fundamental right of all, the right to continue to live.

There are those who will say there is no such right. There are those who will say there is no life before birth. However, it seems to me that those who say that deny the biological and medical reality as we know it today. It is widely known today, when perhaps it was not known 500 years ago, that a few weeks after conception the unborn child exhibits certain patterns of brain activity and other physiological activity. A few months after conception there is movement of the arms and legs.

• (1730)

I was gifted in having had a child born to my family last November 20, a child who was born 10 weeks early. The child was healthy upon birth. The child weighed less than three pounds.

According to the laws of our country today, the mother could have walked into a hospital and said she wanted the unborn child's life terminated. According to the laws in Canada today, the hospitals would have permitted her to do that. There are those who would say she should have been permitted to do that because the child has no rights and is nothing more than a fingernail or hair. It is what I call a collective social denial of a biological and legal reality in our society. Of course, there is precedent for such collective social denial.

Today, we discuss these atrocities of decades gone by with some degree of shame and ask how it could have happened. These atrocities happen as a result of a rationalization and a denial of the biological reality and legal reality. That is shameful.

The motion before the House today is one that I cannot support because it would permit abortion in most circumstances. It does not extend to the many thousands of unborn children who are being aborted today the protection that should be extended to them. There is no justifiable reason for abortion in this country, unless the continuing life of the mother requires some measure to be taken.

It is a falsehood to say today that continuation of a pregnancy in many cases represents a threat to the life of the mother. Our medical technology is far beyond that. The statistics are clear that rarely does such a situation develop.

Why do people rise in this Chamber and elsewhere to say that the mother should decide? They have a view that there is such a thing as an unfettered right to choose, and that we as human beings have the right to choose to do what we like. Of course, we know that that is not true. We cannot break a store window. That is a violation of property rights of another person. We cannot hit another person because that is a violation of the bodily integrity of another person.

We have laws in this country that balance our right to choose to do what we like against the rights of other people to continue life peacefully and productively in our society. There is no unfettered right to choose. Our rights are balanced against the rights of others. That is what law-making is all about.

I cannot choose to go into the public and slander the name of another person because there are laws that say I cannot do that. It is an infringement of the rights of other people. That law represents a limitation on my right to speak freely about what I believe, and we accept that.

Nevertheless, with all that legal precedent there are those who will say that there must be a right to choose on the part of the mother. I say that that is a false assumption. It is a simplistic explanation which, I regret to say, is all too often accepted as a fundamental basis of our society. It is not.

There are those who will also say that we have the right to control our bodies, whether men or women. Do we have that right? Let us take the example of the person who breaks the store window or hits someone else. That person can be arrested. Where is the control over one's body if one can be arrested? One's right to control one's body is limited by the rights of others in this society. That is a fundamental concept of our legal system, our body of law and our social jurisprudence.

It appears that there is widespread acceptance of the notion that a mother should have the right to control her body. There is no such right. The mother cannot control her body, nor can the father control his body. That same mother can be searched internally for narcotics according to many laws in this country.

Today we are talking about a balancing of interest. I agree totally that the issue was one of balancing of rights, but that means that there are rights enjoyed by the unborn child and rights enjoyed by the mother.

The motion before the House discusses balancing the right of a woman to liberty and security of her person and the responsibility of society to protect the unborn. How should that balance be resolved?

I have put forward with the Clerk an amendment to this motion in which I clearly outline how that balance should be dissolved. I make the case in my motion that only if a life-threatening situation exists should any action be taken that would result in the death of the unborn child. I go further and say in my amendment that when the decision is being made about whether or not a life-threatening situation exists, the unborn should be represented by legal counsel.

In the past, under the old Criminal Code, hearings were provided for but they were not *bona fide* hearings. They were a sham.

The only way to protect the unborn child when determining whether or not a life-threatening situation exists for the mother, is to ensure that the unborn child has independent legal representation so that due process is followed in the interest of protecting the unborn child.

Life is a continuum. It does not start at eight weeks or twelve weeks. There is no artificial time of that nature. Life begins at conception in biological terms. My child of 30 weeks was as complete as if it had gone for another 10 weeks inside its mother. The child weighed under three pounds. The difference is only in weight, not the reality of what is there.

There are those who put forward the premise that there is some logic to arbitrarily draw a point at which we would not allow abortion on demand. It is a response to the philosophy that if one cannot see it or feel it, it does not exist. Is that not why they say the mother should be permitted to kill the child before birth, if she wishes?

However, that same child is solely dependent on the mother one day after its birth. If it is isolated with the mother on an island, that mother is required under our law to ensure that the child continues to live. Whether she is required to breastfeed the child or subject her body to the needs of that child, our Criminal Code requires the mother to do that very thing. Otherwise she will be charged with a variety of offences such as child neglect, perhaps manslaughter. There are all kinds of laws in this country to protect that one-day old child. The Criminal Code requires the mother to provide the necessities of life to her child.

• (1740)

We hear stories every day, and everyone concedes it is scandalous, of a five-year old child abandoned by the mother in an apartment or in the woods or in some isolated place. Our society will not accept that because the child is there and can be seen. There is no umbilical cord. There is no defence after a child is born of control over one's body. These mothers cannot reason that their liberty is infringed upon by the responsibility to look after this one-day old child. There is no argument. I have never heard of one.

This forces the question, where is the logic and the consistency? It is the absence of consistency which is most alarming because it reflects the collective rationalization that a large measure of our society has undergone. As I said earlier, there is a historical precedent for such a collective social denial of biological and legal realities.

It concerns me that a body of law which is evolving in this country to protect the unborn child in many areas, does not, as I speak, extend to the protection of the unborn child from the

arbitrary termination of its life. That does not reflect, in my view, the value system of this country

Let me speak for a moment about our value system and the value system I bring to this debate. I am not here simply to regurgitate religious dogma of any denomination. My views on this issue reflect the fundamental belief that human life is something different from and superior to all other forms of life. I believe that life comes from a superior being which we, at least in the Christian religions, call God. So there is that basis, and I happen to accept that. It is fundamental. However, it is not the sole basis upon which I make my argument. If I did not believe in God, I would stand here today and as forcefully make my case because the jurisprudence of this country and of our civilization is there.

There have been other periods in our history when rights were denied. Rights exist out of respect for our fellow man, not necessarily because they are dictated by one religious group or another. There are plenty of laws enacted by people who have no belief in the sanctity of life. They support it and make the case today that the unborn must be protected because they believe that our laws should reflect the realities. There are those who base their case on what I would call secular, philosophical views. In other words, how can we as a society terminate the life of an unborn child?

In closing, I would urge all Members to reject the main motion and to support the amendment I have tabled with the Clerk. I would like to move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Gottselig), that the following amendment to the main motion be made: That all the words in the motion after the words "should prohibit the performance of an abortion" be deleted and the following substituted therefor: While allowing those medical treatments which are necessary to prevent the death of the mother or to remedy a condition that if left untreated would cause the death of the mother, and such legislation shall require the appointment of legal counsel to represent the unborn in any determination process relating to the foregoing.

That is my amendment and I urge all Members to support this amendment when it comes to a vote only 16 hours from now. I urge all Members to stand for the right of the unborn child to live so history will record this period of time as a bright time, as an enlightened time in the evolution of the laws of this country, not for political purposes, but for a solution to a difficult question that is consistent with the values of our country and the laws which have evolved.

Mr. George Henderson (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely important debate we have entered into. At the outset, I want to make my position very clear. I am a pro-life person. I have held this view for many, many years. I have heard the arguments put forward yesterday afternoon and evening in this House from others who do not share my view, and I respect those arguments. But I have not been convinced by those arguments, nor the arguments I have heard over the years from those who support abortion.

My position is based on my belief that life is sacred and that life begins at conception. Earlier this year there was a Private Member's motion which I supported. This motion would have guaranteed rights for the unborn. I must say that I had hoped the Government would have handled this issue in a little better way. First, the Government tried to push through Parliament a multiple choice resolution. This came before the House some time ago. When that fell apart, the Government substituted this motion. To me, neither motion is acceptable. In fact, both of them are unacceptable. I want to read part of the Government's motion:

> "Such legislation would prohibit the performance of an abortion, subject to the following exceptions:
>
> When, during the earlier stages of pregnancy: a qualified medical practitioner is of the opinion that the continuation of the pregnancy of a woman would, or would be likely to, threaten her physical or mental well-being; when the woman in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner decides to terminate her pregnancy; and when the termination is performed by a qualified medical practitioner; and
>
> When, during the subsequent stages of pregnancy: the termination of the pregnancy satisfies further conditions, including a condition that after a certain point in time, the termination would only be permitted where, in the opinion of two qualified medical practitioners, the continuation of the pregnancy would, or would be likely to, endanger the woman's life or seriously endanger her health."

I believe that this motion is a thin disguise for abortion on demand. The words in the motion are worthless. For instance, how does one define "the earlier stages of pregnancy"? Furthermore, on what grounds would a qualified practitioner decide that "the pregnancy of a woman would, or would be likely to, threaten her physical or mental well-being"? I reject the motion. I do not like its language. It renders no protection at all for the unborn.

• (1750)

We might ask why the Government would put forward such a motion. In the game of hockey when a player is trying to run out the clock that is called ragging the puck. The Government claims that through this motion people will get a sense of the House. I hope that we get a sense of the House. I hope that we get the right sense of the House. But I believe that the Government is running out the clock. In other words, I hope this is not debate just for the sake of having a debate. This debate, whatever the outcome, will not resolve this very emotional issue. In any case, I will not dwell on why the Government brought this motion forward rather than a piece of legislation at this time. I will be honoured once again to cast my vote for the unborn.

In the last year or so Members of the House have grappled with two very important issues, that of capital punishment and that of abortion. My belief in the sanctity of human life compelled me to oppose the reinstatement of the death penalty. The issue of abortion has now aroused another emotional debate. As I mentioned earlier, I am opposed to the notion of abortion on demand. The issue of capital punishment is very difficult since there is no doubt that we all have to be honest with ourselves in the case of hardened criminals who rape and

murder young boys and girls. It is difficult for us to wrestle with the issue. We know that many ex-convicts come back on the streets in too short a time. While I believe that at that time the penalty should be much harsher and much stiffer, I certainly could not support legislation that would have asked someone to push a button or pull a cord to take the life of an individual. If I could not do that myself I could not see myself supporting legislation that would allow others to do it.

Like most of my colleagues, my position is deeply rooted in my community and the values that we share there. Our community is based on family. Those families revolve around their children. We also celebrate and share in the gift, indeed, the miracle, of human life.

In 1973, in my own family my youngest son came to a very untimely death at the age of six years. That presented a difficult time for both my wife and myself. I think that it is only those who go through such an event who believe as strongly as I believe in the sanctity of life. It is not an easy thing. I know what parents have to go through. We read about them in the papers almost daily, whether they deal with the death of children as a result of highway accidents, drownings or if they are the victims of merciless killings. It is difficult to accept. We must have a belief. We must believe that there is someone who is above all this. I believe that these things are meant to be.

It is through that sort of belief that I take the stand that I take here in this House this evening, a stand which I have taken for the last number of years. It is not a political belief. It is from the heart. The life of an unborn child should not be arbitrarily terminated. Human life deserves the full protection of the law. The motion now before the House does not provide that protection.

Other Members have spoken of the various methods of abortion. I will not repeat the graphic details. However, I am convinced that Canadians share my abhorrence of these methods.

Certain Members of the House have argued that man's desire to control woman lies at the heart of this debate. I do not believe that since it is a complete disregard for human life. Most of the letters I have received from my own constituents with respect to this issue have come from women. I would say that 99 per cent of them are against abortion.

I will not speak or dwell long on this issue. I wish to put my position on the record as to why I will vote the way in which I will vote. I believe that the motion is wrong. However, I will certainly support amendments that will help to make it and the ensuing draft legislation correct.

Last night the Hon. Member for Willowdale (Mr. Oostrom) indicated that he would be introducing an amendment to the motion which states that all the words in the motion after the words "should prohibit the performance of an abortion" be deleted and the following substituted therefor: "While allowing those medical treatments which are necessary to prevent the death of the mother or to remedy a condition that, if left untreated, would cause the death of the mother."

I certainly urge all Members to examine their conscience and to support that amendment tomorrow when we vote. I sincerely hope that a majority of Members will reject the Government's resolution and thus protect those who are unable to defend themselves—the unborn.

That is all I have to say on this very emotional issue. I hope that all Members will search their conscience. I believe that if there is one thing that this Parliament can do and do right it is to protect the unborn.

Mr. Reginald Stackhouse (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, from time to time Parliament has the opportunity to address itself to the profound issues of human existence. We have such an opportunity in this debate. I have to say that as a listener I have been impressed by the way in which so many Members even though they hold differing views have spoken from the heart, spoken from the depths of their own experience, their own understanding. In such a debate points are reiterated, and if one comes later in the debate, he or she may well wonder what he or she can say that has not been said over and over.

• (1800)

I want to focus particularly on one dimension of the debate which is of great significance and is included in the motion before us, that is, the need to balance the rights of the mother and the rights of the foetus, a balance that I submit must at least be attempted, for justice is not achieved when any right is made an absolute over all others. Making an absolute of the right to choose is such an example.

For instance, in his classic on the right to choose, the right of the individual to shape his own behaviour, John Stuart Mills asserts, in his essay: *On Liberty*, that the individual has the right to choose what he will do with his own life as long as his behaviour does not injure another. That philosophy is basic to this debate about abortion. A mother certainly must have the right to choose, but equally society must have the right to limit those choices when the rights of the foetus are threatened, particularly and most profoundly, the right of the foetus to live. What gives society that right?

I have to submit in this debate that it is the common humanity that mother and foetus share. There can be no more significant demand made upon the state than its duty to protect innocent human life. If we believe that the foetus in the womb shares a common humanity with the mother and indeed with the society into which that foetus will ultimately be born, we have to focus some attention in this debate on that common humanity.

Therefore, I raise with you, Mr. Speaker, the question: When does this humanity begin? When can we say that the foetus shares with the mother, shares with you and me, a common humanity that must give to that foetus the same

protection that you and I expect to receive from the state, the protection against the threat to our lives? When does this humanity begin?

There are many who profoundly and sincerely believe that it begins at conception with the fertilized ovum in the uterus making its way to the womb, which will be its first family home, and even there the fertilized ovum is a human being, a child, a baby. That belief is widely shared and profoundly held. However, it is not held by all, and it never has been. It has never been shared by all who profess the same common faith. For example, in the 13th century St. Thomas Aquinas, whose teaching is generally recognized as the perennial philosophy of western Catholicism, spoke of the human soul being given to the foetus many weeks after conception. There are now many who suggest that the humanity of the foetus is not identified until sometime later than conception, such as the development of the brain or the achievement of what we now call viability, namely, the competence to survive outside the womb.

I cite the examples of medieval and modern simply to show how there has always been, and there is now, a variety of opinion in response to the question: When does human life begin? I put it to the House that there is no scientific data that establishes when humanity begins. There is data on when life begins, but when we ask the questions when does humanity begin and when is the foetus truly human and sufficiently human to claim on the state the obligation of protection, we have to say that there is no scientific data to answer those questions and no empirical evidence to force on any of us an answer which all reasonable people must accept. There is not even any single religious or theological assertion in which all believers concur. Perhaps they should, but the fact is that they do not. Therefore, we as a Parliament are left with the question when does human life begin and left with the lack of a definitive, final answer supported by universal consensus.

It is for that reason that I find the motion before us very difficult to accept. It implies that Parliament can at some point express in legislation a time in the pre-natal development when the foetus becomes human, becomes sufficiently human that it can make a claim on the state for a more serious, a more demanding protection than would be given to it before.

I submit that when Canada's abortion law is written, it will serve the country better if it treats the pre-natal period as a continuum, as an ongoing development from the time of conception. I ask, Mr. Speaker, which of us can believe himself justified to say that the foetus is human at 26 weeks, but not 25 weeks; at 20 weeks, but not 19 weeks; at 16 weeks, but not at 15 weeks; at 12 weeks, but not 11 weeks?

Should we not recognize that there is a developing humanity within the womb, a development that continues even after birth itself? We believe that part of being a human is what we call personhood. It is recognized widely that such personhood does not issue into the world with birth; personhood is something that develops even after birth during the infant years of interaction with other humans, the mother, the family, and the playmates. I make this point for the following reason. If a newborn infant can be said not to possess the fullness of human personhood, the fullness of self-consciousness, we do not deny that newborn infant is human, and for the same reason we should not deny that the foetus shares with us a humanity which makes a claim upon us as a society and as a Parliament to offer innocent human life the protection that is its due.

There are many who, having accepted that claim, oppose abortion on any ground whatsoever. There have been in time many who have opposed abortion even to save the life of the mother. As recently as the reign of Pius XII the claim could be made that direct abortion was always unacceptable, that the human life of the foetus was so inviolable that even saving the mother's life through a direct abortion could not justify the deliberate taking of the life of the foetus.

There are few Canadians who now support that position. I am aware that there are those who still try to make it palatable by invoking what teachers of ethics have called the law of double effect. This is the belief that an action which is good in itself is justified, even though unintentionally it may cause another action which is evil.

I submit that in the context of abortion terminating a pregnancy in order to save the life of the mother, invoking the law of double effect, is intellectually dishonest. It is much more ethical to assert that no right is absolute, not even the right to life, any more than is the right to choose.

• (1810)

Our society asserts that the right to life is not a valid absolute. It asserts it by accepting the necessity to take human life, under prescribed and legislated conditions. That is how our society justifies the use of armed forces, trained, equipped, ordered, and authorized to take life should the need be there. That is how our society can justify armed police forces within its own borders, whose members can legally take life under prescribed conditions.

As a country we have not made an absolute out of the right to life. In the instance of abortion, surely there are occasions when the right of a mother to live must take priority over the foetus to live, when the right of the mother to choose her life will take priority over the right of the life that is within her.

Our law has generally recognized that, for even in the Criminal Code before 1969 when abortion was prohibited it was also explicitly stated that the penalties against abortion would not be levied against the physician or other attendant who performed an abortion to save the life of the mother. We have always accepted that there can be at times a hierarchy of rights.

We need a law on abortion that will respect the right of the mother to make this kind of a claim. We need as well a law that will respect the right of the mother to a healthy life. Realism reminds us that her role as a mother perhaps of other

children makes that right essential not only for herself but for those for whom she is responsible.

I am aware that many Members of the House, as many citizens of the country, are uncertain about a law on abortion including that because of the way in which they believe that the previous law was abused, that very often claims were made on behalf of terminating a pregnancy because of an alleged threat to the health which in reality was not a serious threat; and that the law was used and abused in the interest of what in fact was abortion on demand.

I ask the House to consider the abuse of that law should not prevent us from now providing within the law the right, the moral, the valid claim of a mother to a healthy life; that, rather, we should legislate on our own and in co-operation with other Governments in Canada provide for those steps and procedures which will assure that a law on abortion will be respected and honoured as intended by this Parliament, not abused, distorted, and made a way by which the intent of the law can be circumvented.

There are many people as well who believe that the mother should have a right to choose, in so far as she should not be obliged to carry a foetus to term when she had no responsibility for the pregnancy. Specifically I am referring to the victims of rape. There is some argument that I accept for legalizing the opportunity of a woman to terminate a pregnancy in which she had no say as to its initiation.

As difficult as it is in terms of the law, the rights and the claims of women victimized that way, however few they may be—and there are those who allege that the number is very few—notwithstanding the instance itself are of great concern to the person involved in this situation. She is not a statistic.

I believe that as unacceptable as the motion is it is possible for this Parliament to write a law on abortion which will achieve the balance intended by this motion, a balance between the rights of the mother and the rights of the foetus. I believe that such is intended by one or more amendments that have already been introduced and which the House tomorrow may find more acceptable than the motion on the Order Paper.

I want to devote my remaining minutes to an amendment which I have already submitted to the Clerk. It deals with a dimension apart from whether there should be abortion or whether there should not be, that is, an amendment which recognizes that a mother does not operate within a vacuum, that she is operating within her own life situation, that we do not deal with the question exhaustively just by saying that abortion is right or it is wrong. I want to submit an amendment which will recognize that we are dealing with a very human situation, with a woman who is facing a pregnancy which, for whatever reason, is unwelcomed by her.

Therefore, I believe that it should be mandatory for any medical practitioner advising or recommending that the woman consider or have an abortion and terminate her pregnancy to be required to inform her of available counselling services, to provide her with information and counsel on what services can assist her in continuing the pregnancy and giving birth to the child, finding support in the community and, if she desires, arranging the adoption of that child. It is that we would impose such decisions on her, but that she will be aware of them, that she will also be informed about the possible consequences of having an abortion, the possible psychological and physical harm that can be occasioned by terminating the pregnancy. She may decide anyway to go ahead with it, but she should be aware that it is not as simple and as faultless and as free from injury that she may have assumed.

In other connections, in other work that I did, I have known what such counselling can do, particularly for young, single mothers who may find themselves in a large city without any family, without any connections or personal relationships, who have found themselves for whatever reason engaged in a relationship that has made them pregnant and knowing no one, have wondered where they can find some help and some direction.

Is an abortion the only alternative that is open to them? The fact is that no, it is not. There are communities and institutions where such women can find assistance, where they can find care. There are agencies that will arrange for the adoption and the future well-being of a child that is born under such circumstances. My hope is that when we write a law we will provide for a greater stress upon that kind of counselling so that that need can be met.

The motion on the floor is right in seeking to balance the rights of the mother and the rights of the foetus. I submit that the way it proposes to do that is not the only way. It is not the best way. For many of us it is not an acceptable way, but it is objective to some. I hope that tomorrow there will be an opportunity for the House to vote on amendments that will provide a better way and offer a greater hope to this country.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, thank you for providing me with this opportunity to say a few words in this very, very important debate. I want to begin my remarks by describing one of the disappointing aspects of this debate. It is not that it should not take place, because it is an issue that touches the lives of every one of us and concerns every one of us. When I say "us", I mean Members of Parliament and the people of Canada *per se*. It is an issue that is considered to be extremely critical for many. It is appropriate that we debate the issue of abortion and how a progressive, thoughtful country ought to deal with the issue.

• (1820)

A certain amount of what we are seeing and hearing in the House of Commons today is an illusion. There is an impression that I think the House of Commons and the Parliament of Canada is giving, namely, an impression that we are dealing with the issue, that leadership is being provided, that a decision is being made, and that the issue is being resolved. As you well

know, Mr. Speaker, such is not the case. We are not dealing with a Bill. We are not dealing with legislation. That is how Governments govern. That is what we expect from a prime minister, a cabinet, and a government. We expect them to bring forward legislation to take a position, to provide leadership and pass legislation either in its introduced form or in its amended form through the House of Commons and through the Senate, the Parliament of Canada.

However we are not doing that here today. We are debating a very general motion. I do not need to remind you, Mr. Speaker, because I know your interest in this issue, that immediately following the Supreme Court decision which occurred nearly half a year ago, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) said that it was incumbent upon the Government of Canada to act immediately, to take decisive action as quickly as possible, and to introduce legislation to deal with the perceived crisis created as a result of the Supreme Court decision. The Minister of Justice said six months ago it was urgent that legislation be brought forward immediately to deal with the situation, but no legislation was brought forward. No legislation has been brought forward and no legislation is before the House of Commons today.

We all recognize that Parliament is in its dying days; in a matter of days or weeks this Parliament will be dissolved and we will be into a general election. In other words, no legislation will be introduced despite the promise of the Minister of Justice and the comments of our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney). In a sense the Government is playing politics with this very important issue. It is giving the impression to the people of Canada that somehow or other the Government is dealing with an issue about which so many Canadians feel deeply, yet the Government is not doing that at all.

It is allowing Members of Parliament to make speeches on all sides of the issue and to present amendments on all aspects so that they can go back to their constituencies in the pre-election or election period and say: "Look what I tried to do. The Government of Canada did not do anything. The Cabinet did not do anything. The Prime Minister did not do anything, but this is what I tried to do". However, no changes in legislation or changes in government policy have been made. In a sense it is a relatively hollow exercise. I feel the people of Canada are being somewhat betrayed. There is a great deal of hypocrisy demonstrated by the Government's action. After the votes take place, whatever the outcome, nothing will have been resolved. The *status quo* will be as it is today. Many Canadians want some kind of initiative by the Government. It is a difficult decision, I admit. It is a difficult decision for our Prime Minister to take. It is a difficult decision for the Cabinet to make, but that is what Governments are all about. Making decisions is not easy, particularly on issues such as the one we are debating today. I feel in a sense that the Government has failed to deal with this one, especially for those who felt that legislation ought to be brought forward.

I want to begin my substantive comments by saying that all of us are for life. In a sense, all of us, not to get caught up with the terminology that is so often used, are promoters of life. We are pro-life. We are not anti-life. I become somewhat offended when people suggest that certain Members of Parliament are pro-abortion. That gives the impression that Members of Parliament like the notion that some women will terminate a pregnancy. Obviously such is not the case. There is not a Member of Parliament who is not for life, who would not like to see unwanted pregnancies eliminated 100 per cent.

As we all know, there are realities in this world. Some countries have been taking steps to prohibit abortion and to make abortion illegal. In Brazil where abortions are banned, over one million are illegally performed each year. One hundred thousand women each year die because of unsuccessful attempts to terminate pregnancies. Another 10,000 children each year are born malformed as a result of botched abortions. Simply abolishing abortions in a legal sense does not do away with unwanted pregnancies. Perhaps a little closer to home is Ireland which has taken strong steps to prohibit abortions, yet the number of abortions that take place is not out of line with most other countries where abortions are permitted. The Irish women simply go to England to have their abortions.

Let us set aside the notion that by passing legislation of some kind we can eliminate abortions from taking place. None of us like to see the termination of pregnancy. None of us like to see an unwanted pregnancy. Perhaps that is why so many of us feel a more appropriate initiative would be for Members of Parliament to introduce measures and legislation when necessary that would see the number of unwanted pregnancies in Canada reduced and, indeed, eliminated.

We could do much more to support family planning. As a matter of fact, the Government has cut back on funds to organizations that attempt to assist people planning their families. We could be doing much more in providing for children. Child care is the most obvious example before us. We all recognize that today, as we debate this issue, there are more than one million children in Canada receiving care in unlicensed child care facilities. We would like to see that situation changed. Yet the Government's initiative, while it is a step in the right direction, falls far short of meeting that requirement.

Thousands and thousands of families across this country with children are not adequately cared for because facilities do not exist. We are not doing much to meet that demand. We should be doing much more by providing services to families to enable them to care for their children more appropriately. I do not have to remind you, Sir, that women earn 64 cents for every dollar that men earn. That is plain and simple discrimination against women, in this case against many mothers. Mother led families, almost by definition, live below the poverty line and in inadequate housing. We see children taking advantage of the food banks and soup kitchens. It is a disgrace in a country as rich as Canada that each day thousands and thousands of children have to depend upon these kinds of facilities.

Let me deal with better education and schools. I come from British Columbia. There is movement in B.C. to try to get family planning and sex education out of the schools. We all know that wherever decent programs of sex education have been introduced in schools the level of unwanted pregnancies goes down. There is a direct correlation between the two, yet we see governments taking steps to keep young people ignorant on matters of this kind.

• (1830)

I am very concerned that the motion before us is inadequate. It is very vague at best. It describes early stages when abortion would be allowed and later stages when it would be restricted. What are those stages? There is no mention of that.

Implicit in this motion is the idea that women are having abortions without much thought being attached to the process. Yet the facts are totally at odds with that. I trust women. We all believe, or at least we should believe, that a woman should have the right to make a responsible decision on consultation with her physician, and I am sure in most cases with many others, about abortion. After a thoughtful process of consultations, interviews and discussions reviewing the circumstances surrounding her pregnancy, if in the final analysis the decision is to terminate that pregnancy, who are we to say no to that decision? Surely, if we believe that women have the right to make decisions about day-to-day life, they should certainly have the right to make decisions about their own lives and futures.

I do not think that recriminalizing abortion under the Criminal Code, which for all intents and purposes is what this motion does, is the right thing to do. I do not think that imposing criminal sanctions against women is the answer to the very serious issue we are debating today.

When we consider the evidence, we see that 99.6 per cent of abortions performed in Canada are performed prior to the twentieth week. Perhaps a more appropriate statistic would be that 89 per cent of abortions performed in Canada take place prior to the twelfth week. Again, there is this notion in the motion that so many women have abortions in later stages of pregnancy when in fact the evidence is totally to the contrary.

When I ask why the Government is doing this, it says that it wants to get a sense of the House to assist it in its future decision making on this issue. As I said earlier, this House is about to end and there will be a new Parliament in a matter of weeks or months from now. Using this logic, we will have to go through this process once again to get the sense of the new House in order to give the Government direction.

This is not the place for the Government to conduct Gallup polls on this issue. A Gallup poll has already been conducted. The polls clearly indicate that the overwhelming number of people in Canada believe that the decision to have an abortion or not to have an abortion is a decision that ought to be made by a woman in consultation with her physician.

The statistics are rather overwhelming. On April 13 of this year, Gallup found that virtually 70 per cent of the people of Canada thought that the decision to have an abortion should rest with a woman in consultation with her physician. If the Government wants to get some sense of how the people of Canada feel about this issue, the evidence is clearly there. It does not have to conduct a Gallup poll in the House of Commons.

One thing I believe we are overlooking in this weak government initiative is the whole matter of reproductive technology. For months and months now, there has been much debate in these halls, in the various committees and between Members of Parliament about the changing reproductive technologies that are coming into being in Canada including *in vitro* fertilization, surrogate motherhood, the use of foetal tissue for scientific experimentation, gender selection, and a whole set of other related issues. These issues ought to be thoroughly examined beyond the partisan work that often takes place in our own committees in the House of Commons, and of course, on those committees the Government has overwhelming numbers.

Why not take this whole matter seriously and have a royal commission into the whole matter of reproductive technology? As we have done over the years on other important issues, let us have a royal commission that would examine these issues carefully, explore the latest information, and hear the best witnesses available, both here and in other countries. It would then advise the Government and Parliament on the most appropriate ways to deal with these extremely serious ethical and moral questions. I suggest that we give serious consideration to a royal commission of inquiry into the changing reproductive technologies.

There are many other issues that ought to be included in this debate. I am proud of the contributions of all of my colleagues. As I have indicated, this initiative by the Government is an illusion. It will result in no change. The government motion itself is very vague.

I would like to suggest an amendment that I think would make much more sense in the realities of Canadian society today. It would read as follows: "That, in the opinion of this House, the Supreme Court of Canada, having declared that the provisions of the Criminal Code relating to abortion are inconsistent with the provisions of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and are therefore of no force or effect, law and government policy should respect the principle that the decision whether or not to terminate a pregnancy should be that of a woman involved in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner and that the procedure should be performed by a qualified medical practitioner and further, should ensure that the Canada Health Act and regulations are amended to ensure equality of access throughout Canada".

That summarizes my party position and it summarizes my own position.

This is a difficult issue. It touches the heart of every parliamentarian and of every Canadian. I have been impressed with the quality and the level of debate that has surrounded this issue from all sides of the House and from those with various points of view on the issue. I am proud to have been a part of that process.

Let us recognize that this is not a serious initiative by the Government. The Government's first effort was laughable. It tried at that time to be all things to all people. It tried to play politics with this very, very emotional issue. The Government then realized the folly of its ways.

After we in the Opposition tried to explain to the Government that it was not correct to proceed with a motion that took no position, the Government, after some reflection and probably after some consultation with people like yourself, Mr. Speaker, who are wise about parliamentary procedure, decided that that was an inappropriate way to proceed. It decided to take some kind of a position in a motion.

This motion will result in no change to the laws of Canada. It will result in no change to the *status quo*. In spite of the musings of some government Members who would like to suggest otherwise, next week, next month, and later on this year, the situation regarding abortions in Canada will be the same as it is now. It requires legislation to be changed. It is our job as a Parliament to make changes if they are deemed to be necessary through legislation, not through motions. A motion simply expresses a certain view on a certain issue.

While the situation at the moment seems to me to be meeting the needs of Canadians, the Government has tried to hoodwink us into thinking that it is taking an initiative. If the Government thought changes were required, and I am not certain it really believes that nor do I reflect that view, it would have an obligation to bring forward legislation.

In closing, I want to say that I do think the decision whether or not to terminate a pregnancy ought to be left with a woman in consultation with her doctor. Many people have asked me what would happen if we were to pass a law that prohibited abortions. What kind of penalties would there be for people who break the law, for the thousands and thousands of women who, in their own minds and after thoughtful decisions, decided to terminate pregnancies? How do we deal with that? Do we jail vast numbers of people? Do we impose horrendous fines on people who have had abortions? Of course not.

• (1840)

I call upon my colleagues to show compassion and understanding on this issue. In the final analysis, when we vote, we should ask ourselves if we trust women to make a responsible decision on their behalf and on society's behalf.

Mr. Bill Gottselig (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in this debate, and do so as a parliamentarian representing my constituents in this House and as a husband and father.

We must realize at the outset that all of us feel compassion for people. We recognize that there are times when people feel they are driven to seek abortions when they really should not be. Possibly what we need, at least in part, is to put a stronger support system in place so that people really will get the counselling they need, and the financial assistance if required, to assist women to carry their pregnancy through the full term and give birth to a live child.

We know there is a terrific shortage of children available for adoption. We hear daily of people who wait years for the chance to adopt a child and who ultimately go through life unable to have children.

I want to put on the record some of the scientific information available today dealing with pregnancies, and deal somewhat with abortion methods, and then read into the record some of the thoughts expressed to me by my constituents as a result of the Supreme Court decision last January.

We live in an age of information. We have a wealth of information at our fingertips, and many exciting developments in the new medical field of foetology. During the last decade we have had given to us dramatic evidence of the wondrous process of human growth before birth and have had confirmed that life does begin at conception. Ultrasound imaging and modern medical miracles of treating unborn children are just two of the examples of recent technological developments.

Human conception in a Petri dish through *in vitro* fertilization clearly proves that human life begins with the union of the man's sperm with the woman's egg. Through the work of Doctors Patrick Steptoe and Robert Edwards, Louise Joy Brown was conceived in a dish ten years ago and later implanted in her mother's uterus successfully. It was just a few days ago that we heard of the joy in the Brown household in England when they celebrated Louise's tenth birthday. They also have a younger daughter, six years old, who was conceived by the same process.

This process of *in vitro* fertilization has been repeated over a thousand times in various parts of the world, and it is indisputable proof that from the moment of conception a unique human being with years of potential development ahead of him or her comes into existence. At the single cell stage this being is alive, is human, is made up of 46 chromosomes, is sexed, and is complete, and programmed from within. He or she immediately begins a growth process that will be continuous until adulthood.

This is the manner in which the development progresses. Immediately upon fertilization, cellular development begins. The baby's sex is determined already at the single cell stage by the *x* or *y* chromosome carried in the father's sperm cells.

In the first week division of cells continues and new life implants itself in the mother's uterus. In the third week the foundation of the nervous system has been established. By the end of the week the heart is beating. In the sixth week brain

waves can be measured. The skeleton is complete. Hands and feet are beginning to grow.

In the eighth week the baby responds to pain. Feet and hands with fingerprints are formed. The heartbeat is audible through an office instrument. In the tenth week the baby's body is completely formed. In the twelfth week all organ systems are functioning. The baby continues to grow and mature.

As technology continues to advance and the developing baby matures, potential problems previously unknown and untreated can now be identified and corrected. The medical profession has become more adept at handling the complex surgical demands of operating on the brain and urinary tract of the unborn child.

In the preface to the authoritative textbook *Williams Obstetrics*, 17th Edition, 1985, the authors make the following observation: "Happily we live and work in an era in which the foetus is established as our second patient with many rights and privileges comparable to those previously achieved only after birth. To interrupt this process at any stage of the pregnancy is referred to as an abortion.

Now, we must ask, is the abortion a simple humane procedure beneficial to motherhood, painless to all? The answer is that it certainly is not. An artificially induced abortion, that is the intentional removal of the foetus from the uterus prematurely before it is viable or capable of sustaining life, and we are not concerned here with the spontaneous abortion, is directly killing a human life that has already begun".

During the first trimester the methods that are commonly used are the suction aspiration where the mouth of the womb is stretched open and a suction curette is inserted into the womb and strong suction tears the body in pieces, drawing it into a container. This is the most common method of abortion and great care must be taken to prevent the womb from being damaged.

Dilation and curettage are similar to the suction method except the sharp loop-shaped knife is used. The knife cuts the baby apart and the pieces are then removed through the cervix.

Various other techniques are used from the third to the ninth month, but the effect is the death of an unborn child. Absolutely no doubt about that. I will not go into all of the other methods but we are convinced, we have seen, and it has been proven by scientific methods, that the child does experience extreme pain during this procedure.

In discussing these procedures, until recently, no mention was made of the baby. However, through the use of real time ultrasound we have now seen the desperate efforts of a 12-week old unborn baby trying to escape the suction apparatus of the abortionist, and the pain.

In a recent book, Doctor Myron K. Denny strongly supports abortion, but he candidly talks about the risks. He says:

> When we consider the complexities of the human body we should not be surprised that abortion can result in complications.

There are many complications which can result from abortion including haemorrhage, infection, damage to cervix, perforation of the uterus, and perforation of the bowel. Following abortion many women are unable to conceive or to carry a child to full term.

● (1850)

I read an interesting editorial recently in one of the daily papers written by Mr. Bastien, a freelance writer in Ottawa. He writes:

> "Pro-choice groups often argue that anti-abortionists are seeking to impose their religious views on society. Defending the life of the unborn child is thus equated with religious intolerance."

He goes on to deal with that argument. His position is that to speak out against abortion is a natural law first developed by the Greeks, not the Christians. He goes on say:

> "The Sumerians condemned abortion about 2000 BC. So did Hammurabi 300 years later. In 500 BC, Hippocrates encased the condemnation into the Hippocratic Oath which, until it was abandoned by most medical schools a few decades ago, compelled all doctors to take every means at their disposal to protect the life of the unborn child. And the Declaration of Geneva, a modernized version of the Hippocratic Oath, adopted by the World Medical Association in 1948, states specifically: "I will maintain the utmost respect for human life, from the time of conception".

In the summer of 1987, only one year ago, I included an abortion questionnaire in one of my householders. We had a larger response to this questionnaire than to any other question we had ever posed to my constituents. There were over 700 responses to the questionnaire in which we asked very direct questions so that people could answer simply yes or no.

The first question we asked was "Should it be the right of every woman to decide, if she wishes, to have an abortion?" Sixty-one per cent of my constituents said no, 38 per cent said yes, and 1 per cent was undecided. We asked further: "Do you support the idea of abortion on demand?" Seventy-one per cent said no, 27 per cent said yes, and 2 per cent were undecided. We asked: "Do you support free-standing abortion clinics?" Sixty-six per cent said no, 32 per cent said yes, and 2 per cent were undecided. We asked: "Do you support the present Criminal Code which does not give any rights to the unborn child?" Sixty-three per cent said no, 32 per cent said yes, and 5 per cent were undecided.

I want to emphasize that the position which I hold, that is, the pro-life position, is supported by a large percentage of my constituents. During the last few months, and particularly earlier this year, I am sure that all parliamentarians received a lot of mail from their constituents.

During the debate which is taking place we often hear that abortion is a woman's issue. I say that yes, it is a woman's issue, but it is also a man's issue and a family issue because it affects the direction our society will take and what we are telling other countries throughout the world about us as Canadians.

Within the first month to six weeks after the Supreme Court decision I received a total of 650 letters. Of these, 324 were from women, 139 were from men, and 187 were from couples, and often from families, and every member of the family down to the smallest child had signed the letter. They all had basically the same message—"abortion is wrong, the Supreme Court is not governing us, you were elected to govern us, you make the rules".

I am sure that my mail would not be unlike that of a Member from eastern Canada or the extreme West. I consider myself to be a westerner although I am told by my British Columbia colleagues that they are the true westerners.

I want to read into the record some of the thoughts of my constituents on this issue. The came from people of a wide variety of stations in life. There were letters from young people, teenagers, university students, senior citizens, doctors, lawyers, farmers, and so on. One reads:

> "I believe it is the duty of government to provide protection for human life. It is totally incongruous that a person be charged with murder if the life of a week-old child is taken, yet the same atrocious act, some say, can be legal if carried out several months earlier. Those who think in this vein should re-read MacBeth's words as he contemplated Duncan's murder:"
>
> "This even-handed justice commends the ingredients of our poison'd chalice to our own lips."

This individual goes on to say:

> Further, it is utterly unthinkable that individuals who have been lacking in responsibility in sexual behaviour, can claim "rights" that enable them to take life in order to extricate themselves from the result of their actions. Such a course of action becomes all the more offensive when ones who abhor this procedure are asked to finance it through taxation.

Another constituent writes:

> "I have personally seen the pro-choice videotape wherein Dr. Henry Morgentaler, himself, admits that the pregnancy rarely threatens the life of the mother. With medical technology such as we have today, pregnancy is safer today than ever before.
>
> The argument that women want control and freedom of their own body is totally unfounded! Science and medicine give us evidence that in pregnancy there are two bodies. Regardless of the lack of value they may wish to place on that smaller or newer body, that it exists as a body, may be denied only at the sacrifice of intellectual honesty. The tiny baby at conception has his/her own genetic coding which is different from his/her mother's. This should also answer the question of when "personhood" begins.
>
> Do women forget that fifty per cent of the babies they choose to abort are female human beings? They clamour for freedom of women but, obviously, not freedom for all women."

Another constituent says:

> "The Supreme Court decision of January 28, 1988 is certainly a very disturbing one. We speak with great intensity against the holocaust of the 1940's in Germany, but now we have legalized the silent holocaust that will only increase in our own country. That is, thousands of unborn children will be killed each year in Canada."

I would like to conclude my remarks with a quote from the New York State Medical Society. They say:

> "—from the first moment of conception, there is a living creature in process of development—and—any interruption to this living process always results in the destruction of life—"

That fits very well with the topic we are discussing today. It could have been written at any time in the past few years, certainly since I became a parliamentarian. That, however, was written in 1867, the year of Confederation. Even then abortion was resulting in the destruction of life.

Germany learned by its mistakes. In a 1976 decision the West German Supreme Court invalidated an abortion on request law stating:

> "Let other nations do as they please. We know from bitter experience the enormities that result from denial of the sanctity of human life; the assumption that some lives are "worthless" and hence disposable at the whim of the individual or the will of the State . . . Human life represents an ultimate value . . . Therefore protection cannot be limited and no distinction can be made between unborn and born life."

I will not be able to support the motion introduced by the Government. I intend to support amendments which have been introduced by various colleagues such as the Hon. Member for Gray—Simcoe (Mr. Mitges) and the Hon. Member for Kitchener (Mr. Reimer). I am on record as seconding the amendment introduced by the Hon. Member for Cape Breton Highlands—Canso (Mr. O'Neil).

• (1900)

I ask all Members of the House to consider seriously this question and to consider the sanctity of human life, particularly the lives of the unborn.

The unborn have often been described as our future. They are future Canadians. I urge all Members to examine their consciences carefully and consider all the options. I ask them to look at all the reasoned arguments that have been put forward here and do as I intend, vote for life.

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to participate in the debate with regard to abortion. I approach this debate with a sense of optimism so that we may begin to try to resolve what has become a difficult issue for legislators as well as for Canadians.

There is no law and there are no programs to protect the unborn. I am against abortion on demand and I believe that there ought to be a law to replace the previous enactment.

Having said so, I am reminded of the words of Edmund Burke when he said:

> "Your representative owes you, not his industry alone but his judgment; and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

I have come to my judgment, after listening to Canadians across this country and in my constituency, many of whom have been women, medical doctors, nurses, lawyers, clergymen, schoolteachers, fishermen, steelworkers, coal miners, grandmothers, teenagers, and, yes, countless numbers of organizations with varied opinions. I have come to respect the views expressed by all those different groups and I hope they will come to respect my view.

I approach this issue not in a partisan manner but in a manner which I believe represents the best possible course of

action in developing good public policy for all Canadians. In doing so, I have asked myself and I am sure countless Canadians have asked: Why has the Government of Canada taken so long to bring forward a piece of legislation to address the issues we are now debating?

It should be remembered that we are not debating a Bill. We are debating a motion, a motion which is merely to test the barometers of views held by Members of Parliament on this particular subject matter.

We will have amendments, and those amendments will also attempt to reflect a particular view, although not a detailed perspective, on the subject matter of abortion.

The motion is a statement of intent, not a detailed piece of legislation. Although Members may not agree with the entire motion or the amendments, we are debating and voting not on precise legal terms but on the intent as to what future legislation may or may not take.

I believe the Government has taken considerable time to introduce this motion because it is not certain of the direction in which it wishes to proceed. It is plagued with the problem of balancing the interest of the woman with the rights of the unborn. In my view—and I am genuinely concerned—for a law to be effective, whether that law be restrictive or permissive, there must be consensus among Canadians in the direction in which the country should proceed. As a result, time has lapsed, misinformation has prevailed, while Canadians anxiously await the Government of Canada to respond.

I say sincerely and humbly that I would have hoped that the Government of Canada would have lived up to its word and presented the Canadian Parliament with a piece of legislation and not a motion. I understand and, yes, I sympathize with the difficulties it is confronted with. Nevertheless, it is the Government's duty, its responsibility to have provided Parliament with legislation.

In responding to the challenge of the Supreme Court of Canada when it determined in its judgment that Section 251 was unconstitutional, let us put aside the rhetoric and focus our attention on how we as legislators can in fact balance the interest of the woman with that of the unborn.

I phrase the question differently, for I attempt to reduce it to its most simplest terms, without of course diluting its effect. The question I pose is as follows: What can the state do to facilitate a person to carry their pregnancy to a full term? In response to that question, I have heard a great deal from a variety of groups and individuals. Notwithstanding their sincerity, which I found in great abundance from all sides on the issue, I believe the state ought to enact federal legislation.

The question for many then becomes whether we have a permissive law or a restrictive law.

For me, as a Catholic, the problem is even more difficult. In approaching this problem I remind the House of the words of Father Raymond Decker, author of various articles on jurisprudence and the relation of religion and law, Assistant Dean at Loyola University School of Law, when he said:

> "In approaching the problem of abortion from a Catholic point of view, a fundamental distinction must be made at the outset. That distinction lies between, one, the norms of a personal conscience developed from deeply held Christian commitments; and, two, the norms that are to function for a society made up of a multiplicity of convictions developed from various religious and philosophical commitments."

These are two quite distinct realities, but it is my contention that a restrictive law will not necessarily adhere to the teachings of one particular church. I have always believed in the separation of church and state, and for some to argue otherwise is, for me, counterproductive.

If we are to be effective in reaching our objective, I suggest it is perhaps time that we have a restrictive law with reasonable exceptions, as opposed to a permissive law regarding abortions. I do not believe there are no circumstances whatsoever in which a person should be denied access to abortion, such as rape or incest. There are probably others, but frankly I cannot nor will I attempt to try to provide all those reasons or situations. I am not a medical doctor.

The significance of a restrictive law, as indicated to me by my own bishop, will over time be educational in value. Although persons holding a different view may argue that to use the law and its public force as a means of compelling others to agree with my view is not fair in this pluralistic society, I respond by saying that in the interest of balancing the right of a woman to liberty and security of her person and the responsibility of society to protect the unborn, it may in fact require a restrictive statute.

Even though a law on the books may merely be educational in value, even though it may be permissive in its substance or restrictive in its content, it is preferable to that of having no law at all. The legislation, however, must be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms which reflect the fundamental value and inherent dignity in each human being and the inherent worth of human life, and which achieve the balance between the right of a woman to liberty and security of her person and the responsibility of society to protect the unborn. That part of the motion that we are debating clearly must be the objective of any new law. I am hopeful that the Supreme Court of Canada will address the issues clearly when the Borowski case is adjudicated later in the year.

• (1910)

I am hopeful that the legislators will be able to enact legislation which addresses both the rights of the woman to liberty and security of her person and the responsibility as a society to protect the unborn. May I remind you, Mr. Speaker, of what Edmund Burke said in the British House of Commons in 1775: "All government, indeed every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act, is founded on compromise". I am not asking Members to change their views, but if they share the objective that there must be a balance, as

indicated in the motion and as indicated by all speakers of all Parties, this must be the cornerstone of a new piece of legislation.

In addition to a restrictive law, I believe the state must also provide financial assistance and programs in order to educate and inform the Canadian population on why we should try to reduce the incidence of abortion. Remember, Sir, a person in the exercise of his or her conscience must have good, factual, and up-to-date information. Presumably those who desire to seek an alternative to abortion must also have similar information, as well as counselling. Therefore, the state should provide financial assistance for both pre- and post-natal care.

If we are to restrict abortions in this country, it logically follows that the state must also bear the responsibility, along with others in caring and providing the necessities of life. It is folly to think that the state will not provide financial assistance for housing, child care, nutritional food, as well as other necessities. In addition, the state should provide counselling and information to parents in order that they may discuss sexual attitudes and information with their children as frankly and fully as necessary. The state should also assist educators, who should be allowed to arrange for comprehensive programs appropriate to the developmental stages of the children such as family life, sex education, contraception information, personality development, relationships, and the development of their own values as responsible sexual partners. Why can the state not provide financial assistance to such institutions as the Family Services of Eastern Nova Scotia in order they many retain individuals to provide information and counselling?

The Badgley report on abortion law concluded that the current abortion rate can be reduced only through effective changes in contraceptive practices. A study of some 37 developed countries released in 1985, revealed that teenage pregnancy rates and abortion rates were lower in countries where there was greater availability of contraceptive services and sex education. Similar effects have been noted in Ontario. Teenage pregnancy, the birth and abortion rates are declining more rapidly in those countries where sex education and family planning services are well established.

Let me say that I share the view that it is important for Parliament to respond to the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in a substantive manner. However, in doing so, let us proceed with care in drafting a new abortion law. Let us also be reminded of our objective, namely, to prepare and introduce legislation consistent with the Constitution of Canada, including the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which reflects the fundamental value and inherent dignity of each human being and the inherent worth of human life, which achieves a balance, as indicated by so many, between the rights of a women to liberty and security of her person and the responsibility of society to protect the unborn.

Tomorrow I will not be here, but I wish to register my vote against the motion as introduced by the Government. I would have hoped, as I said at the outset, that instead of a motion we would be dealing with a piece of legislation. However, for whatever reasons, justified or not, we are dealing with a motion. I cannot support this particular motion.

Mr. Vince Dantzer (Okanagan North): Mr. Speaker, tonight, for the first time since I have been in this House of Commons, I am not particularly pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this resolution. The reason is that I intend to oppose this government motion. I am not one who finds any joy or comfort in opposing motions put forward by my own Party. However, the Government's resolution on abortion is essentially a resolution allowing abortion on demand and that is a position I cannot support. I would hope the majority of this House would not support this resolution.

Under the old rules it took three doctors to approve an abortion. Even then we had between 60,000 and 70,000 abortions a year in this country. If we were to require only one doctor to approve an abortion, there will be many more. This Government's resolution is more like the New Democratic Party policy position. As I understand it, tonight the official NDP policy was put forward, which is certainly one of abortion on demand.

It saddens me that my Party does not show greater moral leadership on this crucial issue. It angers me that my Party presents this motion as a compromise position on this difficult issue. Those who characterize this resolution as a "compromise" must think we are all fools. Certainly, if we support it, we would be knaves. We are discussing this matter today because, as we all know, the Supreme Court of Canada overturned Section 251 of the Criminal Code of Canada. That the Supreme Court of Canada ruled as it did was, I must admit, a surprise. Like many other Members of this House, particularly those Members of the Conservative Party who were here in 1982, I believed the Liberal Government of that day and Prime Minister Trudeau when we were assured that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms would have no affect whatsoever on Parliament's right to deal with abortion and with capital punishment. We were further assured by the notwithstanding clause which gave Parliament the right to override any Supreme Court judgment. As a result, many of us in this House, and on this side of the House in particular, voted for the Charter when all our instincts told us not to do so.

To have voted for the Charter of Rights is a vote I will regret all my life. We now find, of course, that the federal Government—at least this one—is not prepared to use the notwithstanding clause. We know now that the Supreme Court is prepared and, indeed, insists on dealing with abortion and on creating rights where none appear in the Charter. It is now apparent to me from reading the judgments of the majority, that the justices first came to the conclusion that Section 251 was bad and then, and only then, attempted to find reasons to support their beliefs. The reasoning they used, I suggest, is bad, the logic faulty, and the different judgments seem to have more to do with the judges own personal philosophy, be it

political or otherwise, than with solid legal arguments. However that may be, we in Canada are now burdened with a Supreme Court that exercises political functions.

Certainly, no one can argue that the issue of whether it is lawful to kill an unborn child must involve political, philosophical and moral considerations as well as legal ones. We have a court that exercises political functions but does not have any political restraints or responsibilities. The court is appointed but not elected. It has no need to answer to anyone, let alone the voters of this country. What this means, of course, in my view, is that we are less of a democracy than we were before the Charter.

It is my view that Parliament should decide the great social and political questions of our time and of our society, not appointed judges.

Earlier I said I had been reluctant to vote for the Charter because I had seen the experience of the American system where its Supreme Court had become the final political arbitrator on moral issues. I was not impressed. What special training do judges have to decide moral issues? What right have judges to impose their moral or political values on Canadian society? In a shorter time we have come as far as the Americans. Our Supreme Court has usurped the legislative power of Parliament and now purports to enact social legislation. The only way they can be stopped is to use without hesitation and with much more frequency the notwithstanding legislation. It has been said that war is too important to be left to the management of generals. I suggest to the House that social policy containing important moral issues is too important to be left to lawyers and judges.

• (1920)

Social legislation belongs to Parliament. If we pass legislation on abortion and the rights of the unborn, and if later that legislation offends the sensibility of the justices of the Supreme Court, then this Government or any government should quickly and forcibly use the notwithstanding legislation to restore the power and responsibility of Parliament.

In my view the solution to the issue we debate today is simple, although the concept may be very complex. An unborn human being has an inherent right to life from the moment of conception. To extinguish the life of that unborn child is to violate and deprive him or her of that right. It is a wrongful act and therefore must be forbidden and made unlawful.

Should there be exceptions? I say only when there is a present, immediate and real danger to the life of the mother. Some, and perhaps many, object to that position. Some abortionists will say that the foetus is not a human being; it is not fully developed; it is only a potential human being; it only has the right to life after it is born. If those people argue that it is not a human being, they have the obligation to say what it is. They have an obligation to give it a meaningful name. Is it a vegetable, an animal, a mineral, or a piece of tissue? What precisely is it in the womb if it is not a human being?

But they cannot do so because the only name for an unborn child is what it is—an unborn human being, a human being with its genetic map in place from the moment of conception, a human being separate, distinct and uniquely different from every other human being, including its mother. It is dependent on her but separate and distinct from her. The best of science recognizes that the human foetus is a human being from conception.

Those who support and promote the so-called semester system for abortion believe, it seems, that an unborn child becomes more human as the months go by. They believe, it seems, that humanness depends on human development. It would make as much sense to suggest a person becomes less human if he or she loses both legs in an auto accident. Would society tolerate a law which allowed the random killing of anyone under 15 years of age but called for the death penalty if anyone over 15 were murdered?

The idea that an unborn child is not a human being results in very strange situations. In British Columbia we have legislation that provides fines up to $500 for the destruction of an egg of a bald-headed eagle. We accept that law. No one argues that the destruction of an egg is not really the destruction of an eagle. However, it does show the distortion of our values. We pay about $300 to kill an unborn child, but we fine anyone $500 if they destroy an unborn eagle.

In Quebec, as in the rest of Canada, women are paying up to $300 to destroy their unborn children. Yet the Government in that province also proposes to pay up to $2,000 for a person not to destroy their unborn child. Surely, we are a society with confused and mixed up values.

Another argument the abortionists use is the slogan espoused by the NDP. In fact, it has a motion before the House. That slogan is: "Abortion is a personal matter between a woman and her doctor". Let us examine the rationality of this slogan. A society exists and survives as a society by reproducing itself by the birth of children. A society would cease to exist if children do not replace those who die.

Consequently, it appears to me that society has a real interest in the number of children born into that society. To say otherwise is nonsense. The birth of a child is therefore not exclusively the interest of the mother; society is also involved in a very real way.

The Supreme Court recognized this. Chief Justice Dickson said: "Like Justices Beetz and Wilson, I agree that protection of the foetal interests by Parliament is also a valid government objective". Aside from the fact of what business the Supreme Court has in defining what are the Government's objectives, and I really do not know, it is a recognition that the Government has that power.

Yet another anomaly is the claim that whether or not an unborn child should be aborted is a matter for a woman and her doctor. Why her doctor? Surely, the question to kill unborn human beings is a philosophical and moral issue. I do

not know of any group of people who are less qualified to decide a philosophical or moral issue than the medical profession. By training, by experience, by education, they are probably the least qualified group to decide philosophical questions. I suggest to the House that most medical people could not tell the difference between a philosophical precept and a wet paint sign.

However, I will admit that after a decision to kill or not to kill has been made, then and only then a doctor is competent to carry out that decision. If the decision has been to allow the unborn child to live, a doctor can best ensure this goal. If the decision has been made to kill the unborn child, a doctor will be adept at finding the most efficient method of killing the unborn child, but a doctor has no qualifications whatsoever to assist in making the original decision. To say that abortion involves only the mother and the doctor ignores the unborn child and society and the rights and interests of each—rather a large omission I would say.

It has also been argued that an aborted baby is better than an unwanted child. This is really an argument put forward by those who would use abortion as a method of birth control. There is no such thing as an unwanted child. Presently, in this country there are thousands of married couples eager to adopt children. They wait years and years for this opportunity. There are never enough babies for adoption. Yet our society allows between 60,000 and 70,000 unborn babies to be aborted each year.

We as a nation do not at this time reproduce ourselves. Yet we continue to abort between 60,000 and 70,000 unborn children each year.

There is another argument that is sometimes used to favour abortion, an argument which is to me most horrifying indeed. It is this: "All right, I will agree and admit that an unborn child is a human being, but when you have to choose between the rights and freedoms of a pregnant woman and the rights and freedoms of the unborn child, then the rights of the woman are paramount and more important than those of the unborn child". Some people are more equal than others—horrors of horrors. I actually heard that argument at a hospital board meeting in my constituency.

Today, as I stand in the House of Commons speaking against this philosophy, I cannot but think and say to myself: "How ironic, how very ironic". Some 40 years ago and more I and others in this House of Commons, and a great many fathers and mothers of Members of this place, went to war, the Second World War. Many gave their lives. Others gave their health. They did this to fight against Hitler's idea that some human beings were more equal than others; that some German Jews were less equal than some Germans; that some old people were less equal than some young people; and that some ill or handicapped people were less equal than some healthy people.

• (1930)

Are we then faced today with the same philosophy that some human beings are less equal than others? How ironic. We won that battle and we might lose the war. If the abortionists win this fight, it is my view that the philosophy espoused by Hitler and Nazi Germany in 1939 will prevail today in our times.

Members of this place face a very profound issue. Many are opposed to the use of abortion, particularly abortion on demand, and the use of abortion for birth control. These people will state that they are not in favour of abortion. However, we live in a pluralistic world, and I cannot impose that option on others who do not believe as I do. There is the argument that one cannot legislate morality. Well, perhaps that is true. However, legislators can show moral leadership. Legislation should reflect the highest standards of society, not the lowest. We legislate against theft, murder, and sexual crimes. These are areas in which we legislate on moral issues, and although we cannot legislate morality, and people continue to rob, steal, and rape, it is because we take stands on moral issues and legislate that there are undoubtedly fewer of these acts than there would be if there were no legislation.

It is a proven fact that each time the law is loosened or eased there are more abortions. One can speculate that if during Abe Lincoln's career the abolitionists had used the "pluralistic argument", since at that time many people firmly and sincerely believed in the practice of slavery, then there might still be slaves in the United States.

There is a time for strong leadership and that time is now. A society which is not prepared to defend the safety of its most innocent and defenceless members is a society embarked on its own destruction.

In the summer of 1982 a mother wrote about this type of society. She stated: "The United States and the West are sinking into a narcissistic, self-obsessed society preferring in the poet's words: 'Bondage with ease rather than strenuous liberty'. We consign our old and sick and needy to giant, faceless bureaucracies to ensure our own non-involvement while we indulge in drugs, sex, and electronic diversions. We want to gain access but be protected at all costs from failure. We want to be free but safe, licentious but sterile, married but uncommitted, parents without obligation. We want energy without producing it, money without earning it, freedom without maintaining it, and love without returning it."

I urge Members of the House to show moral leadership and vote to stop abortion on demand, and the use of abortion for birth control. We must vote to protect the life of the unborn child. We must then move to assist the pregnant mother to find other more acceptable solutions, assisting the single mother to keep her child if she wishes, provide adequate long-term support in such areas as housing, companionship, and education.

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate today with a

certain carefulness that I know other Members share. We in the House are well aware of the diverse views held by Canadians and other elected representatives on the subject of abortion. We know how deeply held those views are. We know that this issue challenges our intellectual resources and it touches our emotions perhaps more profoundly than any other issue. It is for this reason, the very nature of this debate, that many Members would have preferred to avoid the debate.

Yet, its seriousness and, yes, its divisiveness, requires that this debate must be held. It is for this purpose that we in this House are elected, to face difficult national issues and make decisions about them. It is to this sometimes uncomfortable reality that parliamentarians subject themselves. We must stand up and be counted on one side or another on issues about which public opinion is intensely divided.

At the beginning of my comments I wish to be on record as bearing no ill will against those whose views differ from my own. I know full well that personal experience, background, philosophy, and knowledge of one's experiences all shape an individual's final conclusion on the question of abortion. I know that very few, if any, celebrate abortion. Rather, views differ over its acceptability or over the grounds on which it is acceptable. I know also, if my views are to be listened to and considered, that I must be prepared to hear the arguments of others. Nonetheless, I hope the House will come to a firm conclusion to reject the motion before us and adopt an amendment that would support the principle of the sanctity of human life.

It has been suggested that this debate is about competing principles. One competition is between the right to the security of the person of the pregnant woman, and the right to life of the unborn child she carries. Another competition, I suggest, is between the principles of the sanctity of life and quality of life.

As Minister of National Health and Welfare I deal every day with issues of the quality of life. I have sworn to do all I can to improve the quality of life for all Canadians, and in other countries where it is possible for Canada to make a contribution as well. Standing up for the sanctity of human life is missing something essential where a concern for the quality of life is absent, but concern for the quality of life without insistence on the sanctity of life lacks any foundation that will withstand attack.

This debate concerns a fundamental question for our culture and our nation. Will we build our culture on a durable foundation, a foundation that has served humanity for centuries, or will we go into the future hoping to improve quality of life without the security of a bedrock principle that life itself is paramount?

The problem is this: Quality of life is a relative term which by itself cannot be determined too much by persons other than the one involved. Are poor people, disabled people, or dying people totally deprived of the quality of life, or only partially? Are they deprived of the quality of life compared to whom and by what standard? Do we not protect their rights on the grounds that no one else should determine the value of their lives or the quality of their lives? Is it not true that this country has embraced an enthusiastic tradition of human rights in order to protect each one of us from the arbitrary judgments of others? Is it not because, as the poet has said, "no person is an island", that we protect all our rights in order to protect my rights?

If we insist on the sanctity of life then we have somewhere to go as we try to improve the quality of life of people who are unwanted, or who struggle to cope, or who suffer. My great fear, and I do mean my fear, is that if we do not retain this principle of the sanctity of life, we will have no retreat, we will have no refuge when the goal of quality of life becomes arbitrary and abused.

• (1940)

How do we determine the quality of life? I have heard today, not in this debate, but people saying "viability". When is a person viable? Is a person who is suffering from cancer, without the care of our health care system, viable? Yet, we do everything to help that person through his or her last hours, because we base our whole health service on the sanctity of life.

I have heard the words "if a person is disabled". Surely, there should be a different criterion as to whether that potentially disabled person should have the right to live. Who is disabled? Is the person who is blind more disabled than I am, who might not have the intellectual capacity that that person might have? Does the person who is blind or deaf who can make music or be an artist, have less right to the sanctity of life than I do, who might have all my sensory faculties but not have the abilities of that person?

What concerns me about the debate—not in this House, because I think all Members of this House have tried very honestly to wrestle with this question—is that the words I hear in the public become part of the word usage, without looking behind what the words mean and what the words say about our society. Has it been in vain, for the person who is disabled and has worked all of his or her life to try to get legislation passed in the Parliament of Canada and in the legislatures of our provinces, so that there will be legislation protecting and respecting the disabled? Are the disabled not as acceptable before birth to society as those who will not be disabled?

When we speak about the quality of life, that is a very transitory, very arbitrary principle. That is why I believe law must be based on immutable principles which will not only protect society but which will be directional for society.

The Supreme Court has invited Parliament to balance the competing interests of the unborn child and the pregnant woman. I am pleased with the decision of January 28. A number of people in the pro-life movement said that it was a travesty. I personally do not feel that it was, and I will tell the House why. For all the years those of us who have worked so hard to have the rights of the unborn protected, we always had

difficulty conveying to the public that there was another competing right, the right of the unborn. It is very intense at this time because we are now in debate on exactly those competing rights.

I think the debate—looking back to 1969, what was happening at that time when the Criminal Code was changed—has with it the essence of the rights of women and the rights of the unborn and how in our own human frailty as Members of the House we come to conclusions that protect both?

As I said, the Supreme Court has invited Parliament to balance the competing interests of the unborn child and the pregnant woman. I believe the motion before us fails to do that. If the primary right is to protection of life before quality of life, then that right must become effective when life begins. Otherwise, the right has not been guaranteed.

Members have been told that the motion is an effective compromise in that it balances those competing interests. It is not a balance; it is a decision not to extend protection of life to the unborn child.

Many people believe that it is outdated and naive to think that life begins at conception. Medical opinion, however, describes life as a continuum, there being no point at which any qualitative change in the foetus would in effect draw a line between no life and life.

George and Sheila Grant, in an essay called *Abortion and Rights*, and in a paper published on February 16, 1988 by Mr. Iain T. Benson, Chairman of the Civil Liberties Section of the B.C. Branch of the Canadian Bar Association, said, and I quote: "About the unborn child, its genetic individuality remains unchanged from the moment of conception through to death, whenever it occurs. All the changes after conception are of degree, not of kind. The foetus is the weakest stage of all of us at the beginning of the continuum of life. We get stronger and bigger for some period thereafter, but as unique individuals we are the same from conception onwards. To hold otherwise is bad science. The fact that criminal law has said that life begins, as far as murder is concerned, only after the child has proceeded in a living form outside the mother, does not mean that is unworthy of consideration prior to this point. This is precisely why the law has criminalized abortion, due to the realization that the foetus, prior to birth, is in need of protection."

Members may be interested in knowing that the World Health Organization has been quoted on both sides of the issue, but the WHO had no difficulty in defining what so many in our country say cannot be known, namely, "utmost respect for human life is to be from the moment of conception".

No one supporting the motion before the House should take comfort in the thought that it is supported by medical science, nor should anyone think that the motion is good law. We have to ask ourselves: What is the criteria of good law?

First, it must be acceptable in regard to its underlying principles. I have tried to explain that this motion is arbitrary in that it affords protection of life to the unborn, only after an unspecified period of time. This may be convenient for medical practitioners, but it is not sound science. Because there is no scientific basis for drawing a line, there can be no sound legal or ethical basis for drawing a line. If a line is drawn to indicate when life should be protected, it is an arbitrary line. Good law is not arbitrary.

• (1950)

Second, good law should accomplish its objective. The Supreme Court maintained that it is "a legitimate goal for Parliament to seek to protect the foetus". That goal must be balanced with the goal of protecting the security of the person of the pregnant woman. The objective of this law must be to balance these rights at all times. The only way, it seems to me, to balance competing rights is to determine acceptable grounds for the interest of one party taking precedence over the interest of the other party.

The amendment to the motion does what the motion fails to do, namely, establish consistent grounds on which an abortion can be performed. The breadth and generality of the grounds proposed for the first stage of pregnancy make a mockery of the principle of protecting unborn life.

Third, good law must be enforceable law. It is a difficult matter, especially with our history on Section 251 of the Criminal Code, because to make an abortion law work the opinions of physicians must be sought before the procedure can be performed. That requires some specification of the grounds for abortion in the law. Again, the amendment does that. It defines health in a way that preserves the right to security of the person of the pregnant woman. At the same time, it establishes the degree of seriousness required before an abortion can be performed.

The question of abortion is about more than law. It relates to the support we give our young people at home, at school, in our churches, and elsewhere in understanding their sexuality and in handling it in a mature way. It relates to the support we give to pregnant women as a society and as individuals and communities. Abortion is an issue that challenges men to be responsible to their partners and to the children they have fathered. In this debate we must stress that point. It is not only, and I say this not with any prejudice or criticism, a woman's issue. Men have been involved and men should remain involved and take the responsibility for their actions. It is for those reasons that in the last four years I have been able, with the help of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), my colleagues, and other Members of this House, to bring forward programs on child sexual abuse and family violence. Yes, we are using the computers in the Government of Canada to go after those who fathered children and who are not making support payments. I appreciate those programs are not as perfect as any of us in this House would like them to be, but they are a step in the right direction.

This debate has to be more than simply the burden of child bearing on women. I would think there is a commonality, at least on this point, between the two opposing points of view in this House. I hope we can resolve between us as human beings that although we might disagree on the fundamental issues of the debate we agree on this issue. For too long, and I say this with regret to those with whom I have associated over these years, those who have called themselves pro-life, that too often there has been criticism and not enough help. Too often there has been judgment and not enough compassion. Too often there has been a lack of understanding and not enough care. We have an opportunity, through this debate and onward, to take some of those hard questions that I believe are human questions and at least find common ground among all of us on them.

Yet, uncomfortably for us as Members of this House, I repeat that abortion is also a question of law. What we do in this debate and with this motion will say a great deal about the value we place on life itself. That in turn will have a profound effect on how we cope in the future with medical technologies and ethical issues that a few years ago were unthinkable. I have heard the comments of my colleagues in the debate with respect to reproductive technology. I want to say to them tonight that what they have said finds much favour, at least with this Minister. When we have resolved this primary question of abortion law, we must move on, without stopping, at every level, personal, families, groups, churches, local communities, cultural, and national, to prevent unwanted pregnancies and to support women, young people, and families who face difficult choices.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I plead with my colleagues in this House to determine to reinforce, first, principles that life itself is paramount because it is a precious gift to humanity. Only as we go so far as to protect the right of the most defenceless of us will we have the assurance that there exists a strong foundation to protect the rights of all of us, including the unborn, the youngest of us, and will this House have fulfilled its duty.

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in this debate on one of the most important issues to come before this Parliament. I have studied with care both the legal and the moral philosophical implications of the motion before the House. I have particularly listened with care not only to my colleagues, our very eloquent spokesperson on the status of women, the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Ms. Dewar), and the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell), but I have listened as well with care to those who have either supported this motion or those who have proposed amendments to it which would severely restrict the scope of legal abortion in Canada.

I have a particular personal interest in this question, having tabled in the House over the last nine years three different Private Members' Bills which would have the effect of repealing Section 251 of the Criminal Code and allowing this decision on the question of abortion to be made by a woman in consultation with her doctor. It is for that reason especially that I am very pleased with my colleague from Hamilton Mountain who has proposed an amendment speaking on behalf of the New Democratic Party and caucus in this House which states:

> "We believe that law and government policy should respect the principle that the decision whether or not to terminate a pregnancy should be that of the woman involved in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner, and that the procedure should be performed by a qualified medical practitioner; and further should ensure that the Canada Health Act and regulations are amended to ensure equality of access throughout Canada."

I am also interested in this question having during the last election been attacked vigorously by a group which claims to respect life. This group circulated thousands of leaflets throughout my constituency of Burnaby which I personally found deeply offensive and hurtful, a leaflet which says on the cover "Hey, Svend, pick on someone your own size". It has a photograph of a foetus on the cover and inside it states: "Protect all of our children, born and unborn. Defeat Svend Robinson, NDP".

As well, Joe Borowski who currently is before the Supreme Court of Canada, the highest court in the land, marched outside my office with his supporters and accused me of supporting murder.

I want to say that those kinds of attacks, whether they be through a leaflet with a photograph on it or whether they be marching outside one's office, are hurtful and deny the profound respect which not only I but my colleagues have for human life.

• (2000)

I think it is important to take a moment in this debate to examine how it is that we have arrived at this point in the House of Commons and what it is in clear terms that the Government is proposing in its motion. It was some 20 years ago that Parliament adopted legislation which permitted, in certain restrictive circumstances, therapeutic abortions and which allowed birth control devices to be advertised and sold in Canada. That occurred only 20 years ago.

Parliament at that time was made up of 263 men and one woman. That woman was Grace MacInnis, the former Member of Parliament for Vancouver—Kingsway, who argued then as we argue today. She argued with vigour, with force and with eloquence that the law must respect the fundamental decisions of women on this question, made in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner.

Today, some 20 years later, I look around this House and, as my colleague for Vancouver East has pointed out, I see that it does not reflect the mosaic that is Canada. We have not heard in the House of the pain of the single woman who is facing an agonizing decision whether or not to have an abortion, after she had been told, following amniocentesis at 17 weeks, that the child she would bear would be anencephalic, would have no brain, and would die. We have not heard from that woman.

Let us be clear. The motion that is before the House states that that woman, facing that desperate decision, and the doctor who would respond to her despair, to her cry for help, would both be criminals and would be subject to imprisonment, should they make the decision to abort in those circumstances. That is the effect of this motion. I say that that is profoundly unjust and immoral.

We do not hear in this House from the 13-year-old, the teenager who did not even know how to prevent an unwanted pregnancy because no one had ever told her. Her parents would not talk about it and there was no sex education in her school. She has become pregnant and she is afraid and she feels alone. She does not feel that she is ready to be a mother.

Are we in this House prepared to tell that young teenager that if in fact she has an abortion, she is a criminal, and that the doctor who performs that abortion is a criminal as well, and that they should go to jail? I am not prepared to say that, and I believe it would be profoundly wrong for this Parliament to adopt a motion or a law which would brand as criminal women in those circumstances or the doctors who in those circumstances assist them.

Grace MacInnis spoke for choice. Stuart Leggatt, who succeeded her in the House of Commons as the spokesperson on Justice for my Party, spoke out strongly for choice. In doing so, they and I pointed to the obvious weaknesses of Section 251 of the Criminal Code before it was struck down. We pointed to the divisive and draining battles for control of hospital boards which occurred over this issue when the boards should have been concerned about a range of health care questions. We pointed to the fact that lengthy delays resulted in more complications and the fact that less than even 25 per cent of hospitals had therapeutic abortion committees and even fewer actually performed abortions.

The highest court of the land heard a challenge by Dr. Henry Morgentaler, and I for one want to pay tribute to Dr. Henry Morgentaler for the courage he has shown on this question. Following that challenge, the Supreme Court Justices said that this law denies women security of the person.

[*Translation*]

Chief Justice Brian Dickson said, for example: "Forcing a woman, by threat of criminal sanction, to carry a foetus to term unless she meets certain criteria unrelated to her own priorities and aspirations is a profound interference with a woman's body and thus a violation of security of the person."

Madam Justice Bertha Wilson said in her judgement: "The decision whether or not to terminate a pregnancy is essentially a moral decision and in a free and democratic society, the conscience of the individual must be paramount to that of the state."

[*English*]

So the Supreme Court struck down that law. Hon. Members will recall that immediately afterward, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) and other Conservative Ministers stated that it was necessary to move immediately to bring forward new legislation to fill what they said was a legal void. They predicted chaos in Canada. Six months later, their predictions have been proven wrong. I believe that the case has not been made for the recriminalization of abortion.

Canadian women have fought for 20 years for the repeal of Section 251. For us to move back to an era in which this question was one of criminal law rather than of health would, in my view, be to take a giant step backward.

What is it that the Government is proposing in the motion before the House? I believe that the motion before the House represents a fundamental abdication of responsibility by the Government. The motion states that in the opinion of the House, certain actions should be taken. This is political expediency of the worst sort.

If the Government believes that legislation is in fact necessary, why is it that it has not brought forward such legislation? Why is it that it brought forward a motion to test the House, knowing full well that this House will not in fact be making the decision on legislation? What kind of flimflammery, what kind of hypocrisy is that? The Government knows that the speeches made in the House and the votes taken on this motion will make no difference whatsoever because ultimately, it will not be this House that decides this question.

As well, in early October, the Supreme Court of Canada will be hearing an appeal on the Borowski question from the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal. I suggest that if the Government were serious about drafting legislation, it would await the outcome of that appeal, if indeed it believes legislation is necessary, which I do not. So this is an abdication of responsibility.

• (2010)

However, I want to suggest there is a more fundamental question here, which is this. Those who have spoken out in support of an amendment that would restrict access to abortion for Canadian women must surely recognize that such an amendment flies squarely in the face of the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. In short, it is unconstitutional.

Mr. Stevens: That is not right.

Mr. Robinson: The Hon. Member for York—Peel (Mr. Stevens) said in this House: "No problem; what the Government should do is override the Charter of Rights". What kind of contempt does that display for the women of Canada and the Charter of Rights? The courts have said that the law violates the security of a woman's person and violates freedom of conscience. Well, to hell with the Charter, they say. Ignore it. Override it. We do not like the decision. I say: what kind of position is that to take on a question of fundamental rights? The Minister of Justice has, fortunately, rejected that, but we do not know who will be the Minister of Justice in a future government.

I want to make a prediction, and it is this. Those who support this amendment to deny choice, when their amendment is rejected by this House, as it surely must be, those same Members will abandon their principles and do what? They will stand in their place and vote for the government motion. We heard the Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm) suggesting that yesterday.

I do not believe there is a need for legislation. Certainly I support the call for a royal commission on reproductive technology to examine a whole range of issues such as the question of gender selection, experimental use of foetal tissue, and other questions. However, the suggestion that we need a law to deal with this question from a criminal perspective ultimately betrays, in my view, a lack of trust and lack of respect in and for the women of this country. The suggestion that Canadian women or their doctors are in some way going to abuse this absence of legislation is refuted by the facts.

Then there is the suggestion of third trimester abortions. Some 99.7 per cent of all abortions in Canada were performed before 20 weeks. Canadian women are not irresponsible. They do not have to be told by a criminal law that this is a decision which is taken only with the most careful thought and is not taken irresponsibly. Indeed, in the province of Quebec, where the law has not been in force for some time, that has not been the case.

I suggest that rather than moving to recriminalize we should be taking steps to prevent unwanted pregnancies and make contraception more easily available. We should ensure that young people are provided with a better teacher than experience. We should increase the involvement of men, making them more responsible. We should look at new birth control methods and make this country friendlier to children. We should deal with child poverty and the desperate need for a comprehensive child care system, and ensure that we respect children and women in this land.

I want to close by quoting from a document.

[*Translation*]

In a Quebec Catholic monthly published by the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, a religious order, we read: "If we want to minimize the number of abortions, we are convinced that we must put in place the social conditions required for women to have a real choice about motherhood. Such measures however run counter to all governments' neo-conservative policies. Respecting an individual's freedom of choice on abortion does not imply that one would necessarily have an abortion oneself or that one accepts it in principle. It means refusing to impose one's own certainties and moral codes on others. It means accepting and supporting human beings in their complexity and their freedom."

[*English*]

I support that principle. I am opposed to the motion. Let us recognize the right of Canadian women to make this decision for themselves. Let us truly respect life in this country.

Mr. Ken James (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak in this very important debate tonight. Back in 1984, when I was in the process of deciding to run for election as the Member of Parliament for Sarnia—Lambton, I realized the subject of abortion loomed ahead as an issue, as it had been in so many other election campaigns. I believe that I owed my constituents a thoughtful and considered position. It was important that I seek out thoughtful input.

I had never been faced with this issue in my personal life. I have four children, and apart from the usual discomforts of pregnancy my wife had not suffered during them. I have never had to deal personally with the situation of young children at home and the possibility of losing my wife and my children their mother through the continuation of another pregnancy. However, I received important input from people who had experienced some of these things.

In 1984, then, I strongly believed, as I still do, that the health of the woman must be guaranteed and protected during pregnancy. In 1984 the concerns surrounding abortion focused on the definition of the health of the woman and on the existence of abortion clinics. At that time I looked into the existing legislation and after my review I felt that it afforded sufficient protection to the woman while at the same time providing protection for the foetus.

Last January the Supreme Court of Canada struck down that law. The Supreme Court justices were in no way determining that the woman had an unconditional right to abortion under the Charter. Rather, they held that Section 251 of the Criminal Code contravened a pregnant woman's rights under Section 7 of the Charter contrary to the principles of fundamental justice. The focus of the decision, as I understand it, was the determination that the therapeutic abortion committees gave rise to a situation which caused lengthy delays and in some cases precluded abortions entirely because the committees did not exist in all areas of our country.

• (2020)

As a result, access to therapeutic abortions was uneven and inequitable. The entire court agreed that, at some point in the pregnancy, the state interest in protecting the foetus through the criminalization of abortion could be important enough to override the Section 7 rights of the woman. However, the majority decisions were emphatic that the objective of protecting the foetus would not justify the complete removal of provisions protecting the pregnant woman from prosecution. The Justices warned that legislation which carried no exemption for the pregnant woman would be ruled invalid and that the entire process, from qualification decision to abortion, would have to be swift and widely available.

Since the Supreme Court decision I have done considerable in-depth study and analysis of this issue. I have discovered that the subject is far more complex and complicated than my original findings in 1984. The issue no longer involves just the

health of the woman and whether or not abortion clinics can operate. We must now concern ourselves with the constitutional rights of the woman and the constitutional rights of the foetus. We must examine issues such as swift and widely available access to abortion as well as examining the issue of foetus viability and striving to find a balance between the rights of the woman and the rights of the foetus.

It has often been said that there is no consensus in this country on abortion. I have read hundreds and hundreds of letters from the people of my riding of Sarnia—Lambton. I have asked advice and opinions from doctors and lawyers. I have spoken to young men, young women, teenagers, new mothers, grandmothers, and anyone else who would speak to me about their feelings on abortion.

I have talked to my family. I have one son, three daughters and a wife and we have had many discussions around the table. I was at a women's curling banquet last winter and sat at a table with 20 women. I asked them their opinions.

I believe that there is indeed a consensus on this subject. It has been my experience that the majority of persons living in my constituency believe that abortion must be available under certain circumstances and at a certain stage in pregnancy. It is in defining and delineating these circumstances and stages that Canadians look to Parliament for guidance and direction.

However, the Government cannot operate in a vacuum. The amendments, suggestions, and input brought forward and discussed during this debate will provide the Government with a sense of the approach Canadians want to see in formulating abortion legislation. I believe that this is a good thing.

The Opposition has continually criticized the Government for the vague wording of its motion. Yet, once again, we have evidence of just how easy it is to criticize and make headlines in the press without coming forward with alternatives. I realize that the deadline for filing amendments to the motion with the Clerk was 6 p.m. tonight.

It is interesting to note that the seven amendments filed yesterday and printed in today's *Order Paper* were all moved by government Members. These government Members did not throw up their hands and say that the Government is abdicating its responsibility. Government Members recognized that the government was inviting our participation and input, and we responded by giving the Government our proposed amendments.

I am happy with this procedure. Under this procedure I or any Member of Parliament can offer amendments to the main motion and give direction on formulating new regulations and new legislation on this very important issue. I filed an amendment to the motion with the Clerk. I would like to take the time I have left to discuss my stand on this most important issue.

There is a great deal of moral and emotional concern surrounding the subject of abortion. Certainly, I cannot condone or advocate abortion on demand. To my mind, unfettered and totally free access to abortion can be justifiably criticized on moral and emotional grounds. Yet, a total prohibition on abortion is also subject, I believe, to the same charge. The government motion and my amendment deal with abortion with strict medical procedures; abortion, not as a method of birth control, and not as a matter of convenience, but abortion in cases where the life or health of the mother could be jeopardized by the pregnancy.

I agree with the majority of my constituents and, I believe, the majority of Canadians, that abortion is necessary under certain circumstances. I have always believed, and continue to believe, that the life and health, both physical and mental, of the woman must be given priority.

I am a Member of Parliament. My background is in business, marketing, and farming. I am not competent to make medical judgments. I do not believe that I, as a member of the federal Government, have the right to make judgments like that. I do believe, however, that I do have a right, an obligation, and indeed a duty, as a Member of Parliament, to provide guidelines and discipline to the people of Canada and the medical profession to assist them in their decision-making process.

I believe that my position on abortion, as reflected in my amendment, strikes a perfect balance between the competing interests in this issue. In my opinion the termination of a pregnancy must be allowed only in cases where the life and health of the woman is jeopardized. Health must, most definitely, include mental health. I believe that in the first trimester of pregnancy abortions must be less restricted than in subsequent stages. My amendment would substitute "earlier stages" of pregnancy with "first trimester" of pregnancy. That would make the legislation more explicit.

I have too much regard and respect for women to think that an abortion is a choice they enter into lightly or frivolously. This is undeniably one of the most difficult decisions a woman will ever have to make. Canadian women facing the surgical trauma and emotional upheaval of abortion are owed the same quality of medical care that all Canadians have come to expect.

In considering the rights of women we must also not take lightly the rights of the foetus. A balance is essential, and for this reason my amendment proposes more restricted access to abortion after the first trimester of pregnancy than does the government motion. My belief is that only under extraordinary circumstances should the termination of a pregnancy be allowed in the final stages of pregnancy, and only in situations where there is no other medical solution to the health condition.

The second part of my amendment reads: "termination of the pregnancy would only be permitted where two qualified medical practitioners have, in good faith and on reasonable grounds, stated that in their opinion the continuation of the pregnancy would, or would be likely to, endanger the life of the pregnant woman or seriously and substantially endanger her

health and there is no other commonly accepted medical procedure for effectively treating the health risk; and when the termination is performed by a qualified medical practitioner."

• (2030)

I want to close by pointing out that abortions will continue and will always be a fact of life. I doubt there are any among us here today who would wish to see a return to the days of backroom abortions in unclean and unsanitary conditions, nor are any of us interested in seeing a time when abortions are performed solely for the convenience of the woman.

A balance of rights must be struck, a balance between the rights of the woman and the rights of the foetus. We must work together to find this balance because no matter how you look at it, the reality of the situation is that there is no legislation in the world which can effectively or capably protect a foetus without the co-operation of the woman.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, the debate so far has been a sequence of very interesting speeches and personal reflections, quotations even from philosophers and some thorough soul-searching on the part of those who have preceded me.

In most cases, Members have taken a position of pro-life or pro-choice, some have rejected the motion and some have taken no position yet. I found every speech remarkable, but I must say that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) missed a golden opportunity to give Canadians an insight of what he would do and should be doing in his capacity in formulating and developing programs and services aimed at the prevention of abortion. That was a great disappointment.

What brings me to this debate is the belief that in essence, we are dealing with a social and moral issue on which, instead of a polarization, we have to stake out the common ground, the middle ground for the good of Canadians. It seems to me that Member after Member has said explicitly and implicitly that no one is for abortion and no one wants abortion if it can be prevented. That is the large middle ground on which all of us, even those holding extreme views, can take a stand and begin to build.

The question now is: How do we proceed from here, from a society which reacts to abortion to a society which prevents abortion? We seem to have ideological problems. Some tend to see the interest of the mother and foetus as separate rather than one. For instance, the pro-lifers speak of the sanctity of the life of the foetus, but when it comes to a matter of life or death their concept of sanctity switches to the mother, as several Members indicated last night.

The pro-choicers instead speak of control of destiny and body on the part of the expectant mother who should, in their view, control the destiny of the foetus as well. The pro-lifer, then, does not want abortion but accepts abortion in case of danger to the mother's life. The pro-choicer also seems not to want abortion but wants to give priority to keeping the options open for the expectant woman.

Both groups, it seems to me, would have much more in common than they do now if, in their approach, they would focus on the mother and foetus as belonging to the same unit, so to speak, one dependent on the other.

If this observation is accurate, I submit that we are debating the wrong motion. Rather than a motion about whether and under what condition abortion should be allowed, it should be a motion on the measures we need in Canada to prevent most abortions. With adequate social measures, we would perhaps not eliminate abortions entirely but we would go a long way in reducing their numbers considerably.

What are some of the social measures and programs we need to prevent abortion so it be brought to the level at which it should be in a modern and civilized society such as ours?

I want to refer to the suggestions in the British Columbia Teachers Status of Women Journal of June, 1988. They are quite relevant in our search for answers. First, they suggest that contraception be more easily available. The shocking fact is that 46 per cent of Canadians believe that they do not have access to contraception and family planning services. For many others, they are prohibitively expensive.

The second suggestion is to provide young people with a better teacher than experience. It has been found that a shocking number of teenagers know nothing at all about how reproduction works, how their own bodies work, and how to prevent pregnancy. Their teacher is trial and error, plus television, movies and misinformation from peers.

The third suggestion is to increase the involvement of men. No woman ever made herself pregnant. Men should be helped to recognize their equal responsibility in all aspects of sexuality: Decision-making, obtaining and using contraception, and the handling of any crisis when it occurs.

Fourth, they suggest the development of support services. This is where the Minister of National Health and Welfare could have spoken strongly. Social services and economic assistance should be available for those who are prepared to go through with an unexpected pregnancy.

Poverty has been found to be one of the strongest encouragements for abortion. Therefore, we must make housing, day care, employment and counselling in general available and accessible, as many other Members who spoke before me have stressed.

These four recommendations advanced by the British Columbia Teachers Status of Women Journal in June of this year are aimed at preventing abortions and going to the root of the problem. The British Columbia Teachers' Federation stresses another point very strongly. It is that outlawing abortion would simply drive women underground to seek illegal abortions. Outlawing would not prevent abortions, but

rather would put at risk the health of the women unnecessarily.

It seems to me that the polarization of the debate on abortion in the House and, to some extent in the country, should be a matter of serious concern to all parliamentarians and citizens at large.

I submit that we should resist stressing what divides but stress what brings us together in tackling a social issue of such importance.

Politically and socially we must, from now on, work hard at identifying viable solutions. In that search, most of us would be more comfortable if a majority of Members in the House were to consist of women and, outside the House, if the institutions and organizations making statements on abortions were to consist of a majority of women as well.

• (2040)

Finally, in our approach we must establish the grounds for abortion openly, frankly, refraining from hyprocrisy. Many tough questions need to be answered which this motion does not even touch upon. For instance, should a woman have an abortion if the foetus is affected by a disease such as brain cancer? Does society have the right to impose a pregnancy on that woman? Does society have the right to impose a pregnancy on a woman who has been raped? Does society have a right to impose a pregnancy on a teenager who has been the victim of incest? At what point do we draw a line between the rights of the foetus and the rights of the pregnant woman? This is what Madam Justice Bertha Wilson asked Parliament to do. This is what this motion does not address.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, would we not be better off if, in developing a policy, we were to see the pregnant woman and the foetus as one unit, developing in harmony, supported by society? At the same time, if we are honest, we have to face also the painful reality that from time to time, and particularly so in the absence of social support programs, abortion exists in certain circumstances, unless we prefer to hide our collective heads in the sand. The motion before us today is vague, incomplete and lacks social purpose. Instead of producing a Bill accompanied by a strong statement of social measures and programs by the Minister of National Health and Welfare, aimed at preventing abortion not just regulating it, the Government, unfortunately, chose to conduct a poll in the House of Commons.

The motion also lacks precision. It is different in its English and French text at a crucial point. In the French a woman should consult a doctor before making a decision. In the English text, a woman should make a decision in consultation with her doctor. There is quite a difference between the two.

In conclusion, I would say that to drive abortion underground, to drive abortion abroad, to make it a remedy for the well-to-do, is not the way for Canada to go. Canadians deserve better, and I am sure you agree, Mr. Speaker. I hope that after the next election, because we are running short now of days and weeks, we will see presented in this Parliament legislation that will be accompanied by a social policy that will be strong on prevention, inspired by compassion and clear on the realities the men and woman of Canada face from time to time.

In essence, I believe that Canadians want the reassurance on a moral plane that no one really wants abortion if it can be avoided, second, a practical and compassionate set of solutions when it cannot be avoided, third, a substantial emphasis on prevention and, fourth, equal access once a policy on abortion is agreed upon. Unfortunately, the Government has not come forward with ideas. It has not come forward with a Bill. The Government seems incapable of giving leadership on such a difficult yet important issue. I suspect that tonight Canadians are rather disappointed.

Mr. Paul Gagnon (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to add my comments to this debate. I have listened very closely to the articulate and eloquent statements and arguments both from those opposing abortion and from those who are in favour of abortion.

In June, 1987, two of the most contentious moral issues of our day were debated in this House of Commons. We debated capital punishment and abortion. Both debates were vigorous and both of them centered on the sanctity of life. If one considers those two separate issues and takes them together, a person can develop four separate positions. The first position is that a person could say, yes, for capital punishment and, yes, for abortion. The second position could be, no, for capital punishment and, no, for abortion. The third position could be, yes, for capital punishment and, no, for abortion. The fourth position could be, no, for capital punishment and, yes, for abortion.

If one considers those four positions, and takes them in sequence, the first position, yes, for capital punishment and, yes, for abortion, the message is very clear. Life is not particularly sacred and not particularly precious. That message is logical and consistent. The second option would be, no, for capital punishment and, no, for abortion. The message there is life is precious. That is logical and consistent. The third option, yes, for capital punishment—the Clifford Olsons of this world do not deserve to be kept alive—and, no, for abortion. The message there is that life is so precious, those who have abused their rights should forfeit their own. That is logical and consistent.

The fourth and last category, no, for capital punishment and, yes, for abortion has its own message, and the only message I can understand is, kill the babies and save the killers. That is illogical and inconsistent. Yet last June of 1987, 65 Members of Parliament voted that way. I would accuse them of intellectual halitosis. They cannot have it both ways. Either they are for life or they are against life.

Abortion

The Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) rethought his position on abortion and stood in this House and renounced his previous position. I call upon the other 64 Members to rethink their positions, to be logical, and to vote for life.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Before I recognize the Hon. Member for Eglinton—Lawrence (Mr. de Corneille), I would like to recognize the Hon. Member for Nipissing (Mr. Mantha) who has a very short speech.

Mr. Moe Mantha (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a few moments to state my position on this important matter of abortion. I hold a pro-life view on this issue. I believe that life begins at conception. Some people say this is a woman's issue, but I believe it is a family issue, one that concerns you and me, Mr. Speaker.

• (2050)

I have four children. We adopted two girls some 18 years ago.

I was elected by the people of Nipissing to take a stand on difficult issues. That, Mr. Speaker, is what I am doing in the House today, and what I have done in my riding in the past months.

I have received thousands of letters from my constituents, young and old, male and female. They all say the same thing—abortion is wrong, and we must protect the life of the unborn from the moment of conception.

In closing, I would like to read a letter I received from a little girl in my riding.

> Dear Mr. Mantha:
>
> I would like to tell you how I feel about abortion. I thank my natural mother that she loved me enough not to abort me. Instead she put me up for adoption. Now I live with a family that loves me and cares for me. Mr. Mantha, abortion is wrong. Please protect the unborn children in Canada!

Just to reiterate, I would like to thank the people of Nipissing who respect the stand that I have taken on this important matter. Also, I would like to thank the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) for allowing us to vote according to our conscience on this difficult issue.

Mr. Roland de Corneille (Eglinton—Lawrence): Mr. Speaker, in our efforts to draft legislation on abortion we must, first, take into consideration the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada which struck down Section 251 of the Criminal Code on the basis of Section 7 of the Charter of Rights, to wit, a woman's right to liberty and security of person. Any legislation, no matter how well thought out and carefully worded which does not acknowledge or deal with the Supreme Court's decision *vis-à-vis* the rights of the pregnant woman is a waste of time as it will only be struck down again with the same or a similar rationale.

Some groups favour having no abortion legislation at all since any legal limitations as to time, circumstances or conditions may be construed as victimizing the woman and downgrading her position in society. That is one point of view. Other groups feel that unlimited access to abortion victimizes the unborn who, they maintain, as potential human beings have an unalterable right to life.

So the debate rages on between those whose views, no matter how well intentioned, would predispose them to draft laws in which either mothers or their unborn children would be victimized. The debate, couched in terms of a woman's right over her own body as opposed to the foetus's right to life, sets up a polarity presupposing that there has to be a victim. Unless the two poles can be, somehow, balanced, no viable legislation is possible. One-sided positions, whether they mirror indifference to the plight of women while trying to save the unborn, or indifference to the cry of the unborn while trying to raise up the status of women, are tragic because they do not even start to address the complexity of human needs which the abortion issue should be making terrifyingly clear.

The Supreme Court decision concentrated on the rights and status of women, at the same time clearly inviting us here in the House of Commons as legislators to consider the rights and status of their unborn children. Since its decision precludes victimization of the mother, and its invitation implies a reverence for the life potential of the unborn, any legislation embodying a polarity of concern wherein either mother or unborn child have to become victims is most undesirable.

Rather than prolong a no-win confrontation between pro-life and pro-choice let us, as legislators, address the issue from another angle, that of reverence for life. Reverence for life implies a reverence for the miracle of reproduction. It embodies an attitude of deep concern that each individual life be able to continue and fulfil its potential, not merely after conception but after birth as well. Lives dominated by poverty, despair and physical abuse signify not reverence for life but indifference and disdain on the part of the society which allows such situations to exist.

In its report to the National Executive Council of the Anglican Church of Canada the Task Force on Abortion gives the following statistics:

> According to the National Council of Welfare, though in the past two decades the over-all poverty rate in Canada has dropped from 23 per cent to 14.9 per cent, 56 per cent of single parent families headed by women are poor.

The resort to abortion for social and economic reasons, usually identified as the overwhelming reason for abortions in Canada today, is a judgment upon society and calls for prompt government action.

No child is born into a vacuum. Rather, every child from conception is readied for life in a complex network of family and community relationships. But many Canadian women today feel that they must resort to abortion as the only way of coping with a society which has no place for pregnant women or their children. Women feel that they must restructure themselves by emptying their wombs, whereas it is really society that must be restructured.

The report of the Task Force on Abortion went on to state: "When women choose to abort it is frequently in coercive, lonely and grief-stricken circumstances in which they feel completely unable to bear their child. Often, the biggest problem facing the woman is her lack of a real social and economic support system. Many women who choose not to bear their child make their decision out of alienation and hopelessness. For us, such despair cannot be left as the motive force. True choice must involve alternatives to despair".

The report went on to state further: "When thinking about abortion, it is important for us to reflect on what it means to be a woman in our society. In the fact of some ugly realities, women have many real needs and legitimate aspirations. Women need to have control over their own lives. They do not want to conceive a child through rape, whether inside or outside of marriage; nor do they want to be victims of coercive sex. They do not want their bodies used as objects of sexual violence through hard-core pornography. They do not want to be battered. They do not want to be dispossessed. The choice to bear children should not result in marginalization and poverty".

The task force report went on to state: "They do want the fathers of their children to nurture them; and when relationships end, they want the fathers of their children to pay support and not abdicate the emotional and economic responsibilities of fatherhood, condemning their estranged wives and families to a life of poverty, marginalized from the mainstream of society, without adequate child care services or retraining programs to enable them to enter the workforce or continue their education".

That, according to the report of the Task Force on Abortion is what women want. What do the unborn want? I suggest that, surely, they want the very same.

I must observe, then, that the resolution before the House and therefore the amendments thereto do not deal with and in fact ignore the issues raised by the Supreme Court to establish whether the foetus is a person and/or at what point the foetus enjoys human life. Nor does this legislation deal with abortion in its context.

The resolution deals with how to limit the mother or limit the unborn, perhaps pitting one against the other, but does not acknowledge or deal with such crucial matters as birth control, counselling, social services, violence, battering, child care, housing or conditions of remorseless poverty.

This resolution by itself is no solution because its effects are unequal. It punishes the poor and thus stalls off the necessity for Parliament to deal with the root causes of the real issues. Ultimately, it will not succeed in preventing or limiting abortions.

• (2100)

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton—Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, attempting to balance fairly the interests of mothers and those of unborn children approximately 4,000 days before the end of the 20th century is probably the most difficult, divisive issue imaginable for legislators.

The recent decision of a majority of the Supreme Court of Canada in the *Morgentaler* case to invalidate Section 251 of the Criminal Code, the therapeutic abortion section under which approximately one million abortions have been conducted since 1969 in our country, means that it is currently legal under federal law to do an abortion at any time for any reason whatsoever. At present there is no legal protection from this Parliament for unborn children from conception until their emergence as live births from their mothers. Fortunately, members of the highest court have indicated that it is the responsibility of Parliament to provide a new law for the control of abortion, providing that such complies with the Charter of Rights.

The intense national debate over abortion, to legislate or not, and if so how, is deeply felt on both sides of the issue and on all sides of the House. Many women strongly believe that if their ability to end a pregnancy is restricted it will thwart their personal goals and dreams. They especially resent the participation of men whether as legislators or as decision-makers in any abortion approval process because they know it is their sex which is most directly affected by pregnancy, abortion, and child rearing.

On the other side of the debate are those of us who believe a foetus is a human being whether at conception or at any other point before it becomes viable outside its mother's body. An abortion without a very good reason is wrong to those of us who feel that way, because all religions and all philosophies of life that I respect recognize and assert the sacredness of human life.

My own view of the matter is coloured in part by my limited understanding of Dr. Albert Schweitzer's reverence for life philosophy. The doctor-missionary once summarized his view thus: "The essence of civilization consists in this, that the reverence for life which in my will-to-live is struggling for recognition does get stronger and stronger in individuals and in mankind". Nowhere, to my knowledge, did the missionary-doctor speak specifically about the abortion issue. As all Members know it was only until recently that this issue was a very important one around the world, but there appears to me to be no doubt on which side of the spectrum Dr. Schweitzer would stand if he were alive today.

In an attempt to obtain as many views as possible of residents of southeast Edmonton on this subject, I sent a questionnaire to approximately 50,000 households early in July. There has been a flood of replies. Almost 5,000 have been returned, which is almost five times as many replies as I have ever received in a survey on anything. Many contained thoughtful letters, and I have read all of them with care. I wish to quote from some of the letters on both sides of the issue. No names are used since I was not authorized to do so by anyone who wrote.

Abortion

The following are some excerpts from the pro-life respondents. A constituent who identified herself as a 15-year old female stated:

"A foetus is a human life and a human life should be respected. I just wonder how you, David Kilgour, would like it if your mother at the present moment would come with a knife and stab you in the back because you were a nuisance to her social life."

A female doctor stated:

". . . to destroy a human life because of carelessness is an atrocity. It is just as intolerable of the members of my profession to agree to perform abortions, and that their enthusiasm changes as does the fee schedule and benefits allowed. As a profession, we need to present the other options, all of them, other than abortion to patients."

"As well, we must not neglect the ramifications to the mother (and her health) if an abortion is performed for her . . . I implore you to work toward legislation that will not only drastically reduce, but strictly control and enforce abortions in Canada."

An adult, and I do not know of which sex, stated:

"We need to take into account the effects on society of providing abortion on demand. We are already a disposable society. Are we now to the point of disposing thoughtlessly of future generations?"

A woman wrote:

"If we no longer value human life, our future will be bleak . . . every person is of worth—born or unborn, beautiful or ugly, smart or not so smart. An option I see for the event of an unplanned pregnancy would be service and assistance for the mother, to see her through the pregnancy, leaving her the choice to keep or give up the baby for adoption. This option leaves the mother dignity—she opts for life and opportunity for her child, not destruction."

A constituent, and I do not know the sex, wrote:

"Are you aware that it is illegal to break the egg of the American bald eagle, but legal to kill an unborn child? If the state can "legalize" the murder of some, it can "legalize" the murder of many. Abortion today justifies euthanasia tomorrow."

A woman wrote:

"I've had two abortions due to the RH factor. I'm 36 years old now and I really miss the children I could have had. I know a lot of women who have had abortions because the timing was wrong. I have one son and I wish that he could have had a brother or sister."

And finally a man wrote and stated:

"Is an immature human being any less human because of its immaturity? If an unborn child (at any age) is not human then what is it? . . . Isn't the law supposed to protect the more fundamental rights of human beings (such as the right to live in safety) over the less fundamental rights (such as the right to convenience)? . . . There are alternatives to abortion."

I would now like to quote some letters from constituents who are on the pro-choice side of the issue, and provide some samples of what they had to say. A woman wrote:

"For myself, the only reason I would have an abortion is if the baby was grossly abnormal and would be not able to be an independent living human. But for others, I believe they should have the right to choose for themselves."

A second woman wrote:

"I consider the unborn child to be a precious human being and yet I have marked that a woman under any circumstances should have the right to an abortion . . . Government can help people decide on these issues in providing funding for family planning, better financial support for low-income families, more insight into pros and cons of abortions (which I do not feel people are aware *of*) and more financial and emotional support to the single mother."

Another woman wrote:

"I feel a greater emphasis should be placed on sexual education and birth control. Research should focus on safe and effective birth control, on the individual's duty to either birth control or abstain if children aren't wanted. With this achieved, abortions would only then be required for active cases of rape, incest, failure of birth control, or danger to the mother."

A man wrote:

"I believe the more legislation there is the greater the loss of freedom—I am not a woman but I wouldn't want to sit in judgment and say, "No, you cannot have an abortion"."

A woman wrote:

"If I became pregnant while on the pill or an IUD I would likely choose abortion despite the fact I would be "sick" about it as we simply could not find the financial resources to raise another child and I would not have the child and give it up; this would be in my mind much worse."

Finally, a pro-choice constituent wrote the following:

"As a single parent who chose not to abort my child, I have strong views . . . I have found that being a single parent is extremely difficult, both financially, emotionally and all other ways. Had my decision not to abort been forced upon me by the Government (instead of my own naiveté), I would be even more resentful. It is extreme cruelty to force women to have unwanted children—better death—"

I take it she means the death of the child.

"—than years of poverty and stress."

In attempting to analyse the responses, I now realize fully that there are some weaknesses in the 11 questions that were asked, the way that they were worded. I also realize that a point of view—my point of view—which is on the pro-life side of the spectrum, comes through in the questionnaire. In doing it again, I would attempt to get agreement on the questions from representatives on both sides of the debate.

• (2110)

There has been far too little time—the letters are still coming in—to do an analysis on all of the questions on the questionnaire, as will be done, but my staff and I have managed to compile the replies to Question No. 10, which asks whether constituents want me to work for legislation that will: "(A) reduce drastically the number of abortions performed in Canada", or "(B) obtain a more liberal law than before so that abortion is made more freely accessible". Out of approximately 5,000 replies received to date, 2,865 or about 60 per cent prefer option (A), and that is the drastically reduced abortions. And 1,960, or about 40 per cent, indicated a preference for (B).

Whether this is representative of the 130,000 people who live in the present constituency of Edmonton—Strathcona is, of course, very difficult to know. Some people, doubtlessly, were away on vacation. Others, including my mother-in-law, were missed by the postman. Others, I am sure, refused to reply because they think that I am definitely on the pro-side of the issue. Certainly, all of the replies that came in appeared to be spontaneous, and there seemed to be no campaign by either

side to get people to reply. One of the first replies that came in said that the questions obviously showed that I was on the pro-abortion side of the issue.

A fairly recent opinion survey of 700 Edmontonians, randomly selected, by the Population Laboratory at the University of Alberta evidently found that less than 40 per cent of those surveyed think that abortion on demand is acceptable. I say that it is slightly less than 40 per cent. An Angus Reid opinion survey done across Canada three weeks after the Morgentaler decision indicated, as I am sure you know, that more than 6 in 10 Canadians nationally believe that any new abortion legislation should impose some legal protection for unborn children. In my view, therefore, the results of my survey, while imperfect, are probably fairly representative for the people who live in that part of Edmonton as a whole.

In the moment or so left to me, I would like to indicate how and why I will vote on the various matters before the House tomorrow at roughly noon. First, I will vote for the amendments to the main motion before the House, which in effect would prevent abortions unless the life of the mother is otherwise in danger. Second, I will vote for the amendment of the Hon. Member for Kitchener (Mr. Reimer), which bars abortions, unless a continuation of a pregnancy would seriously endanger a woman's health. I had, by the way, prepared a similar amendment along these lines, but it seems unnecessary to put in a second amendment to vote on which is essentially the same as that of the Member for Kitchener.

Third, I will vote for the amendment which requires counselling before an abortion can be had. With considerable thought, I will vote against the Government's main motion, if that becomes the final vote, because I believe that a Bill enacted consistent with it would legalize abortion on demand for all but the tiny percentage of abortions—I believe it is less than 5 per cent—which do not occur in the first months of pregnancy.

Being personally very concerned about pregnancy caused by rape or incest, I would like to signal now that when a Bill is brought to the House, as I hope it will be—if not in this Parliament, the first thing in the next Parliament—I believe very serious consideration should be given to allowing abortions when two independent doctors are convinced that the pregnancy has occurred from one of those two causes.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I would say at the outset that I am one of those Members who enter this debate not totally sure or confident or secure in exactly what I am going to say. I listened with extraordinary interest to many of the comments of Members, some with passion and fervour and commitment and surety. I am afraid that I cannot bring that same level of certitude to this debate, yet I know that it is one of the real tests of being a Member of Parliament and therefore cannot be evaded or avoided. People expect us to exercise our judgment and to express our point of view, even though it is an issue on which there can be many conflicting feelings and emotions and thoughts at the same time. Partly that is borne out of frustration, but more from what I really believe is a lack of leadership by the Government in not setting forward legislation. That point has been made many times in this House.

The Supreme Court last January gave a strong and abiding message to this Parliament, to this Government, that a decision had to be made, that the buck stopped here, that we could not sit on the fence any longer. Yet, I still feel that there is a lot of skating going on and that this debate is not a resolution to the problem. It is not providing clear direction for the country. It may provide other beneficial outlets of opinions, it may satisfy the requirements to get points of view on the record, but I do not believe it, in a concrete way, satisfies either the obligation put upon us by the Supreme Court or the expectation put upon us by the people of Canada. There will be a great sense of let-down, of failed expectations, that those who may be watching this debate or reading about it will say, after it is over, now it is decided, only to read that it is not decided at all.

What in fact you have is a wide variety of opinions and differing points of view. I cannot predict the results of the vote, but I can sense, at least, that there will not be a clear direction established. Yet, that onus must ultimately be recognized and must ultimately be honoured.

For those of us who have been in elected public life for a number of years, we were able, for a long period of time, to hide behind the decision made back in 1969 when the original decision was made. We all knew that it was unsatisfactory. We all knew that the committee system for making decisions on abortion was not satisfactory on any account, particularly because it was unfair to many. It certainly did not satisfy the requirements of equity or of effectiveness. In that sense, the Supreme Court did part of our job for us. It made a tough decision. It clearly put its finger on the failure of the existing system and set forward at least a standard by which this Parliament should try to measure. It did not make it easy, however, because it said that there has to be a balance, a balance of the fundamental sanctity of rights of women to make choices, and at the same time the equally vital moral requirement of life. I do not know who has the wisdom of Solomon to be able to balance such important values, such important questions of moral judgment, and say which is the preferred one.

• (2120)

As one who is a philosophical Liberal, I value deeply the concept of choice which can be translated into different words, liberty and right to decide. We have fought for 1,000 years, for generations, to get that right to make decisions about ourselves and our society. I consider it to be one of the great principles that a civilized society is able to endow. I know very well that in certain crucial cases, because of reasons of history and evolution, large segments of our population have been denied the right to make these choices. There is no doubt that when

you talk to women, not just about the abortion issue but on a whole range of issues, they have been denied those rights. This has been a male dominated society. Things have not been equal.

Women have not been given the full rein of choice. There is no doubt about that, and I do not have to go through the litany of transgressions that have been visited upon women for a long period of time to make the point. Yet we also know that choice is not a licence. It is not totally free. Society has always found it necessary to put certain constraints, certain parameters, around the range of choice. That is what this issue is about. Sitting in the balance is also a deeply held value by people of religious beliefs and personal beliefs that the foetus has a life and it is a question of when does life begin. Does it start at conception or otherwise? Where do you cut that balance in between?

I would have to say that in the past I have certainly been philosophically, theoretically, abstractly a believer in the choice option. I have been convinced by the arguments in a practical way that legislative anti-abortion laws would not work. There is a lot of evidence of the kinds of problems we had in society before 1969. I was struck by the comment made by the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) about the situation in Brazil. That country virtually bans abortion yet one million abortions still take place in Brazil annually. Women are still exercising that choice even though it may be illegal.

The idea of including abortion in the Criminal Code I find abhorrent. I do not think the Criminal Code is the way to set limits or parameters. But at the same time I have a personal experience to relate. A few years ago my wife and I were visited with great joy. We were able to adopt a young son who has brought enormous warmth, happiness and joy to us as a family. I cannot help when I look at my young son thinking that if the natural mother had made a different choice and had an abortion I would not be able to share in the wonderful experience that we have had. It made me think, I have to confess, and made me look at things from a very different perspective. I had to. It made me recognize that the choice being made is a vital one and a whole series of rippling circles affect not the immediate experience of the woman and child but society as a whole.

If I have to come to one possible conclusion from this debate—I have heard speeches from all sides of the House and from all spectrums—it is that we have failed desperately in providing the kind of necessary family support. Federal, provincial and municipal Governments for the last 10 years have been cutting back on social services, the necessary family support systems which allow legitimate choices to be made. When I look at the budgets of this Government, provincial Governments and even the Government to which I belonged, those things tended to take the first cuts. How can you ask women to make a choice on perhaps the most vital matter in one's life when you have denied and restricted, eviscerated, the abilities, to make that choice?

I have heard Member after Member say it is time for proper family planning, counselling, support services, half-way homes, income and all the rest. I have heard the same Members in different debates argue the other way, saying it is time we restricted our social services and cut back. You cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. I have heard Members in this House, and I could go back to their speeches, trying to have things both ways.

If the Government is looking for instruction out of this debate and if it is looking for guidance and wisdom, surely the one thing we can agree on is that we do a lousy job in this country in supporting families, particularly in enabling women to make proper choices. We do not provide the necessary essential ingredients to allow them to make a choice, a choice not dictated by economic necessities.

The Hon. Member for Edmonton—Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour) quoted a letter from a woman who said a single parent was dictated by poverty or poor family circumstances and that affects in a profound and dramatic way the choice that person will make. How can we on the one hand be saying, "Let's deal with this question. Let's make sure that if a choice is to be made it is a choice for life", when we do not provide the proper support and wherewithal for life to exist properly, fairly and effectively in this society? Perhaps out of this whole debate that in itself is a value worth emphasizing.

Maybe this Parliament in its late night debate can send a message to the rest of society that it is time to change and recognize the investments and support needed—I do not like the words social programs—namely, basically annexed family programs. Maybe we should put this decision off until we see what happens if we give families a decent chance and women a decent chance. Right now is not the right time because any decision is not based on the right criteria or evaluation.

I am certainly not satisfied with the Government's resolution. There are too many inconsistencies and vagaries to it. I will certainly take a look at the amendments presented to see if one fits the requirement that fully honours the principle and concept of choice but also carries with it the full investment to make it a worth-while choice, to make it a moral imperative choice not one that is dictated because one lives in desperate or denigrated circumstances.

A year and a half ago with the co-operation of a number of churches and community organizations I sponsored a family study in my riding. I was embarrassed in part by the results. It made me recognize how many things I had not taken into account as a Member of Parliament. I generally consider myself a pretty decent Member of Parliament. There were so many things in those homes I had not been able to touch. People cry out for the kind of support which they can no longer get from their church or extended family which in a large urban society is not there any more.

What about mental health support? Do you know how many people said that they are dealing with mental nervous breakdown and do not know where to turn, Mr. Speaker? We should

look at family income programs, family allowances and social assistance. They are not sufficient to allow families to adapt to new circumstances.

What if you find out that your child needs remedial training or has a learning disability? What if there is a death, a divorce or a separation in the family? The way in which we apply and direct our family income programs do not allow families to adapt and respond to those kinds of crisis or circumstances. Is it any wonder people get nervous and anxious about raising a family when they feel so bereft of the important essentials which may have been provided in past generations because of extended families consisting of uncles and aunts? In the past there was also a much closer religious community than there is today. That is part of the reality we face. We have to fill that vacuum.

I can certainly affirm that commitment. On the question itself, I will not give up on my belief that there is a real right to choose, particularly in the case of women making a choice only they can make about the product of their womb. I know men are participants but it is finally a woman's choice. I believe there must also be proper parameters and conditions set by society. Unfortunately, this resolution does not provide that.

• (2130)

We have not been able to hear the kind of expert advice and testimony to complete that kind of calculation, to make a proper judgment. That is why legislation would have been so much more important than this. Therefore, my vote will be dictated by my looking for a still better solution than the ones we have provided, indicating my strong commitment to filling that social vacuum, to trying to maintain a choice with parameters but finding the right wording and telling the Government that it had better do it again because it did not get it right this time. That, I hope, will represent the tremendous variety of views, cross-section of opinions and feelings that I have received from my constituents and the advice I have received from so many people.

My solution is not perfect, it is incomplete and I admit that. But so are the resolutions and the amendments that are on the floor of the House of Commons. All I can hope is that perhaps out of this debate will come some germ or kernel of a new wisdom and maybe some slow building of a consensus in society on an issue that has been so divisive so far.

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, members of the Opposition have said that this debate is based on hypocrisy, on a simulation of virtue or on pretence. If that were true, then the speeches of opposition Members and, for that matter, of government Members, would be pretence through their own participation.

I do not believe that any of the speeches are a pretence. I believe them to be honest expressions of the thoughts and the feelings of the Members with opinions shared by a number of the Members' constituents. That the views of any Member properly reflect the views of all his constituents or of a majority of them is either improbable or indeed impossible.

This debate deals with two very distinct points of view. While the viewpoint of some may approach the viewpoint of others, they do not cross that invisible but insurmountable barrier that separates the two. Bearing this in mind, surely those who would shout hypocrisy fail to understand that apart from the public, there is another body that will be giving careful attention to what is said in this debate. I refer to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Surely the Supreme Court of Canada will seek to find some form of common ground or some measure of uniform concern from what has been said or from what will be said. It may be that it will need the wisdom of Solomon to find evidence of common ground, but to find areas of majority view may be somewhat less challenging.

Since 1974, I have publicly stated that I support the right-to-life movement. I have also stated that my support is not as all-encompassing as they might wish. I cannot support the premise that every foetus should be allowed to go full term when there is clearly demonstrated evidence that the foetus or infant has such profound developmental abnormalities as to be grotesque and/or non-viable; in simple medical terms as defined by *Dorland's Medical Dictionary*, a monster. Obstetricians could provide us with frightening examples, but surely there is no need to elaborate.

What kind of a person and what kind of a system would insist that a woman had to go through a full-term pregnancy with an anencephalic foetus, a foetus without a brain, or else the medical coverage would not pay for the delivery? That woman, an American citizen, a federal government employee, was interviewed last night on CBC's *Journal*. That is the kind of cruel and unusual and indeed in my view unethical punishment that has surfaced as a result of an imperious and sweeping abuse of what may have been well-intended policy.

Only very recently have we been made aware of an entirely new baby, sadly a baby whose mother is addicted to crack, that highly refined narcotic that can be smoked. The baby of the crack-addict mother has no sucking reflex, cannot feed on its own, does not and cannot cry, does not freely move and is probably seriously mentally impaired. As well, given the promiscuity that goes with crack, there is a high risk of either syphilis or AIDS or both being passed on to the foetus by the mother. Where lies the moral obligation to the foetus here? Is it abortion or is it a short life in a dark void of misery?

I would like to turn to the issue of the unwed mother and, more particularly, the teenage mother. In spite of the fact that today's teenagers, unlike those of 10 or 20 years ago, are well informed on the subject of sexuality, the facts are that they are still very vulnerable to pregnancy. For them, as for most of us, intercourse is a spontaneous expression, not a pre-planned, pre-programmed event. The pregnant teenager never thought it would happen to her. The day after conception is three months

too late to be on the pill and it is too late to have taken other preventive measures.

Society no longer condemns the teenager, or at least the majority does not. Parents no longer order their daughters out of their homes, or at least the vast majority do not. However, to diminish this risk, society must provide for this circumstance.

I have heard so often that society should do this or should do that or that society could offer support. However, there is no more room for wishful thinking, for should do or could do. It is must do. We have to provide the kind of environment that encourages the unwed mother to carry her baby to full term, that provides a system which would allow the continuation of her education and that provides for adoption with a minimum of trauma to both the natural parents and the baby.

I remember well the sad story of an unwed mother, 25 years ago. She related to me that when she discovered she was pregnant, her parents sent her from a small town in British Columbia off to a home for unwed mothers in Manitoba. There she was assigned to menial and hardworking tasks on a daily basis, and also on a daily basis was reminded with lectures of just how sinful she was. Her baby was then taken from her for adoption. How sad that she thereafter remained childless. That is not my view of a caring society.

Let us not revert to that form of criminalization, but rather, if it is the wish of the natural parents, let us encourage adoption, not abortion. Let us add to the sum total of our national talents, and for that matter, the near zero population growth because of the trend to smaller families. Canadians need to be reminded that even with a high birth rate and a high immigration rate, our actual population growth will still be only 1 per cent by the year 2000. That is less than 12 years from now.

• (2140)

As one who supports a pro life position, I was shocked to hear an avowed pro lifer in the U.S. declare last night, again on *The Journal*, that one of their first federal accomplishments was to deny medical coverage for abortions to those American families receiving federally assisted social assistance or welfare. That same policy may be quite unintentionally inferred in part (2) of the amendments submitted by my colleague from Kitchener. I do not for a moment suggest that it was prompted by the U.S. experience, but I cannot support an amendment that could attack that most defenseless part of our society, those who exist, by circumstance and not by choice, at or below the poverty line. That is, for me, unacceptable and discriminatory. It raises again the issue of what a nation must do, not should do, or could do.

Fecundity among the poor is a world-wide phenomena. In Africa it does not mean another mouth to feed. It means one more child to help gather food and firewood. In North America it means ignorance of birth control methods, or a particular religious belief, or the absence of money to pay for birth control products.

Let me digress for a moment. Surely all of us have at some time, or often, when watching a movie war scene, large or small, real or imagined, past or present, reflected on the talents destroyed, the positive contributions to society that may have been lost forever, destroyed in the blast of a bomb, the thud of a bullet. Reflect then upon the eyes and face of the miracle of a baby. Surely our society has a moral obligation to allow that miracle to happen. Surely we must become a "must do" Canadian community, so that social and economic considerations are no longer just that, considerations.

I would like to make reference as well to the concern I have regarding the subject of those women who are victims of rape or incest. I would make an exception in those cases. Clearly that places on the mother a degree of stress, revulsion, anger, and a host of other emotions that go far beyond the normal experience of those who would normally be able to offer support.

With respect to the motion and amendments before the House, I reserve my position at this point. I will await the termination of the debate and all the amendments have been moved.

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria—Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, I feel it is not only my privilege and honour but my duty to rise today and address this motion and its amendments.

Issues of life affecting conscience must be considered particularly carefully. In my years of service to my constituency there have been several discussions on capital punishment. These have been debated with passion by Members on all sides of the House. No one can argue that that issue has not had tremendous impact on and caused much soul-searching by Members of Parliament.

Similarly, over the years, the Government of Canada has on more than one occasion discussed abortion. Previous governments prepared Bills which, though not perfect, set out a degree of control over access to abortions. The Hon. Member for Grey—Simcoe (Mr. Mitges) introduced a motion, M-37, which would have included the rights of the unborn under the Constitution. It, too, provoked a very heartfelt debate before its defeat. Now, with the recent Supreme Court ruling which declared the existing legislation unconstitutional, we are back to square one. No federal legislation now regulates abortion.

Like other Members, I have been deluged by information, letters, and petitions from across Canada. In June I presented one of those petitions on behalf of some of my constituents who adhere to the pro life side of the argument. The bulk of input from my constituency concurred with this viewpoint. I could quote hundreds of letters from constituents who ask that Parliament enact legislation to restore the restriction on access to abortion. Many thanked me for support of Motion M-37 and asked for my help to continue to protect human life. I might add that I have had a very high proportion of individual,

hand-written letters, of a non-form type. There is no doubt of the sincerity of input or strength of feelings of Canadians on both sides of the issue.

Quite often, when asked how I would vote on this issue, I state to my constituents that, of course, it would depend on the exact wording of such a motion. This motion before us is very clear and gives every Member the opportunity to voice their individual opinion and vote according to what they think is right. I congratulate the Minister on his efforts. The motion sets out an intermediate option which respects the desire to see new legislation, but gives a great deal of latitude for adhering to the legislation. A possible paraphrase of the objective of the main motion is to create controlled access to abortion.

In my opinion, and that of most pro-life and pro-choice advocates, the main motion is not perfect. It neither recognizes the mother's complete right to choose, or the belief that life begins at conception. Thus, while it is a legitimate attempt at a compromise, the compromise is acceptable to no one.

In considering what I would say in this debate, I reread the motion introduced by the Hon. Member for Grey—Simcoe on November 21, 1986. Permit me to read it again:

> "That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of amending the Constitution Act, 1982, to include unborn human persons, and that the Governor General issue a proclamation under the Great Seal of Canada to amend Section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights so that it reads as follows:
>
> "7. Everyone including a human foetus or unborn being has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice". "

Needless to say, had this motion been accepted, today's debate would not be necessary. Recognition of the unborn as having rights from the moment of creation would make the question of pro life or pro choice a moot point. All life should have a choice.

Private Members' Bill C-312, an Act to provide an interim measure respecting abortion and to amend the Criminal Code, introduced on Monday by the Hon. Member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby), introduced a positive element into this debate. It requests that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) place an amendment to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, to protect the life of the unborn, on the agenda of a First Ministers Conference. In the interim, this Act would make abortion illegal except for medical reasons.

• (2150)

Such a conference would, I believe, give this discussion a fuller airing and lay the basis for the most comprehensive abortion legislation possible. Canadians deserve this. We have left them in limbo for too many years.

As I said earlier, I have received hundreds of letters from constituents supporting the pro-life position. I want to read you excerpts from just two of them. The first is signed by two women from my constituency. These ladies state:

> Now is the time for you and your colleagues in government to speak for the innocent unborn who have paid a horrendous price for so-called women's rights and health.

They go on:

> "This shameful situation has gone on for over 20 years, the blackest period in our history. Now is the time to stop the killing. We the caring and responsible electorate of Canada demand that you prepare and pass a law which is positive and protective of all life from conception to natural death. Protect Canada's future."

The second letter is from a male constituent. He writes:

> "Human life begins at conception. If we try to establish a time of beginning other than that, the whole matter becomes a relative issue. Does life then begin when the foetus first begins to move in the womb? Does it begin arbitrarily at 20 weeks? Does it begin at birth or perhaps a week later . . . "

Further in that letter the writer appeals for my assistance stating:

> "Mr. Scott, as my representative in Parliament, I ask that you vote against abortion and work towards establishing legislation that would put an end to abortion and stand up constitutionally in the Supreme Court of this country. I trust that our Conservative Government will be conservative on the issue of abortion."

These letters echo all the sentiments of the pro-life letters I have received. They also remind me of my reasons for supporting Motion M-37. As the writer said, who can truthfully say that an unborn baby is not alive? I know that a woman's body should be under her control but what we are talking about here, despite arguments to the contrary, is two lives, the life of the mother and the life of the unborn. Even the mother should not be able to take away a child's life as long as it it not threatening her own. Someone, or some law, must protect all life.

For this reason I want to go on record as supporting the amendment which would only permit abortions in the case of a real and present danger to the life of the mother.

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I would like to start my speech by talking about the great joy which I felt, not as a Member of Parliament but as a human being, when I heard this week that my sister-in-law had delivered a baby after long and difficult labour and after going through considerable medical problems before that wonderful event took place. I had a tremendous sense of joy and a sense that a continuing regeneration of the world was taking place. Much more than that, I had simply a sense of happiness and excitement and a feeling of tremendous pleasure that this woman had brought forth a child and that this child would take its place in the community of North America. That is one very real reality for all of us who are parents, uncles, aunts, or grandparents.

We talk about the need for a pro-life position in this society. What we need in Canada is a pro-child policy, a policy which attempts to create the conditions and circumstances which will give the children of our country the best possible opportunities for their future and the very best care which we as a society can provide. It is from faith in a pro-child position which much of my commitment as a social democrat grows.

We must create in this country the situation of equality which will enable each child to have the same possibilities as every other child. Every child must have the same sense of health, the same sense of shelter, the same sense of job opportunities, and the same sense of being able to participate fully in this society.

In order to do that we must ensure that the foetus is given the greatest possible support and security from society. We must have programs of support for single mothers. We must have programs of support for women who are facing difficult choices in today's society. They must have knowledge, not only in areas like birth control, but on subjects like nutrition and ensuring that drug abuse does not damage a foetus. Those must be commitments of a child-centered society.

Those commitments must include commitments to serious and widely available day care facilities, available not only to those who are very poor and cannot afford day care except on a subsidized basis, or to those who are very well off and can afford day care for that reason. We must move to a commitment to day care such as my own children benefited from so tremendously.

• (2200)

We must also recognize some of the realities in attempting to set a policy dealing with the subject that is before us in this debate. One reality is that in my constituency of Essex—Windsor, any woman who wants an abortion can cross the bridge or go through the tunnel to Detroit and immediately obtain an abortion from an abortion clinic without any obstruction whatsoever. That is a reality.

A second reality is that the Supreme Court of Canada, after very careful and agonizing consideration concluded that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms for our society meant that we could not set up a system which would impede women if they chose to have access to an abortion. That too is a reality that we cannot reverse. We cannot pretend that the Supreme Court did not give this subject profound and deep consideration. Our Charter of Rights protects everyone in our society, 52 per cent of whom are women. We cannot, nor should we take that protection away. It would destroy the Charter of Rights that protects us all in our freedom of speech, our freedom of assembly and our freedom to take democratic action as a community in the future.

There is a third reality. There was a time when it was illegal in this country to have an abortion, yet abortions took place. We cannot go back to making abortions illegal because it will not stop abortions from taking place. It will simply force women to seek illegal abortions in unsafe, completely unhealthy ways, that will cause immense damage to the women of our community. Those realities cannot be ignored.

I do not believe Members of Parliament can take a completely pro-life position as a result of pressure from constituents or because of our beliefs, since those realities exist and cannot be overcome in 1988 in Canada.

I have other considerations besides the realities which shape how I will vote tomorrow on these resolutions. The first and most profound consideration that will affect me is my belief in the responsibility of the women of Canada. I do not believe that in our present situation in Canada women will march out and begin killing their foetuses. That is sheer nonsense.

The women of Canada have profound commitment toward their belief in having children and bringing forth a new generation in our society. I do not believe our present circumstances will result in irresponsible women deciding to somehow destroy our future as a society. That is a most patronizing and male supremist perspective that could be adopted by Members of Parliament.

Above all, I will vote tomorrow with a sense of utter and complete faith in the women of this country, that they will make choices in consultation with their doctors, qualified medical practitioners, that will be good for us as a society, good for our children and good for the foetuses for whom so many shout for protection.

I do not believe that protection is needed when the women of this country have responsibility for the next generation, as they always have throughout history. I have faith in our society that it will not suddenly become a place where we do not think about the future of the foetus that a woman is carrying. Our society must begin to make a greater commitment to support for women and on education on reproduction. If our society moves in that direction in the context of the amendment of choice by the Member for Yukon (Ms. McLaughlin), we will see fewer abortions in this country. By putting our faith in the responsibility of women and the commitment of this society to support women and children in a way that has not been done, I think the abortion rate in this country will begin to decline. So I reject this motion because it betrays that freedom and responsibility of women and because it is unenforceable if one looks at it closely. I support instead the amendment which has been moved by my colleague, the Member for Yukon an amendment which does not favour abortion. It does not endorse abortion but says instead it believes in the responsibility and freedom of women to choose, in consultation with their doctors, what is best in the context of a society which cares much more than our society has yet demonstrated with respect to the future, the equality and the potential of its children.

• (2210)

We have to make a commitment to personal and social responsibility in the way we vote tomorrow. My commitment will be to vote against the Government's motion and to vote in favour of the motion moved by my colleague on behalf of our caucus.

[*Editor's Note: For continuation of proceedings see Part II.*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, July 27, 1988

[*English*]

The House continued its sitting.

Mr. Bob Corbett (Fundy—Royal): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the various positions put forward, particularly to the position put forward by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Essex-Windsor (Mr. Langdon). I must say I am touched by his words and the sincerity in which he makes his plea to this House of Commons with respect to how he will represent himself in the hours to come. He spoke about how we, a legislative body of parliamentarians, should present ourselves to the electorate and the people of this nation. We in this House are all concerned about the unborn, but the unborn is not being taken into consideration in our hearts and souls.

I welcome the opportunity to speak before this House on this particular issue. As a Member of Parliament I have a chance to address the Commons and I know there are a great many people who would also like to have this opportunity and privilege. Last year we had the opportunity to address Parliament on two major issues, capital punishment and abortion. At that time Canadians chose to preserve the life of those who have taken the life of another. Let us work together today to preserve the life of the product of conception. I supported the right to life motion moved by the Hon. Member for Grey-Simcoe (Mr. Mitges) and at that time I urged the Commons to include a provision in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms that would recognize the right to life of the unborn. In 1982, during the Constitution debate, I called upon the Government to include such a right and protection. I am again this day calling upon the Government to implement legislation that would provide protection for the unborn and the unassailable right to life.

My position has always been clear. I cannot accept abortion as a means of birth control. Despite the misinformation given by the Canadian Abortion Right Action League to many of my constituents, I do believe that when a woman's life is in jeopardy, her right to life is paramount. A good many Canadians do not believe abortions can be performed without thought to the consequences of that action. This is a position that is shared by a great many of my constituents, but not all.

I have been told by the pro-abortionists that by taking my position I am imposing my morality on others. That is not my view of this issue. My viewpoint is one for the safeguarding of the rights of those who cannot speak for their own mortality or against their own mortality. In my opinion, which I know is shared by a large segment of our population, the abortion issue is not simply what the pro-abortionists term a "health matter". It is not a clinical issue that many state it to be, but an action that challenges the moral and ethical conscience of each and every Canadian.

We cannot dismiss abortion as strictly a "health matter", with the obvious exception of when a mother's life is at risk, or a medical procedure that discredits the life that is taken. The term "health" has been given an unlimited interpretation, meaning everything from a very real and serious threat to the mother's life to the interruption of a career. As the number of abortions has leapt into the tens of thousands every year, it is readily apparent that some segments of our society are willing to place a greater importance on the social and economic status of one life, at the cost of one life itself for another. Unless we say otherwise, before too long all right and wrong will be measured in social and economic worth.

To limit the argument to a right to choose on behalf of the mother denies the right to choose by that life that cannot speak and cannot defend itself. In this debate, we must remember the need for protection to life, liberty and security that Canadians demand for every living person. What makes this debate so vital is that we have the opportunity to extend those protections to those lives that have no say and require the protection of a caring society.

I believe simply that life begins at conception. I think that when we are in a position to accept that life at conception is just a progression through life itself until death, it will then become very much clearer. As people in a caring society we must accept the fact that we should not be in a position to exorcize a life in the womb anymore than we would exorcize a pimple or hangnail because in the later stages of life we might be able to say that because of senility or dementia and so on, some people are unable to care for themselves, make decisions for themselves and because they are unable to make those decisions so necessary to maintain and sustain life itself, they should be exorcized. How can we suggest that only when birth itself occurs that that is when life begins? That cannot be the situation. I suggest we must accept realistically that life at conception is just one stage of the many apparent stages of life as we proceed through the entire procedure that we refer to as life until death.

• (2220)

We have many, many facets. We have scripture. We have life itself which we are all enjoying. How can we say that one stage or the other is less or more critical than the particular

stage that we as fortunate Canadians in this Chamber might be able to accept upon ourselves?

I can sympathize and be compassionate with the fact that when incest or rape takes place that is cause for abortion. The fact of the matter is that we are a generation of people who have suffered tragedy after tragedy. The number of lives that have been snuffed out as a result of incest due to abortion or rape due to abortion are minimal. Unwanted pregnancies as a result of those two tragic situations are even fewer. Although I sympathize completely and totally with that type of situation, I do not believe that we have the right to take that life any more than we have the right to take the life of another through a procedure that might be as a result of what I mentioned before such as senility, dementia or brain stem damage.

Members have heard horrible stories, tragedies surrounding the abortion issue. Many are stories that Canadians do not want to see repeated. Nevertheless, Canadians cannot abrogate their responsibilities to defend and protect innocent life.

I must point out the terrible methods that are utilized. As Members of the House of Commons or as members of a caring society we cannot afford to forget the methods that are used to terminate a life in the womb. For instance, we would not begin to think of terminating a life of an elderly person just because he or she has lost control of their capacity to reason by injecting them with a saline solution, or that we should perhaps carve them up into many different pieces and extract them and throw them into a plastic bag and have them disposed of in something certainly less than most of us as Christians would appreciate is appropriate.

Today, in my opinion, the unborn child has not one legal protection to life. The pro-abortion lobby claims Criminal Code Section 252 provides legal protection to the foetus by providing laws against the supply of a drug, instrument, or other noxious thing to procure an abortion. This section can be used to prosecute back-alley abortionists. It is still inadequate. There are no legal rights to life in the womb.

How can society provide every protection and guarantee to a born life and yet offer the unborn life not one protection? Many Canadians steadfastly believe that existence as an embryo, a foetus, an infant, an adolescent and an adult is a succession in the state of development. For those who believe that life begins at conception, such as I do, the proposal which some are suggesting would be a compromise and is simply not acceptable. That suggestion is that an abortion not be performed after a certain date.

Many Canadians will not be able to accept that a life either in the second or third trimester deserves greater legal protection than a life in the first trimester. On what day does a life go from being of no legal importance to one worthy of society's benevolence?

The physical and mental limitations of the unborn require that a caring society act on their behalf. For almost 20 years Canadians have witnessed the dimming of legal protection for the unborn.

The 1969 amendment to the Criminal Code indicated that decline. The Supreme Court decision in the Morgentaler case swept away all legal rights for those of us in our society who have not yet acquired the opportunity or the ability to speak for ourselves.

Today parliamentarians have the opportunity to install legislation that will provide the necessary protection for the unborn while acknowledging the need to provide for a legitimate threat to a life caused by pregnancy. To allow an abortion for any lesser reason would constitute an abandonment of society's responsibilities to those who cannot defend themselves or speak for themselves.

Education, contraception and comprehension are means of avoiding the birth of millions of unwanted children. I would very much like to see the Government of the country devote more funding to education.

Many pro-abortionists have argued or urged the Government to leave the matter as it now stands with easy legal access for the mother. I am urging the Government to take steps toward legislation that will provide the unborn with legal guarantees.

In the rulings handed down by the Supreme Court there was a definite indication that there must be a recognition of the need to protect the unborn. In its summary the court stated: "There has always been a clear recognition of a public interest in the protection of the unborn and there is no evidence or indication of general acceptance of the concept of abortion at will in our society".

Judge Beetz stated in his finding: "I am of the opinion that the protection of the foetus is, as the Court of Appeal observed, always has been, a valid objective in Canadian criminal law. I think Section 1 of the Charter authorizes reasonable limits to be put on a woman's rights having regard to the state interest in the protection of the foetus".

Chief Justice Dickson stated: "Like Beetz and J. J. Wilson I agree that protection of foetal interests by Parliament is also a valid governmental objective. It follows that balancing these interests, with the lives and health of women a major factor, is clearly an important governmental objective".

It is clear that some members of the highly esteemed and highly regarded Supreme Court of Canada recognize the right to protection of the unborn and caution against the abandonment of these principles. I sincerely hope that the Government takes this perception into account while formulating the decision that will serve as a bench-mark of our society. The recognition of life and the protection of life is fundamental to our laws and to our society. Limiting human life to economic or social equations is the abandonment of these values which Canadians cherish and defend. To diminish the right to life will and would diminish these laws and traditions that guide

our consciences and the firmament of the principle upon which all great nations and great religions are built.

I appreciate the opportunity of making my position known. I trust that we will act in wisdom and in the faith in which our constituents have given us the responsibility of acting with tomorrow.

• (2230)

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, I regret that we are not rising tonight to speak on an actual piece of legislation as opposed to this motion. The Government has failed to bring forth a Bill after many days, weeks, and months of discussion. Some time ago the Government put three options on the Order Paper and we were supposed to vote on any one of our choice. That is passing the buck of responsibility, and it is passing the buck of responsible government. The Government is here to govern and put forward legislation, which it has failed to do. Tonight we are faced with discussing the motion and not legislation.

This Government has the largest majority in Canadian history, but courage seems to be non-existent when it comes to clearcut decision-making. There might be some feeling on the part of the Government that this debate on a motion will suffice for the next election. I submit that it will not be accepted as a substitute. Our thinking must be longer term than the next election.

First, I reject the motion that the Government has placed before us. The Government has fudged the issue of abortion by attempting to appear to be the proverbial all things to all persons without pleasing anyone very much. This debate is not taking place to please people or to reject them. Surely the foremost aim and objective of this debate should be that of making certain that a happy, young teenager, laughing, enjoying life, studying and planning the future in 16 years time from the date of this debate should have the opportunity to do all those things because he or she had the right to be born, instead of being a 16-year old casualty of abortion or an abortion statistic.

This is a very crucial debate. The feelings that I will put on the record tonight are very sincere and they are certainly the way I feel about this issue. No matter how one looks at the issue of abortion, I feel in all conscience that I have no right, and I do not think that any of us has any right, to unnecessarily destroy life before or after birth. God brings us into this world and He takes us out. Sometimes it is extremely difficult to accept the death of a loved one, but there is a purpose and there must be a faith.

On the other hand, can you imagine the horrible thought, Mr. Speaker, that if the mother and the father of that lost loved one had decided to accept the abortion route rather than the birth route you would have never known that friend or relative in the first place. This begs the question, how many potential friends, potentially great citizens, community leaders, leaders, internationally influential people, professional people, and farmers have never had the opportunity to play their roles in life because they were not allowed the right to be born?

We know that economics plays a great role in today's family. Surely one of the things that could be done is support the family through the tax system of the country and give greater allowances to families raising children. I can remember when I was growing up and family allowances suddenly came in. It was a boon to the family.

It is said that the way a nation treats its native peoples, the way a nation treats its poor and its downtrodden spells out the real character of that nation. May I submit that the way that the Parliament of Canada treats its yet unborn citizens and the mothers says a great deal about our country and displays the real character of this nation not only to the world but to our maker.

The question of abortion is indeed a moral issue. It is indeed a family issue. Some sadly call it an economic issue. It is a matter of rights as opposed to responsibility. It certainly must put the emphasis on education as it relates to birth control. We should have better programs and more money should be put into those programs. As a previous speaker said, sometimes these are the types of programs that are the first to be cut. If we are going to talk about an abortion policy in this nation, then we better get with it and talk seriously about education on birth control and make it more acceptable to society as a whole.

Discussions and communications between parents and family members must be that of a free-flowing and understanding conversation, a real relationship within the home. We have an obligation to educate and to advise. Parents who assist unwed mothers within their family, those who provide love and encouragement and look after the child and accept it as their own, stand tall in my estimation, and I know that they stand tall in the estimation of most Members of this House because they are accepting a social obligation and they are doing it willingly. Those are the type of people whom I like and respect. They have the courage to face up to a difficult problem, and they do it head on. They do it with a joyous outlook and end up feeling a great deal of satisfaction because of it. Therefore, we have to change our prejudices in this country if we are going to talk sincerely about the abortion issue. We have to take a different attitude toward unwed mothers. There are still areas of this country where that is not taking place. We must be aware of the self-righteous, who are the worst enemies of destroying this kind of prejudice, and show love and care for the unwed mother instead of trying to make her an outcast in society.

• (2240)

I feel very strongly about protecting the life of the mother in any legislation that emanates in the future from this motion that we are discussing today. My prejudices in this regard are strongly built in because of a personal experience. For my wife and I, our first child was born on Mother's Day in 1961. After

a very serious and long period for my wife, the baby was stillborn, a very difficult situation for a mother going full-time. It turned out later that that baby was one of the first victims of thalidomide.

I do not know how many times I counted every square of concrete on the sidewalk that encircled that hospital during those many hours. It put real emphasis in my mind as to the protection of the mother when it comes to any legislation that we are discussing today. When our second child came along, perfectly healthy, it was a great joy. When the third one came along, it was another great joy. Our only regret is that we do not have six more like them.

I was quite interested this afternoon in listening to a very impassioned speech by the Hon. Member for Hull—Aylmer (Mr. Isabelle), a medical doctor in our Party. We heard him say how he had delivered over the course of his lifetime 8,000 babies. He explained the joy that he has seen on parents' faces time and time again as these births occurred.

It is very important to protect the life and well-being of the mother through all of this. The old law that the Supreme Court struck down on January 28 was brought in with good intent in 1969. I was here for that debate, as was the Hon. Member for Victoria—Haliburton (Mr. Scott). I remember it well. We just spoke a while ago. We were class-mates. However, the good intent of that legislation was not always followed in spirit over the years.

As we discuss this resolution today and the follow-up legislation, whenever it comes, we cannot just talk about our rights; we must also talk about our responsibilities. Who are we to say that we have the right to terminate a pregnancy before or after a certain number of months, as this motion today implies? I submit that we do not. I do not agree with that. To say that life does not begin at conception is simply to defy all of the laws and logic of biology.

Let us be a nation of understanding, let us be a nation of love in the sense of respect and our help to others at all times. Common sense goes a long way in solving difficult problems. I was not born in a hospital; I was born in a farmhouse during the Depression years. If economic considerations had been brought to bear at that time, I would have never been born and would not be here today. I was born into a family that had no money. We could hardly pay our taxes during those years, but there was love, caring and understanding. I look back upon my childhood days and I think of my parents. I consider them to be real martyrs. With no money, they raised a family, with food on the table, good guidance, direction and encouragement. As I well recall, if you did not always accept that guidance, there was always a little bit of additional encouragement to make sure that you did, because discipline was very much a factor in our family.

I can remember when family allowances came in. I was going to high school at the time. What a great thing that was for the family. My gosh, to get a cheque at the end of the month for either $6 or $7—and later on it was $8 a month—was like a gift. We had never witnessed that before. I relate back to a situation where the economics of a family is very important. If we are not going to help them out in that route with family expenses, then we should be helping them out through the tax system at their level of income.

Canada's future is very important. Families are getting smaller in Canada. If we do not increase the size of families, encourage them to grow larger, and if we do not increase immigration, we are going to face a decline in population in Canada after the turn of the century.

This can change the Canadian social and cultural outlet because it means a greater mix of cultures in the world and it means that we are going to have to change with that society, because it will indeed change as it is changing rapidly right now. Do we ever learn from history?

A part of the downfall of the Roman Empire was a total lack of moral life. Abortion was a big issue at that time. They did not want young athletes having children because it interfered with their athletic life, it interfered with their muscular development and so on. We should be taking a lesson from that. Today, when we have greater medical knowledge than they had then, we should be handling these situations with a little more expertise. We should also be looking at the implications of their policies then and wonder if we have not gone complete circle on some of these. Today, we should take a serious look at abortion and abortion laws. I want to see legislation that protects the life of the mother and respects the moral right of the foetus to be born.

• (2250)

I look forward to legislation that will be coming forward in this House and I hope I will have an opportunity to speak on it. While I will be voting against this motion tomorrow because it does not agree with my feelings in any way, I will also be looking at the amendments that will be brought before the House tomorrow and giving serious attention to them when I vote.

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Mr. Speaker, I will not be voting in favour of the motion that has been tabled in the House. Before I get into my speech, I want to make a few comments about the speech delivered by the New Democratic Party Member, the Hon. Member for Essex-Windsor (Mr. Langdon). Part of his argument was that if abortions are deemed illegal, abortions will continue anyway and this really is no justification for having laws which would outlaw abortion and that abortions would continue in the back alleys of the country and in the back rooms of society. Is that a good enough reason for us not having morally acceptable laws, because they will be broken? Are we to say because citizens break the speed limit with their automobiles that we should have no safe highway laws? Are we to say to the people of Canada because banks are broken into and robbed, we submit and acquiesce as governments and admit that it is acceptable to rob banks? That is

sheer nonsense and utter rot to use that kind of logic in the debate such as the one we are having here tonight.

As I indicated, I will not be supporting the motion before us. In my opening remarks I want to make reference to a paper by Dr. Paul De Bellefeuille, formerly associate professor of paediatrics, University of Ottawa. I make reference to just one paragraph as follows:

> «Human? Of course the foetus is human. He is the offspring of our species. From the very first, he possesses a full genetic endowment which will be his, and his alone, until he dies. Development is a continuum; once it is begun, no point in time can be taken as the moment when we become human. We are so from the very start.
>
> These are not legal concepts. They are scientific facts. But even if some judges do not consider the foetus a person, our jurisprudence recognizes him as a subject of rights: he may inherit, one may sue on his behalf for damages.»

I have not polled my constituents. I am compelled to vote as my conscience dictates to me. We understand and we know that this is an emotional and certainly a divisive debate which has taken place throughout the country and continues here in the House of Commons tonight. I think we need to remind ourselves that we live in a disposable, plastic, instant society which desires and I think even demands instant gratification and espouses, to a large degree, I think situational ethics. However, Mr. Speaker, each of us is a product of his or her environment and heredity. We did not choose our heredity nor our early environment. That which we learned to a large extent determines our value system. It includes our learning from our parents, our educators, teachers, clergy, peers, and through a learning process we establish our own personal beliefs and convictions. The British law system upon which our laws are based flow from the Judaeo-Christian ethics, including the Ten Commandments. Judaeo-Christian ethics have been the basis for guidelines to our moral conduct.

I want to make reference to two passages from the Old Testament. In the Book of Jeremiah 1:5 we read, and this is God speaking about the prophet Jeremiah:

> «Before I formed you in the womb, I knew you. Before you were born I set you apart.»

I knew you. I knew you when you were in your mother's womb. That speaks volumes to me. Then there is another passage which causes me to have the convictions that I have, and for other reasons as well. It is David speaking in Psalm 139. He talks about God knowing him before he was born, when he was in his mother's womb and before all of his parts were formed. He tells us that God knew him and He loved him and knew all about him and formed him even before all the parts of his body were formed. That speaks volumes to me. When I read that, can I now say that the unborn have no value? Could I now support a motion that is before this House and say, indeed, the unborn do not have that intrinsic value? I ask of those in the country who fought to save the seals and are numbered among the pro-choice people who advocate today killing the unborn, what is their value system? On what is that value system based?

Disposable Society, Disposable Babies? That is the title of an article that appeared in a small town newspaper in Brownsburg, Quebec. A letter was written by Edith Clark to her local newspaper. It was on the subject of abortion. Let me quote a few paragraphs:

> «Just think of a six month old baby you know. Supposing his mother were to say, "I'm tired of caring for this child, it's exhausting and time consuming, he's interfering with my career, I'll kill him now before he takes up any more of my time," and then carries through with her plan? We would all be horrified! If I were to demand that this should be against the law, no one would call me a narrow minded bigot trying to impose my moral views on other people.
>
> Yet if this same mother, one year earlier, made the same decision, for the same reason, about this same child, our government says that's just fine. Why? If it's not right six months after birth why is it all right six months before birth? Because we didn't know then how sweet and beautiful he'd be.
>
> We seem to have reached the ultimate in a disposable society—disposable babies. What a sad commentary on our times. What does the future hold for a nation that considers its children a burden rather than a blessing?»

Then, Mr. Speaker, I come to a problem which seems to be rarely mentioned in this debate and rarely mentioned across the country. I was glad I had seen this article in *The Ottawa Citizen* on June 9, 1988. This is written by a reporter in London, Ontario. It reads:

> Abortion is a psychological Vietnam for many women, according to a growing body of evidence.

This article tells about the terrible price that has been paid and will be paid by those women who have abortions. The article goes on:

> «Almost 100 studies in the U.S. and Canada over the past quarter century have found that sometimes more than half of women who have abortions experience similar negative psychological after effects.
>
> The feelings range from grief, guilt, regret, sadness, shame and depression to crying, insomnia, nightmares, anxiety, feelings of ugliness, drug and alcohol abuse and suicide.
>
> While short term distress is common, there is also strong evidence of delayed and serious long term effects.
>
> Because the emotions are often blunted and deeply buried, they might not surface for as many as 20 or more years, similar to Vietnam veterans.
>
> Dr. Barrie De Veber, a paediatrics professor at the University of Weston, Ontario and the Children's Hospital of Weston, Ontario, said the psychological effects of pregnancy loss are largely ignored.
>
> He said that while abortion quickly solves an immediate problem, psychological side effects can set in years later. With a miscarriage, grief is most acute when it occurs and moderates with time.»

● (2300)

Before this debate, and indeed during this debate, we have heard that a woman has the right to choose what she wants to do with her body. Why then do we do all in our power to stop people from committing suicide? To pick up on that same theme, an article which appeared in *The Globe and Mail* of April 26 of this year, written by Richard Bastien, said:

> «Yet, if killing an unborn child is a matter of personal preference, why not also abusing or molesting a born one? And if every woman has the right to control her own body, why should governments require the use of a seat belt in a car, or the wearing of a hard hat on construction sites? And why should they spend money on anti-smoking campaigns?»

I think Mr. Bastien has put forward a good argument for that position.

As the list of reasons for aborting is extended, will it include, and I suspect that with some women it already includes, the reason that the baby is not the right sex? With today's medical technology, what chance would Helen Keller have had? With the ability that now exists to enter a mother's womb and picture the baby that is in a mother's womb, medical technology would discover today that that baby who became Helen Keller was blind and deaf. Yet we know of the tremendous impact she made on society. That woman learned as people who were her patient teachers taught her. What a wonderful contribution she has made to society and what a great deal she has taught us.

Just last weekend as I was returning to my riding, I was listening to the radio in my car. I heard a marvellous radio program, a taped broadcast. A woman who died two years ago of cancer was speaking. Her name was Mary Crowley and she lived in California. She became very fast friends with Ethel Waters, that marvellous black singer who performed so beautifully singing negro spirituals. She had such great artistic qualities and she performed in so many movies. She was loved by many people who are my age. I am sure the younger generation may not have heard of her. What a tremendous contribution she made to the artistic world.

Mary Crowley and Ethel Waters became fast friends. Ethel Waters was Mary's senior in years. As Ethel got older, she asked Mary who would take care of her when she got older. Mary said that she would take care of her because she did not have a mother and Ethel would be her mother. So they became fast friends.

Mary said that one day, Ethel Waters called Mary into the room and said: "Mary, I want you to have this. It is my diamond watch. I had that when I was in my heyday," and she gave it to Mary. Mary was reluctant to take it, but it was a year later that Ethel died.

I thought that the most poignant part of that program was when Mary Crowley said that Ethel Waters was born to a 13 year old girl, the victim of rape. What a loss to society it would have been if that girl had aborted that baby. In today's society, we would have given her every reason to abort that baby. What a tremendous contribution that baby who became Ethel Waters has made to society. One of the songs I loved to hear her sing was *His Eye Is On the Sparrow*, a song that has moved thousands of people.

As I was looking through the material that I had on this issue, I found a clipping that I had removed from *The Ottawa Citizen* of April 14, 1986. It is the picture of a baby just 22 weeks old. The caption reads:

> "Tiny James was born 22 weeks premature recently at Edmonton's Royal Alexandra Hospital. James weighed just under a pound-and-a-half, but because of advances in treatment he's expected to grow up to be strong and healthy."

James measures about the length of a person's hand. If he was born 22 weeks premature, that means that he was only 16 weeks old when he was born. What would our pro-choice friends say about a baby born at only 16 weeks old? Is he viable or is he not viable?

What about a baby that is removed from a mother's womb for surgery, replaced in her womb, carried to full term and then born? I want Hon. Members to think about that. What about the baby—though many would refer to it as a foetus—that could legally have been aborted before surgery? If this baby is removed, it is already a baby, not a foetus, and we think enough of it to perform surgery on it so that it can be healthy. Then the baby is returned to the mother's womb, and the baby is a foetus again. Under certain laws, it could probably be aborted. My, what a dangerous web we weave.

This is a life and death issue. About a month ago, I made a statement on this subject in the House of Commons. The headline of *The Globe and Mail* article of April 26, 1988, reads: "Life and death issue Netherlands expected to approve bill providing euthanasia defence". The article read:

> After 15 years of sometimes bitter public debate, it seems likely the Netherlands will soon become the first Western country to legalize mercy killing.
>
> Unless there is a new, unexpected outburst of opposition, legislation to permit euthanasia will be approved by the Dutch Parliament within the next few months.

The article went on:

> Although there is no prescribed method of death, the consensus in the Dutch medical community is that it would be carried out by injection of a sedative and curare, ensuring a painless and quick death.

If we liberalize our abortion laws, if we open them up so that it is almost abortion on demand, who will be next? I soon will be a senior citizen. Who knows, in another 10 or 15 years, what will happen to me physically? Will we then say to our seniors: "We will just give you an injection and put you out of your misery. You cannot hear anymore, you cannot see, you really cannot contribute to society"?

In a daily national newspaper, I read this headline: "Ear damage repaired with sound". The article read:

> "The story begins in Paris where an ear specialist, Dr. Alfred Tomatis, was intrigued by the fact that song birds hatched by silent foster mothers can't sing. Tomatis discovered that the human fetus hears its mother's voice at 4 1/2 months and, incredibly, the higher frequency tones of her voice actually nourish the unborn child. From there it was only a step to wondering if, for the damaged or emotionally deprived child, it was not possible to return to that period of nourishment and actually repair the damage—with sound."

Is it not incredible and interesting that a baby will hear its mother's sound at the age of 4.5 months?

• (2310)

May I ask permission of the House to speak for two minutes more?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sure the House will agree.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Fretz: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, and I thank all Members who are here.

A paper was distributed to most of us entitled "What Is A Person?" by Edward Bell Smith. It said that a person is not defined by size. A person is not defined by whether or not they have limbs or by any other degree of physical development. A person's worth must not be determined by their degree of mental development. Being a person must not be based on popularity or acceptance by others. Finally, a person must not be defined by whether or not they are on a life support system.

If we say to the unborn that they have no right to exist simply because they do not breathe air on their own or must depend on the built-in support system of the womb, we might as well pull the plug on all who do not exist in the normal way. That is a gross form of prejudice that ends where? With artificial hearts or pacemakers? Are people who use those less valuable than those who do not? It would be absurd to think so. Rather, a person is created by a miracle, a spark of life that man has never created but can so easily destroy. It can only be passed on from generation to generation and I submit must be done so with an ever-increasing sense of awe and wonder that even in its tiniest form it contains the potential of a Michaelangelo or Beethoven.

My last comment is from the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops. Their sixth point is that there can be no quick fix of this complex issue. What is at stake is this country's whole future. Just as the natural resources must be protected for future generations, so human resources must be protected for future generations. Members of the coming generation must have full life enhancing protection and support. Our common future depends on our respect for all the beings of nature.

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in this debate and take a pro choice position, which my Party is taking as well. On the resolution, my Party is taking the position that both law and government policy in the wake of the Supreme Court decision should affirm the right of a woman to make the decision of whether or not to have an abortion in conjunction with her doctor, provided that any abortion is carried out by a licensed medical practitioner. Our resolution also seeks to assure equitable access in all parts of Canada so that women are not denied access to an abortion, if that is what they need and decide in conscience that they should have, because of a lack of facilities in the area of the country in which they live. I have given the issue a great deal of thought and I will vote against the resolution which the Government has proposed and which initiated this debate.

My colleagues have spoken with some concern about the hyprocrisy, and I have to use that word, of the Government in saying this issue was urgent after the Supreme Court decision last January but then waiting until now to move. As well, rather than providing a government position in the form of legislation, even if it decided to allow a free vote on that legislation, it brought forward a resolution with no indication exactly what it means or whether it does or does not express government policy.

If this matter is urgent then, legislation should have been proposed. As it stands, this action will effectively defer any legislation on the issue until the fall, and most unlikely until a new Parliament is elected. In the meantime, any resolution adopted tomorrow, or even a failure to adopt a resolution tomorrow, changes nothing. It just indicates that the Government cannot make up its mind on this very difficult issue.

The Government's resolution has many flaws. I think the most fundamental flaw is the degree to which it subordinates the decision of a woman about whether or not she should have an abortion in the face of an unintended pregnancy, to many other factors. It calls for legislation consistent with the Constitution of Canada and the Charter of Rights. It says that the legislation should reflect the fundamental value and inherent dignity of each human being and the inherent worth of human life. Value judgments, and there are a large number of views as to exactly how that should be interpreted.

The resolution says the legislation should seek to achieve a balance between the right of a woman to liberty and security of her person and the responsibility of society to protect the unborn. Then, having called for a balance, the resolution says the legislation should prohibit abortion except in certain circumstances. One might interpret that as saying that the Government was taking a very hard line and effectively confining abortions to a very limited number of categories.

It requires that there be consultation and the practitioner must be of the view that continuation of the pregnancy would threaten the physical and mental well being of a woman. That, too, makes this provision sound restrictive. In practice, however, we all recognize that were the Government's resolution to be translated into legislation, the preambles, which I find objectionable because they are questionable, would not be in the legislation and not subject to interpretation. In practice, a medical doctor would be making a decision at the request of a woman either seeking an abortion or consulting with a doctor to decide whether or not to have an abortion, and the doctor would be making a decision with the woman or the woman with the doctor based on both medical grounds and the woman's perception of her physical and mental well being.

Since the earlier stages of the pregnancy would be up to 16 or 18 or 20 weeks, then the vast bulk of pregnancies that were sought to be terminated through abortion would be done so by a decision of the woman in consultation with her doctor.

The Government resolution then talks about further conditions during subsequent stages of pregnancy. One of my substantial objections to the Government's resolution is precisely that, although in only limited circumstances, albeit undefined, the Government is seeking to recriminalize abortion after the Supreme Court decision to take abortion effectively out of the Criminal Code. If we are logical in what we are talking about, and if we recriminalized abortions even under

certain circumstances, then I would assume that criminal penalties should be applied. That means a woman would be subject to imprisonment as a punishment for having gone through an abortion which was deemed to be illegal because she came to seek it too late and therefore did not come under the earlier part of any law that flowed from the Government's resolution.

I do not think it is right under any circumstances that a woman should be put in prison because she had an abortion which she had decided upon in conscience after, I am sure, a great deal of reflection and anguish and thought. One of the issues in the debate today is precisely the question of whose conscience has to prevail in this particular question.

I note in the debate in the last couple of days that almost all, if not all, of the women who have spoken from all three political parties have taken a pro choice position. There may have been nuances, they may have had some concern, as do I, about the triviality and frivolity involved in a woman choosing an abortion because she found the baby she was carrying was the wrong sex. However, the overwhelming view taken by women in this debate has been a pro choice position and that this has to be a decision made by a woman facing an unintended pregnancy, in consultation with her doctor.

• (2320)

Most of the men from the Progressive Conservative Party who have spoken on this issue have taken a position, in varying degrees, opposed to abortion. Because the Government says that this is an issue of free conscience, it is permitting a free vote by its members and has not proposed a government view as the New Democrats have proposed a caucus position on behalf of the New Democratic Party.

We grant Members of Parliament the right to make a decision in conscience on this difficult issue, but that decision of conscience, made overwhelmingly by male Members of Parliament since 90 per cent of this House is male, could deny freedom of conscience to women, the ones who get pregnant and may face this difficult decision.

If the consequences of pregnancy were shared equally, men expressing a pro-life position may take a different view. Every pregnancy results from conception. No conception takes place without a male partner, yet the consequences of unwanted pregnancy are borne almost entirely by the woman. Under those circumstances it seems to me that the decisions about unintended pregnancies should also be made almost entirely by the woman. If this Parliament was 50 per cent female or 90 per cent female it would have more legitimacy in making this decision.

Perhaps all of us in this House should reflect on how men would feel if a parliament dominated by women decided on a measure which was intrusive into their bodies and lives, i.e. vasectomy, and that for some reason this was to be required of males under certain circumstances. There would be outrage, there would be rebellion, there would be demonstrations in front of the House of Commons.

If the law prevents termination of unwanted pregnancy, it would condemn women who wish to respect the law to carry through with those pregnancies regardless of the consequences. Frankly, the consequences of carrying through a pregnancy, having a baby, and quite possibly maintaining it through 20 years of its life, are a great deal greater than the consequences of a male having a vasectomy which, among other things, is a reversible operation.

The Member who just spoke talked about the loss to our society if Ethel Waters, the singer, had not been born. He pointed out that she was born as a consequence of the rape of a 13-year-old girl. I cannot justify saying to young teenagers, who may be victims of rape or may be sucked in by what society shows about sexuality in advertisements and all the other messages which are given to young people of both sexes who are impressionable, that under no circumstances can they have an abortion or even consider an abortion because by so doing they may prevent another Ethel Waters from coming into this world.

What are the consequences for the thousands of teenagers who might carry children to term and then find it very difficult to give those babies up for adoption? What are the consequences for the lives of those very young women if they do not have even a choice about whether to bear those children?

I have given this issue a great deal of thought. I have met with local groups such as Planned Parenthood and pro-life groups such as Christians For Life. I recognize and respect the points of view which have been expressed on both sides. I believe this is an issue of conscience, and I respect the fact that there are people in our society who are opposed to abortion. I have listened and read the material they have offered. I still remain of the view that this is a decision which must be made by a woman with her doctor.

I do not try to impose my position on those who are opposed to abortion, and I do not believe that people who are opposed to abortion should impose their views on the 70 per cent of Canadians who indicate, through Gallup polls and in other ways, that they believe this is a decision which should be left to a woman in conjunction with her doctor.

I believe that the Conservative Party has thrown this debate open to a poll of sorts among Members of Parliament because the leaders of the Conservative Party do not see their way clear to an easy answer on this one. On the one hand, there are Members such as the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mrs. McDougall) who has given a passionate speech on a pro-choice position. On the other hand, a number of Members who have spoken, mainly male, have taken a strong and passionate position on the pro-life or anti-abortion position.

Perhaps we can all learn a bit of humility from this diversity of views expressed within the government Party, as well as other Parties, and recognize that the Supreme Court was

perhaps on the right track when it said that this decision should be made by a woman and that to apply criminal law was contrary to rights.

I believe that the distinction between early and late termination of pregnancy is a false and misleading one. Assuming that the Government's definition of early termination of pregnancy is up to 18 or 20 weeks, I will cite the statistics. In 1985, according to Statistics Canada, 88.9 per cent of abortions took place before the twelfth week of gestation. Another 8 per cent of terminations took place before the sixteenth week of gestation. Another 3 per cent took place before the twentieth week, and only .3 per cent of terminations took place after the twentieth week. Three one-hundredths of one per cent, a total of about 20 out of 60,000 abortions, took place after the twenty-fifth week, that is, after the point at which people tend to feel that the foetus has become viable. Therefore, 97, 98, or 99 per cent of the abortions taking place now would be allowed by the Government's resolution, if the decision were taken by the woman in conjuction with her doctor.

Some call that abortion on demand, but I do not believe it is on demand because I believe that is a very difficult decision. Any woman who is in that position must know from talking to a friend, a counsellor, a nurse, her mother, an aunt, or someone else whom she trusts that she will not recover quickly. She will have a sense of emptiness and loss and wonder what that baby might be. She takes the risk that perhaps she will never again become pregnant and may never bear a child of her own. These are the consequences of unintended pregnancy. However, bear in mind that the men who are responsible for unintended pregnancies bear none of those consequences in our society.

Despite the comments made by the Catholic Bishops of Canada, the Catholic Church, for which I have a great deal of respect, has no *ex cathedra* teaching on this subject. It has left the question of when life begins to the theologians and to individual judgment. Even the Catholic Church does not have funeral rites for foetuses which are miscarried or aborted and die as a consequence. That is general in all religions prevalent in Canada and indicates that even our great religions have dealt in a somewhat different way with unborn children before they react the age of viability. I do not know whether it is possible to have one coherent abortion policy except for an abortion policy that recognizes the diversity which now exists.

I note that the Government has reduced the funding for family planning in Canada by approximately one-third since it came to power. If we want to reduce unintended pregnancies, we need more funding and more support for family so that men and women of all ages can avoid unintended pregnancies. Currently, according to Planned Parenthood, about half the pregnancies which women experience in Canada are unintended. Of course, many of those result in births because people want the child. A man and woman may decide to have a child although they may not have intended for it to come along.

• (2330)

While education about sexuality is a major means by which we can reduce unintended pregnancies, only half the schools in Canada provided education in sexuality in 1984. Given the time it takes for training, education, and so on, it is generally considered to be undesirable and unwise for women to have babies before they reach the age of 19 or 20. They are adapting to life and learning skills particularly because many women will have to work for most of their lifetime, when previously they could be wives and mothers. That was accepted by women and society not so many years ago.

In Canada, one teenager girl in every five becomes pregnant before she is 20. That pregnancy can have an extraordinarily negative effect on that young woman in terms of her career prospects, her education, her chances of having a decent marriage. Not one male has an unintended pregnancy before the age of 20. We are talking about an issue that largely affects women.

As a parent, I found it very difficult to talk about sexuality with my three sons. I left them to learn much from movies, television, and on the street. That was a common way to learn about sexuality. The schools do not take part and sometimes, as a society, we interfere with the schools and prevent them from talking about sexuality due to a fear that it will encourage young people to become sexually active.

Since the days of the Model T, young people have increasingly had the means and the ability to become sexually active at ages which tend to get younger and younger. A basic element of sex education for young people is for them to know that it is okay to say no. We do not even do that because that kind of education is often not available.

The Planned Parenthood group suggests among other things that there should be an increased involvement by men. It should include an understanding by men that this is an issue that overwhelmingly concerns women. We, as males, have to be prepared to listen to what women say about this subject.

I am satisfied, from the people to whom I have talked in the last months as this issue was coming before us, that a woman who finds that she has become pregnant unintentionally and wants to have that pregnancy terminated very quickly will react that way anyway. They will take a view, which is a common sense view, that in the early stages of pregnancy it is more a matter of the health and well-being for women, while later on the foetus should have greater concern. In the small number of late pregnancies, it concerns someone who was unaware she was pregnant, or where a birth abnormality has been diagnosed in a very severe case like an encephalitic child which is brain damaged. It is where a woman had not access to abortion services earlier for various reasons. I think we must deal with those reasons in conscience and with compassion.

In conclusion, my son, Ben, is 24. He and his partner are expecting a child in November. That foetus is at the stage of four or five months. As it reaches the stage of viability, I recall

from our own children that one becomes aware of it. I recognize that people have, in conscience, brought forward all these factors.

We must also recognize that we are talking about trying to make women equal in our society. However, women are the only ones who bear the children in our society. Therefore, they must make these decisions. We cannot leave these decisions to men, and that is why I am supporting the NDP resolution that we will be putting forward tomorrow. That is why I am taking a pro-choice position on this very difficult issue.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I do not support the motion on the Order Paper, so I have amended it.

My amendment will strike out everything after the words "human life" in the main motion and substitute my amendment so that the motion will read: "That, in the opinion of this House, the Supreme Court of Canada having declared that the provisions of the Criminal Code relating to abortion are inconsistent with the provisions of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and are therefore of no force or effect, the Government should prepare and introduce legislation, consistent with the Constitution of Canada, including the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which reflects the fundamental value and inherent dignity of each human being and the inherent worth of human life", continuing with my amendment: "Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, enacts as follows:

1. Section 251 of the Criminal Code and the heading preceding are repealed and the following substituted therefor: Protection of the Unborn.

251(1) Everyone who, with the intent to cause the death of an unborn human being, uses any means to carry out that intent is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for life.

(2) Everyone who, in doing anything or omitting to do anything that is the duty of that person to do, shows wanton or reckless disregard for the life and safety of an unborn human being and thereby causes the death of that unborn human being is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for five years.

(3) Every pregnant female person who, with intent to cause the death of an unborn human being within her, uses any means to carry out that intent is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for two years.

(4) No one is guilty of an offence under subsection (1) if the life of the unborn human being was ended as a result of medical treatment necessary to prevent the death of the mother of the unborn human being or to remedy a condition that, if left untreated, would cause the death of that mother.

(5) In this section any means includes

(a) the administration of a drug or any other noxious thing,

(b) the use of an instrument, and

(c) manipulation of any kind.

Unborn human being means a human life from the moment of conception until birth, whether conceived naturally or otherwise."

First, let me pay tribute to Senator Stanley Haidasz, who is sponsoring the amended part of this motion in the Senate.

My amended motion uses a motion moved by the Liberal Senator Haidasz, seconded by Progressive Conservative Senator John MacDonald. It sets out precisely what I believe and what many of my constituents believe. It is a pro-life position.

Respect for human life is basic to our way of life and to our society. I believe that life begins the moment that conception takes place. The unborn human being has done no wrong. He or she should not be punished, let alone murdered. To those who do not believe that life begins at conception, I ask: At what moment, then, does life begin? Surely everyone accepts the fact that at some point a fertilized ovum becomes a life. If not at conception, when?

Reverend Father Ken Forster of Fort St. James, British Columbia, said to me in a letter: "If I had difficulty believing that human life began at conception, I certainly would not want to be in a position of deciding whether it began at eight days, one month, three months or at birth". Only God has the right to make that decision. How do those who say that life begins at birth explain the growth, the movement, and beating heart of the unborn child?

My second reason for not supporting abortion, the killing of unborn babies, is that I believe the Bible. I make no apology for believing the Bible as the word of God and make no apology at trying to follow what that scripture says. Genesis 2.7 states that God is the creator and source of the first human life. I quote that section:

> "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

• (2340)

Second, I believe that God quickens the human body to enable conception. To prove that I quote from Genesis 17:19:

> And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him."

Jeremiah 1:5 shows the love of God for the unborn child:

> "Then the word of the Lord came unto me saying, before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations."

We have the commandment "thou shalt not kill", and if we disobey we reap the punishment. There are many other reasons I support my motion as amended, as set out by Senator Haidasz, but the reasons I have outlined are the main reasons.

Why can I not support the motion on the Order Paper? It is not a government motion. It is a motion on the Order Paper. First, it opens the door to thousands of abortions. It permits abortion on request in the early stages of pregnancy with some restrictions in the last few months. The law that was struck down by the Supreme Court of Canada had some restrictions that were thought would limit abortions. I was not in the House of Commons at that time. It did not limit abortions, but it did result in the direct killing of some 60,000 unborn babies every year. If this motion on the Order Paper is made the law of Canada, mark my words, there will be more unborn babies murdered in the womb.

The motion on the Order Paper talks about "a balance of the right of a woman to liberty and security and the responsibility of society to protect the unborn". I know of no one who argues that a woman should not have liberty and security, but surely the liberty and security does not carry with it the right to kill another life, the life she carries. I agree also that a woman has the right to control her own body, but that does not carry the right to have a doctor murder another life, the baby she carries. To me, there is no balance between the right of a woman to liberty and security and the right of the unborn baby she carries. That baby has an equal right to liberty and security. More than that, the baby has a right to be born and the right to live. So the very basis of the motion on the Order Paper, in my view, is faulty.

There is another reason I cannot support the motion on the Order Paper. What is it the beginning of? We have the results of the 1969 law that resulted in doctors authorizing thousands of abortions which had nothing whatsoever to do with the health of the mother. Scores of reasons were evident, birth control, economic conditions, mental anguish caused if the baby was born, the baby was unwanted, the baby was unloved, it would interfere with the social life, and so on. These and many other reasons were given as excuses to destroy an innocent baby's life.

If these reasons are ever considered valid enough to murder a baby in the womb, what will we authorize next? The murder of some of the kids in a big family for economic reasons? The murder of a victim of infantile paralysis because of mental anguish? The murder of a crippled aged husband because he can no longer bring home a paycheque? The sick and bedridden people in a auxiliary hospital because they can no longer do the things they did 20 years ago? Heaven forbid. Let us not start down such a road that will lead to such tragedies.

In conclusion, my motion as amended recognizes the sanctity of human life. It is based on Holy Writ. It will be a beginning in bringing this nation back to the scriptural foundations laid by our early pioneers. It will allow thousands of beautiful boys and girls to be born so that they can build a greater Canada.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting in this House since six o'clock this evening and I can assure you that this is an extremely complex and emotional issue, not one that is easy to deal with. As you know, the Supreme Court of Canada rendered a judgment on January 28 of this year striking down the previous Criminal Code provisions with respect to abortion, declaring them unconstitutional. From that time this country has been without a criminal law on abortion. It has been without any law whatsoever on abortion. Despite that fact, it has taken the Government nearly four months to come forward with a replacement measure.

On May 20, the Government presented a multiple choice resolution which was unprecedented in Canadian parliamentary history, and it was clearly out of order. After much argument that such a resolution was not acceptable, the Government discussed it within its caucus, procrastinated, but finally withdrew the resolution. On July 22, only five days ago, the Government presented us with a new resolution.

This new resolution which is now before us deals with a single proposal. It is not a multiple choice question. It is subject to amendment and thus far 21 amendments to that resolution have been put forward. Canadians must understand that no matter what happens to this motion and to its amendments, it will make absolutely no difference to the state of the law on abortion in this country. Nothing will change as a result of this resolution and the votes that will take place tomorrow. That is because this motion is simply a resolution, not a Bill. As you know, Mr. Speaker, it requires a Bill in order to legislate. That is why it is hard to take this motion and this debate too seriously.

We all know that no matter what the outcome of the debate, nothing will change until a Bill is presented and passed. It is unlikely that there will be such a Bill until after the next election. Then the House of Commons will have a different composition. There will be many new Members, and since this is a free vote question, those new Members will not be bound by any advisory vote of this Parliament which will take place tomorrow. That is why this process and this motion are misleading.

We have been without a law on abortion since January 28, and after tomorrow there will still be no law on abortion. Several Members have said there must be responsibility and that it is time for action. I have heard that many times this evening.

• (2350)

This motion will not result in action. The Government has not assumed its responsibility. Since the Government controls this House, we in the Opposition or the Private Members of this House cannot present the kind of motion that we would prefer. It is true that we can present amendments to the motion, but those amendments must be compatible with the principal motion.

It would have been preferable if the Government had stated clearly that it was not yet ready to deal with this issue. There might have been many reasons for making such a statement.

One might have been the Borowski case which is presently before the Supreme Court and will be decided later this year. That case will decide on the legal rights of the foetus, the unborn child. The Government has not said that. It pretends that this resolution and this debate and the vote tomorrow will somehow resolve the question. It will not.

As I said earlier, it is difficult to take this motion seriously, not only because it will not produce action in solving the problem but also because the debate is limited to two days and there is a vote that must immediately follow. The vote must follow tomorrow around noon time.

Furthermore, there have been no committee hearings as there were in 1968 when I was a member of that committee which studied the issue. The committee hearings which were in great depth preceded the legislation which was to follow. It is a pretense to deal with a serious matter without dealing with it properly.

Since the judgment of the Supreme Court in January, I have studied this issue in great depth and intensity. I have met representatives from both sides of the question. I have met the anti-abortion groups. I have met the pro-choice groups. I have considered my position very seriously.

I want to say that I am philosophically opposed to abortion. While I am not a scientist, I believe that human life begins at or soon after conception and that the person develops as months go on until that person is born. Then, the person continues to develop until adulthood.

That having been said, I have serious doubts as to what extent and in what manner abortion should be dealt with or should be covered in the Criminal Code. I have no doubt about my own personal position. That is very clear. I have held that position for a long time. However, I do have doubt as to how this matter should be dealt with in the Criminal Code. I submit that it is a very complex and difficult issue.

To begin with, I doubt whether many of us would argue that everything we believe to be immoral should be the subject of the criminal law. At one time adultery, homosexuality, suicide, drug addiction, and contraception were criminal offences in Canada, but they are not so today.

Second, while many of us believe life starts at conception, we have rarely treated the developing foetus in the same way as a born child. For example, we have always had separate criminal laws for abortion and murder. Some people have said in this debate and elsewhere that abortion is murder, but the two have never been treated the same.

Why is this so? The answer is based in our history and in the history of British criminal law, but it is probably due to the fact that there was a consensus in society which felt that there was a difference between the two. That is why there is some inconsistency by those who oppose different abortion rules for different stages of pregnancy. If there is no difference between a child before birth and a child after birth, then why the two offences? If one can differentiate for criminal law purposes the child just before birth from the child just after birth, why can we not differentiate human life before viability from the human life after viability? They are both different stages in the process of developing human life.

As I have said, over a long period of our history we have distinguished between the crimes of abortion and the crimes of murder, both with different penalties and both with different procedures. One could never plead guilty to murder but one could to abortion. They have different penalties. The penalty for murder has always been more serious. They have been treated differently. It is not therefore inconsistent to suggest that we should have different rules for life, before viability and after viability.

Furthermore, if the quality of life is always the same from the very moment of conception to adult life how can we agree to some exceptions for abortion such as rape and incest but not for other exceptions such as health? Where is the line drawn? On what principle do we draw that line? In both cases the unborn child is equally innocent.

I am further confused by the seeming inconsistency of the Christian church. I say that with great respect because I am a member of the Christian church. If human life is the same at all stages, why can the conceived child not be immediately baptized and therefore capable of eternal life as defined by Christian theology? Since the foetus spontaneously aborted or miscarried, as one would say, in early stages has not been baptized, it is deemed to have a lesser status than the child who dies in the later stages and who has been baptized. In both cases the life is innocent. Why the different treatment? Why is the life in the first month of pregnancy that is spontaneously miscarried, aborted, treated differently from the child that is born and baptized? I must say that I see a glaring double standard with respect to the spontaneously aborted foetus and the deliberately aborted foetus, both in law and in morality.

A woman can, among other things, smoke, drink, and eat junk food during her pregnancy and possibly harm or abort her child but she is not subject to criminal sanctions. This all adds up to demonstrate that in law, both criminal and canon law, we do not and have not treated all stages of foetal development in the same way despite the fact that we might believe that human life starts at conception. This goes back to my original point.

While I am personally opposed to abortion, I find it difficult to determine at what point and to what extent the criminal law should apply. In this respect we must recognize that if the criminal law is to be enforceable there must be a strong consensus with respect to which offences should be criminalized. If there is not a strong consensus, then there will not be enforcement and the law is ridiculed, it is defamed, it is in disrespect.

During the twenties in the United States alcoholic beverages were outlawed. There was prohibition. There was no consensus for that law. It was not respected and was obeyed more in the breach.

Recently in Quebec with respect to the abortion law—and I did not like it—two juries unanimously acquitted an accused who was obviously running an abortion clinic. That is because there was no consensus for the criminal law that was in place and it could not be enforced.

It is my opinion that the only law that will have a strong consensus in Canada is one that will permit abortion for serious reasons in the later stages of pregnancy. Consequently, only such a criminal law will be enforceable. That is not to say that nothing else should be done. I believe that there are too many abortions, both legal and illegal. I think we could reduce a good number of those if we had better education with respect to sex, foetal development, birth control, and better birth control measures. I also think that we could give more support to groups such as Birthright and other preventive measures which might reduce the number of unwanted pregnancies.

• (0000)

Also essential are measures to support mothers and families. If there is to be a true choice, then there must be the support systems for mothers who might wish to keep their babies. Young mothers must not be driven to abortion because they cannot face an unfair and hostile world where there is not proper nutrition, housing, and other measures to help them keep and support their babies.

This resolution before the House will not solve anything and a Bill will be necessary. This is only chapter one of my submission with respect to this extremely serious and important matter. Chapter two will be produced when the Bill is presented to the House, probably not until after the next election.

In the meantime, I will continue to listen, to read, and to study this issue. I am not happy with the principal motion before the House, and I have not yet had time to examine the 21 amendments that have been tabled. No matter what happens, I want to say again that the motion and the process that we have before us will not solve the problem tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with some interest and have been delighted to note that most Members have, over the last couple of days, put forward their individual points of view. The previous speaker was quite correct, this resolution in front of us which is taking the form of an adjournment debate must be followed by government legislation. I think we all anticipate the events tomorrow.

Together with my colleague, the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East (Mr. Allmand) I was also part of the problem some 20 years ago when we did a lot of work in the Harley Commission. Among the things that we did was to acknowledge to ourselves, after two and a half years of extensive and intensive hearings, that we did not have an answer. The problem we face today with the position of the Supreme Court of Canada is understandable and it was certainly predictable over the years that intervened.

Twenty years ago we passed a bad law, and I was part of that. I might say *en passant* that the suggestion implicit, if not stated, in the Canadian Catholic Conference of Bishops statement that the matter has just begun was in fact begun 20 years ago. We had agreed within the committee that perhaps fundamental to all of us was the necessity of a multi-disciplinary study of this very difficult and complex question. That did not happen. A colleague of Mr. Trudeau and the government of the day, said: No. We will bury it in an omnibus justice Bill, which they would not allow us to separate—and we have had some demonstration of that situation recently. We have a law in Canada, a bad law, unevenly available to people. It has been struck down, as most of us who were involved knew it would eventually be because it was bad law.

Now what do we have? The Government is asking Parliament to give it some direction. At this point in time I do not intend to develop any theories or arguments one way or the other. I am quite prepared to tell the Government where it is I stand and what I would like to see the Government do. I will make my position very clear, as I did 20 years ago, that I am simply against abortion except where it anticipates, through rational and reasoned thought on the part of professional people, that it might jeopardize the life of the mother.

As I said, I was part of the problem 20 years ago. I am delighted to be part of the dialogue that may resolve the problem. I do not believe that this Chamber has the wisdom to ultimately do that, but I do believe that society does have that capacity, and that it is a matter of a will on the part of this Chamber to set out to pursue it. We cannot do it here alone. We do not have the disciplines. We do not have the knowledge. Except in passing comment or reference, there has not been any history of nations such as Japan and their experience with abortion on demand. I would commend anyone who wants to go back and look at the literature. There is no medical history in this country of which I am aware that tells anyone, and particularly the family practitioner, about the physiological impact of an abortion and subsequent abortions on the capacity of a woman to carry to full term subsequent foetuses. These questions must be examined by us, admittedly as laymen, and must be examined very closely. I hope Members have gone back and had a look at the evidence in the Harley Commission report and some of the very difficult questions that were posed with respect to this issue.

Tonight, I only wish to indicate to the Government, as someone who has now spent some 32 years in public life, that we had bad law, the Supreme Court of Canada has told us that, and we have a responsibility to correct it. In response to my friend, the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East, the Government intends to correct it. The Government is not naive in that respect at all.

I reject the gestational approach to the law that is suggested in the resolution and as such will vote against it. I am pleased to state that my friend, the Hon. Member for Grey—Simcoe (Mr. Mitges), and others have expressed my views with respect to this simply and quite eloquently, as well as I could, if not better.

• (0010)

I have five children. Four of them are adopted. I know the value of life. If it were not violating family private matters, I could suggest to you that I know an awful lot about the difficulties that this Chamber faces with respect to this matter. Let me say simply that I reject the gestational theory. I accept and embrace the concept that life begins at conception. I would not want to believe in anything other than that, because to do so would take me back 20 years to the horror of bad decisions made in this Chamber, and I do not want to do that. I want, rather, to be part of the solution. I do not want to abandon what I understand to be a primary function of our responsibility. In that regard, I say to you and to the Government that, as a Catholic, and as a Catholic legislator, I must pay some attention to good law. Good law is very simply explained. I think the Members of the Chamber will agree that it is simply law that people want to obey and will obey. Bad law are laws that we pass that people will not obey. We have, in that context, an enormous task cut out for us.

I expect that the Government will accept its responsibility, and I believe that the Government will place it before us. Indeed, I will urge with all that I have to ensure that it does. I do not want the unborn foetus unprotected for an undue period of time.

I ask the people who are here in this Chamber and those people who are their constituents to thoughtfully—not emotionally, but thoughtfully—consult with us, give us the benefit of their thoughts, help us and, above all, for the love of God pray for us.

Mr. Anthony Roman (York North): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to rise today and to address this motion on abortion which could set the framework for a new law that will govern Canadians in the future. I do not propose to repeat the many good arguments of my colleagues concerning the protection of the unborn child. Canadians look to their Members of Parliament to draft legislation which reflects and respects their rights. One of our main purposes here is to observe rights and protect them through legislation. Canadians do not take these rights casually, and for that reason I am sure my colleagues will agree that we must examine this issue carefully.

Canada's law regarding abortion, the one which the highest court of our land struck down last January 28, was arrived at following lengthy debate in 1969. I am sure that the duly elected legislators of that time made decisions that they felt were right. But in the almost 20 years since then, many concepts of rights have developed, and these concepts became law. It is the obligation of Canada's legislators to respect these laws and use them to guide new legislation that we draft here. Canada's Charter of Rights and Freedoms was Parliament's answer to the need for entrenching rights for Canadians.

Our Charter states: "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof". Now we have been shown by our Supreme Court that we had created a conflict between our Charter and a law, the former abortion law. Many Canadians feel that we need a new law now. Clearly, having no law is not a protection for those who need it. I believe that the unborn child has the right to life, liberty and security.

An examination of abortion legislation reveals that the unborn are the weakest element in the situation. If abortion affects them, then it holds that the law must include them, as well. If we follow our principle of protecting the weak, we have no choice but to legislate in their favour.

Some people seek a compromise between the rights of the unborn versus the rights for the mother. There may be a conflict between the two, but the route of compromise will not protect the weakest when they need it.

My fellow legislators are facing a major task. We must lead the way into the future based upon established principles and goals. Our long-standing principle of equality, fairness, and protection of rights has been entrenched within our Constitution and now we must always consider these guidelines. Therefore, I maintain without any reservation that to protect the weakest person in the matter of abortion, we need a law which takes this principle into account.

The Government stated its intention to draft abortion legislation from the will of the Commons expressed by this motion an interesting but flawed approach. It is flawed because the Government is putting forth a motion which cannot become a law, which does not protect the weak and which therefore permits the stronger forces of choice to prevail over the weak, unborn children. Why has the Government not introduced a Bill?

The Government maintains that it has a preferred position but is willing to seek the consensus of the House. Considering the majority of the Government in this House, that is, quite seriously, very considerate. Unfortunately, that considerate gesture is not what I, or many Canadians expect from their Government.

That is why this motion is inadequate. It addresses an urgent need, inadequately. This matter must be a Bill and become law soon. Canadians should not be asked to wait while the caucus of their Government presents various options. To delay this legislation is not a responsible government approach.

The absence of a law concerning abortion has left Canada permitting abortions in all circumstances because there is no prohibition. The Government's motion suggested continuing this permissive attitude with some very minor restrictions. Frankly, this is not acceptable.

Over the course of history, the medical profession and science in general have continually increased their accumulated knowledge. Each year more technical advances have permitted more understanding of life in general.

In the 20 years since 1969, medicine has achieved a new understanding of when life begins. These current definitions were not in place 20 years ago. To ignore the best scientific evidence of our times is to fly in the face of ignorance.

We now realize that a division of cells, which occurs shortly after the union of sperm and ovum at conception, can more clearly determine that a life has begun. Any medical procedure which might alter the natural course of events must take this fact into account.

• (0020)

As Members of Parliament, legislators must take seriously their leadership roles. One aspect of leadership is responsibility. Responsibility, in this case, means recognizing that life begins at conception. We must pass laws that protect the sanctity of life, as outlined in our Charter of Rights. Abortion, as an after-the-fact legal/medical remedy, is not a way for legislators to demonstrate leadership and responsibility. The Supreme Court of Canada did not tell Parliament it could not pass laws protecting the rights of the unborn. Nor were we told to pass legislation defining where abortions could be obtained and by whom. Parliament was instructed that rights must be considered and weighed. That is the bottom line of the message in my opinion.

I believe the state has no right to say an innocent life may be ended. Two individuals should not be able to make this decision either. What the state can do is accept valid medical evidence acquired since our last law was drafted. It can permit medical doctors to continue their tradition of upholding their oath namely, "That a medical practitioner's duty is to protect life". Do we want to say that the medical profession should ignore its oath? If, in an emergency, only one of two lives can be saved by a doctor, then the doctor must exercise an appropriate medical judgment.

I have repeatedly told my constituents that it is imperative Parliament move quickly in drafting new legislation which constitutionally guarantees and protects the right to life of the unborn. This motion actually states that abortion is not permitted except in certain circumstances. Yet one of those circumstances is when the pregnant woman chooses to abort. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this is not a prohibition of abortion but, in my opinion, permission instead. That is not an acceptable state of affairs nor is it a tolerable route, and as a motion intended to lead toward law, I cannot support it. I cannot support anything short of protection of all Canadians, including the unborn, under our laws and our Charter of Rights and Freedoms. I believe that any compromise would allow forces to undermine our fundamental rights and freedoms. Unborn Canadians require the protection of legislation which grants them protection against abortion. I cannot put it more simply, Mr. Speaker.

There are many reasons for protecting the unborn against abortion. However, within the constraints of our debate the most basic reason I believe is that life starts at conception. The unborn child is deserving of the protection afforded under our laws. As a responsible Member of Parliament I believe all Canadians deserve to be treated equally.

I will support amendments to this motion which provide the full, legal protection of our Charter of Rights and Freedoms to unborn Canadian children. I will not support this motion as it now stands before us.

Mr. Bob Pennock (Etobicoke North): Mr. Speaker, in this House tonight we are debating an issue which will have, quite literally, life or death consequences. With this in mind, we must carefully consider every avenue of this subject. In my opinion, it should not be dealt with as a religious debate but rather a sensitive moral and social issue though there are, of course, religious overtones.

We will never reach a consensus on the abortion issue. The scientific and medical communities are unable to reach agreement on many of the key elements of this argument. One example of this division is over the question of when life begins. When does it begin? At conception? When brain waves are detected? When the heart beats? Or at birth? In my opinion, life begins at conception. From that moment on there exists an individual with a genetic make-up that is different from both parents. At conception that individual has the potential to do or become anything.

The abortion debate is not about the miracle of life but rather how society deals with balancing rights. In every case where an abortion is wanted we have a woman with rights and, as the Supreme Court of this country pointed out, with aspirations and goals that may not include having a child. Chief Justice Dickson has said that:

> "Forcing women by threat of criminal sanctions to carry a foetus to term, unless she meets certain criteria unrelated to her own priorities and aspirations, is a profound interference with a woman's body and thus an infringement of security of the person."

Must the pregnant woman forfeit all rights, including in very extreme cases the right to live? If abortions are totally outlawed, as one extreme would have them, women with life threatening health problems would be forced to carry a child to term. I certainly cannot support that. The situation is further complicated by cases of rape and incest. Should an innocent woman impregnated against her will be forced to carry a child? I cannot support that. In any case, does anyone really believe that abortions can be totally eliminated simply because there is a law outlawing them? Has it worked with prostitution? Ask the young ladies working in the market area if they know that their profession, the world's oldest, is illegal? Of course, they know, but that does not stop them from plying their trade.

Our American neighbours outlawed alcohol during the prohibition years. This action simply moved the industry underground. Bathtub gin turned a profit for organized crime but the legislation did not stop Americans from drinking.

Abortions will be done, legally or illegally. I prefer to think of women entering hospitals receiving counselling and being informed of all their options. Education and counselling are the key to preventing abortions. Informing women of the possible psychological effect of having an abortion and letting them know what support services are available to new mothers may convince some about how to deal with the situation in ways other than abortion.

If through legislation we outlaw abortion, will we see a return to the days when desperate women went to unqualified practitioners who worked in unsanitary conditions? Having an abortion was more than emotionally scarring then. It could kill. No one wants to see that situation occur again. I certainly do not. Surely in this day and age we can provide the services needed, whether those services involve setting up adoptions, support groups for new mothers or abortions.

Society has coined a phrase "unwanted children". How can there be unwanted children in a country where childless couples, desperate to adopt, run ads in newspapers? Children can certainly be unplanned, but someone always wants them, though that someone may not be a biological parent.

Education and counselling, in my opinion, will do more to prevent the need for abortion than any restrictive law that any Government can draft. More attention should be spent on these two aspects of the abortion debate. It has been said that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure". I feel that education is our ounce of prevention. Preventing unplanned pregnancy is far better than ending it. Canadians of all ages should be encouraged to seek the proper educational tools in order to understand better the positive and negative realities surrounding abortions.

As legislators, we should encourage our provincial counterparts to use the educational system as a place to start informing our youth, tomorrow's leaders and possibly legislators about responsibility. Having said that, I would like to add that I do think that this Government has a duty to the Canadian people to give some direction through legislation and through this debate that we are in now.

As I said in my opening remarks, I feel that life begins at conception. Therefore the foetus has rights that deserve to be protected. Because of my personal belief, my intention is to vote for any reasonable amendment that does this. Should, however, that be defeated, then it would be my intention to vote for a compromise which would balance the rights of both woman and child.

In conclusion, the compromise position is one I can support as well because it would seem acceptable to the Supreme Court. It is my hope through this debate that we will be able to produce a law that will protect the unborn. I think it is very important that we understand that having at least some form of law by going for the compromise does not prevent us from working hard for improvements. A vacuum, though, which is what we would have if we were to defeat the main motion, if that is the one we eventually get to, will virtually mean abortion on demand. We must strive for some form of workable legislation through the debate that is occurring tonight.

• (0030)

We have all heard the critics say that we will not actually achieve anything through this debate or through voting on this motion. I for one do not believe that that is true. We hear people say that we would not be able to produce a law before an election, that we would not be able to draft the legislation. I fervently believe, however, that the direction and initiative that this House can provide the Government through this debate would be one that any new Government, I would hope, would have the gumption to take up from where we left off.

Mr. Barry Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, abortion is wrong. I do not intend to cite in this debate chapter and verse of Canadian statistics or the statistics of other countries. Statistics are for losers. Abortion is wrong.

I will not quote Scripture or what others have said on this issue in recent hours, weeks, months or years. Abortion is wrong.

I will not try to give a scientific interpretation of human life or of foetal viability either. When I was elected to this House of Commons almost four years ago, I brought with me some fundamental Christian principles that I learned from my parents, from my teachers and from my church. One of my basic principles was reinforced during my working experiences in Africa and Central America and in my world travels. That is that life, indeed human life, is precious, is sacred and is what we strive to preserve and protect at all times. Abortion is wrong and no one can make it right.

The Supreme Court Justices have said to Parliament essentially that the old law on abortion is no longer applicable in Canada and that we can either leave well enough alone or make a new law that is acceptable. The state has decided, and rightly so, that Parliament should do something. I therefore commend the Government for allowing this debate to begin all over again, recognizing that as soon as we vote, debate will not end but will merely take a different twist along its endless path toward an impossible solution.

Nurses, doctors, lawyers, judges, parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles and people all over the world face this issue on a daily basis. We face it now as Parliamentarians. I say to our people that abortion is wrong.

We are talking about supporting option (a), option (b) or option (c), Motion 1, Motion 2 or Motion 3. Let me ask this question: what options does a foetus have? It has two only: life

or death. If one were to ask a foetus what one he or she would prefer, we can be certain what the answer would be.

As foetal life gets more and more viable, more and more independent and more and more important as it gets older and therefore should be preserved, does the converse apply as we become more and more senior as we age, slow down and become less viable? Should it be destroyed? I think not, Sir, I think not. Can one therefore speak of abortion and euthanasia in the same breath? I think not.

We cannot quantify the quality of life with some arbitrary time frame. Life is life, from conception to natural death. Abortion is wrong, Sir.

The fundamental principle that I learned as a child and as a young man and that I now apply as a Parliamentarian is that the preservation of life is the most important goal of any civilized society. As Dr. Albert Schweitzer said, if a man loses reverence for any part of life, he will lose reverence for all life.

The line we are trying to divide between a woman's right to choose and the unborn's right to live is simply indivisible. As long as it is the normal practice for women to conceive and to deliver children, that unique privilege and those unborn children must be respected and protected. The right to control one's body does not imply the right to destroy another person's body.

Some people may say to me: "Barry, you are out of touch with the times. Women have changed. Economic necessities have changed. Social priorities have changed. Our laws have changed". All this true, Sir, but what has not changed is conception, pregnancy and childbirth. No one can change that and no one ever will. The process of childbirth simply must be protected. Perhaps the times are out of touch with the historical reality that human life, born and unborn, is what we are all about.

Our Charter and our laws have been written by people. They will be rewritten by people. This debate is about what is right and what is wrong. It should not be about what someone thinks he or she should be allowed to do or not to do.

I am not here to condemn anyone. I am here to say and to do what I think is right. Canadians need more people, not fewer. Abortion is wrong, and I will vote accordingly.

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of difficulty that I enter into this debate, in part because I think the majority of the Members we have heard from on this issue, while I recognize that they are certainly concerned about human life and about the protection of the unborn, can only speak about abortion in a very theoretical sense. They are men. They cannot get pregnant. They cannot bear children. They cannot know the pain and uncertainty involved in carrying a foetus that may have no brain or may have other problems.

While, unlike some, I do believe that men certainly have a right to participate in this debate, I find it extremely difficult to listen to the over-all tone of the Members who would speak in a very black-and-white fashion on this issue when they themselves will never, ever be faced with the possibility of having to undergo an abortion. That being said, when I thought about my participation in this debate, I thought about what I would like to be able to tell my daughter when she reaches the age at which she will begin to understand the meaning of human life and begin to understand what it means to conceive and to bear a child. I have to say, all theories aside, that I think everyone of us truly believes that human life begins at the moment of conception. I do not think we can pick a time in the second or third or whatever month when somehow human life miraculously takes on a new form. A foetus does represent human life in its very earliest stages.

• (0040)

One of the things that caused me to come to the debate tonight was that I was sitting at home watching some of the participants on television. One Member said all of the women who had spoken were all "pro choice". That provoked me to enter the debate because I think that women, like men, represent the broad range and broad spectrum of opinion on this issue. I do not think there is one homogenous voice speaking out and saying this is what is right or this is what is wrong.

Unlike the previous speaker I do not think this country or the world sees this issue in black and white. I do think, in particular because I have the capacity to bear a child and because I have borne a child, as a woman I have a special responsibility to respect the nature of life and the nature of conception. I know that for myself I could never, I do not believe, undergo an abortion.

We have received admonitions from the Cardinal to examine our consciences. I think most of the admonitions really fell somewhat short of the mark because I think anyone who has participated in this debate has sought counsel. If they are of a religious nature, they have prayed. They have sought guidance. As an individual participating in this debate I certainly believe that I have a responsibility to sanctify and respect the beginning of human life from conception. I also have a point where I have to look at my role as a legislator and my own conscience. I have to ask myself whether, given the moral choice and the moral decision that I make, that I could not undergo an abortion and hope my daughter would never undergo an abortion, that can be translated into an amendment to the Criminal Code or whether it can be translated into some kind of over-all edict for the Canadian people.

I have to tell you that at this point the Government is asking for guidance. I think the Government should take guidance from the fact that notwithstanding the public opinion polls, notwithstanding what I perceive to be in some cases a focus on the choice of the woman without consideration of or specific recognition of the rights of the foetus, we in Parliament should send a message that we must respect life. If we do not, if we say that the lives of the unborn at a certain stage are worth

dispensing with and at a certain stage are not worth dispensing with, we are then setting the stage for trivialization of human life in its early stages.

I think about the elderly. I think about other people who may or could be expendable. Someone says if I have an amnio and that baby is retarded do I want to carry it to term? Those are moral choices and moral decisions that we all have to make. I personally have come to terms with that decision but I also think that in a pluralistic Parliament we need to have some recognition that each person in Canada has to make that moral choice for themselves. It cannot be made by someone who cannot bear a child under all circumstances, but certainly a direction and message can be sent to the Government about the kind of legislation we would like to see brought forward.

I do not see that in this resolution. I see a gutless government. I see a Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) who is not even prepared to speak on the issue, to put his views on the record. I see a resolution, not even introduced in the form of a Bill, which attempts to be all things to all people.

I expect that no matter what views a person puts on the record, whether they be perceived as pro-choice or pro-life or somewhere in the middle, they may not be accepted by all the people. Yet the Canadian people are struggling for some answers and they expect parliamentarians to put their views on the record. I do not think they particularly respect the position of the Government which sat on the issue for six months, leaving us with no abortion law. Unlike some who believe we are better off with no law, I think we should have a law. We should have restrictions and recognitions which balance the rights of the woman and the foetus but which in particular respect the fact that a foetus is an unborn human being.

I think a lot of us would like to put that aside from time to time and step away, but in the over-all scheme of human life, anyone who has conceived will know that once they have a fertilized egg, they have the potential for human life growing within them.

I am not here to come down with the definitive law. I will not support the amendment put forward by a Member who believes abortion should be permitted under no circumstances except where the life of the mother is in danger, because I think there may be other mitigating circumstances. I do not believe that a child or teenager or a women who is raped should necessarily have to carry that foetus to term. I do not believe the fruits of incest should necessarily be carried to term. I think there are other circumstances, and while I would certainly ask the Government to come forward with a Bill that hopefully combines some of the wisdom of the Supreme Court judgment, because I do not think we can totally set that aside, yet it has taken some time to look at one side of the issue and that is the rights of the mother. We have not yet seen the issue of the rights of the foetus.

I think the Bill to be introduced by the Government should strike a balance between those two areas and I do not see that in this resolution. I do not see it in the comments made by many Members who have spoken in support of the Government's position. I see a weak-kneed, gutless, hypocritical approach by a government that does not want to say where it stands and would like to have several positions on the matter.

I urge the Minister of Justice to come forward specifically with a Bill. More than six months have passed since the judgment and there is no law governing abortion in this country. I do not think we can treat abortion simply like any other medical operation. We have to bring forward sanctions, limitations, and it is up to Parliament and its members. This is where I feel the ultimate dilemma lies. It is up to us as Members to strike a balance between our own strongly held views which say that we find abortion morally wrong, that we find the killing of a foetus reprehensible. At the same time, in Parliament I am called upon by the people of my riding to come forward with a piece of legislation which can best reflect the hopes and aspirations of all my constituents and, in particular, which can best reflect the hopes and aspirations of women because women are not particularly being represented in this debate.

• (0050)

That being said, I do not think this is a black and white issue. I do not think we can simply say yes or no. We must send a strong message that we want very specific legislation. We must send a strong message that we want strong recognition of the right of the foetus, recognition that a foetus is an unborn human being.

What I as a parliamentarian say on this issue is not going to be judged by the people in an election. Surely they can make a decision and keep me in or throw me out. Ultimately the decision made by a woman on the issue of abortion, within the limited parameters that should be established by legislation, is a decision between herself and her creator. It is a decision about the moral choices she makes for herself. The Supreme Court said quite clearly that in a pluralistic society we must recognize that a woman may choose the moral option for herself. It is not for Parliament to say specifically that in all cases it is absolutely impossible in the same way as it is not possible, I believe, for Parliament to leave the situation in limbo.

I cannot support the Government's resolution. I have not seen the many amendments. Frankly, the process is ridiculous. We will be seeing the amendments tomorrow morning at eleven o'clock and voting on them an hour later in an issue of this gravity.

I hope that the Minister of Justice will come forward with specific legislation, a Bill which is amendable and can respond to some of the concerns which have been expressed, even by groups like the Canadian Medical Association which asked "What is a qualified medical practitioner?" What about the issue of the other helping professions and the other health professions in terms of the service of delivering an abortion? Do they have the right to say no?

These issues were not addressed in the three-headed resolution which became a one-headed resolution which is a wrong-headed resolution. I hope that the Minister of Justice will come out from behind the curtains, speak to the issue, and show the country the direction in which he would like to take us, bearing in mind that the vast majority of Canadians, recognizing the pluralistic society in which we live, want to have a law brought forward which respects life, respects the foetus, respects the unborn. They want a law which says that our society does not treat human beings as a disposable commodity, that we believe that every human being has value and that that value extends from the moment of conception until the time they are buried.

If we bring forward a law which tries to balance some of the pluralistic moral decisions and moral judgments which have to be made by women specifically on this most difficult issue with the recognition that both men and women have a responsibility to support the sanctity of life in every way possible, including in specific legislative measures, we will all be the better for it. I do not think we will have a perfect law. I do not think that any law we will bring forward will satisfy all sides on the issue. However, I think we will strike a balance and it will be a step toward a greater strengthening of the recognition of the rights of humanity.

I opened by saying that I wanted to speak to my daughter. I was probably influenced even more to speak to my father. My father has been sick for very many years. If you have a notion that that somehow diminishes the value of human life you could say that perhaps a person like my father does not have a need to live. It was determined at one point that he would be a vegetable but he has gradually brought himself away from that. The concern that I have about the recognition of the sanctity of life is that if, as a society, we say on the one hand that we can do away with one part of the human family at one end of the scale, that sets the stage for doing away at the other end of the scale. We then tell our elderly that they are no longer workable and no longer contributing to society.

Even though I recognize that in the context of Parliament those directions have to be decided by Parliament, I believe that we must bring forward a resolution which, in the larger context, respects the continuity of human life. In that context it provides protection, not only for the unborn but for those who are at the end of their lives. In the human continuum the legislation which the Government should be considering should give very strong recognition to the rights of the unborn bearing in mind that the moral decision which a woman takes when she undergoes an abortion is subject, not only to Parliament and the laws of Canada, but to her own conscience and to the laws of her maker.

• (0100)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Charles-Eugène Marin (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, I will keep it short, since a number of previous speakers have for hours now been describing various points of view that I share wholly or in part.

Mr. Speaker, we must begin by remembering that pregnancy is not an illness, and therefore does not automatically require an abortion. As a doctor I know there are high-risk pregnancies that do require medical intervention, after study and after discussion with the parties involved. That having been said, the Supreme Court decision on abortion was for many Canadians including me, a position we find difficult to accept. It is of course obvious that Supreme Court decisions are based on points of law and not just on historical precedent, religious facts or social evolution. If this is fortunate in some cases, it is extremely unfortunate that we must have recourse to the law in matters as important as the life or death of human beings. I do not believe we have the right to deal out death on demand to a human being, especially to a human being without defences, like a foetus.

There may be situations that call for medical intervention in a pregnancy. But I emphasize that it is unacceptable to have a law permitting abortion in demand or as a method of birth control, as is the case in certain countries.

As a doctor who once swore to help human beings and not to destroy them, Mr. Speaker, I will vote against the motion under consideration. It is not sufficiently clear and precise. I will also vote against any proposition that could trap me in one of the two extremist positions, either abortion on demand or the impossibility of obtaining a therapeutic abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I am expressing the opinion of the people of Gaspé, 85 per cent of whom have spoken out against free abortion.

To be here today to uphold this position, I drove 1,400 kilometres in my car. I wanted to demonstrate that people can be both disciplined and courageous. It is obvious that there will be people who will see my action differently. They can say I was foolish, and that it doesn't take any courage to drive for twelve hours.

What I wanted to express here, Mr. Speaker, is that abortion and all the languages we use about abortion are perceived so differently by each and every one of us that before we can reach a decision it is vital that the proposition be clear and precise and that it determine and define its terms.

[*English*]

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I enter this debate with some hesitancy. I have been here all day listening to my colleagues speak on the resolution before the House. Obviously, in the days leading up to this debate I have been thinking about policies that affect abortion and, of course, this is not the first time I have had to consider this question.

Let me begin by saying that I do not enter this debate with any absolute certainty about my stance on the issue. That is not to say I have not made a decision about how I will vote,

because I have, but my attitude is similar to the attitude of the scientist who understands that whatever theory one posits, greater knowledge and testing and awareness may tear that theory apart.

Having listened to what others have said, and having participated in the discussion at my own caucus, I was ready to go home tonight as the clock approached midnight. In fact, I had left the parliamentary precincts, but while I was waiting for my bus I thought about what I would have said if I was here. Since the bus was late, I decided to put my thoughts on the record.

In so doing, I hope I can give some meaning to the vote tomorrow when we will make a decision whether to sit in one's seat or stand to vote. I want to give my constituents and anyone else who cares to take note the meaning I apply to those actions.

The context in which I place this whole debate is about what we value the most, on what we place the greatest emphasis, and what is the greatest need for society today. While I do not often say this in public debates, I believe that we have a real need as a society and individuals for a spiritual awakening. Human beings must be valued more than anything else in the world. That is the fundamental context within which I approach this question.

The Government has failed the challenge that was placed before it by the Supreme Court decision. It has failed to provide real leadership in the House by bringing in legislation and setting a direction. The amendments moved by our Party states that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "effect" and in the first paragraph substitute therefor: "Law and government policy should respect the principle that the decision whether or not to terminate a pregnancy should be that of the woman involved in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner and that the procedure should be performed by a qualified medical practitioner, and further should ensure that the Canada Health Act and regulations are amended to ensure the quality of access throughout Canada".

There are two elements to this statement. First, the decision about an abortion would be made by a woman in consultation with her doctor. That is our party policy and I want to say up front that I support that party policy.

Second, the amendment talks about legislation. We are not saying that we should throw open the door without regard to how things will be done, but that there will be some law in place to provide guidance and the decision will be made by the woman in consultation with her doctor. Those are fundamentals of the amendment we have moved. The question of abortion is a profound spiritual and moral question.

• (0110)

It is not a legal question or an economic question or a political question. It is a moral question. Usually in moral matters we look to the churches for leadership. However, the churches today will not give us a clear road-map. On the one hand, there is the United Church whose position could be designated as pro-choice and, on the other hand, we have the Catholic Church, of which I am a member, whose position is pro-life. The churches do not provide us with the kind of spiritual and moral leadership, a clarity of direction we need to make these decisions. It falls upon the shoulders of political leaders, therefore, to provide the moral fibre and leadership. Otherwise we are left in a vacuum.

I have said where I stand with respect to the subject before us. However some might like to, we cannot solve the challenge of abortions through legislative means alone. It has been said in this House tonight that in a country like Brazil with very strict laws against abortion a million abortions take place, so strict laws which seek to put an end to abortion do not work. In other countries such as Norway and Sweden, which have education, the number of abortions have dropped. We need some perspective on non-legislative action.

I think it is essential that if we are to minimize the number of abortions we ought to have contraceptive means readily available. There should be very good sex education. Young people approaching the age at which they are capable of reproduction should have the information. They should know the facts so they can appreciate the risks they are facing if they choose to engage in sexual activity. I think that is fundamental.

Beyond that we should make available to our youth education in human relationships. We should teach them how to build intimate human relationships, how to build trust with another human being, how to communicate with another human being so that they do not confuse sexual activity with a need to experience a warm human touch, so that they do not conclude that the only way they can receive the loving warm human touch is through genital sexual activity. I would say we must teach our children how to build intimate human relationships.

A number of non-legislative things could be done to reduce the number of abortions. Other speakers have mentioned that we should have programs for young women who choose to take their pregnancy to term so that they have adequate support.

I want to mention another area of importance. Once we have the laws and programs in place and once we have reduced abortions to a minimum, surely that is not the end of the story. It is only the beginning. What we will be faced with then is children being born who are wanted. What happens to the human being after birth? I think that is a fundamental aspect of what we are faced with today. What do we choose to value? First, the family has to be the first place in which the human is valued above all else—above economic activity, above the hustle and bustle of life, above all the strains modern society puts on parents. We have to put into practice ways of living so that we nurture our children. We must reinforce the positive

esteem of our children. The family is the place to start in terms of how we live together, and society has to support the family.

There should be adequate day care. There should be programs that will ensure that families and their children no longer have to live below the poverty line. We should ensure that families and their children no longer have to live without a roof over their heads, which is something that is happening today. We should ensure that families and their children no longer have to go to the Sally Ann to get something to eat, as is the case in the city I represent.

If we really value the human person, if we really think the challenge we are facing is a moral challenge, then we have to support the family. A crucial part of supporting the family is not only social programs and educational programs which are necessary, but the parents who are responsible for these children must have the opportunity to work. They must have decent work which gives them a fair income so they can have a just part of the material rewards of our society. That is part of valuing the human being above all else. The women in these families should be able to work for wages that are equal to that of men, rather than 60 per cent as it is today. That is a part of valuing the human person above the whims of the market.

Valuing the human person means that above all else we want to ensure our environment is not only healthy but beautiful. We want to be able to see the stars and breathe in the fragrance of flowers. The bottom line is that we are in favour of economic growth because we need employment for our families. We want to make new distinctions, that we will no longer pollute this planet and destroy it because we know that pollution is a threat to our very survival and, therefore, it is fundamentally a spiritual question.

If we value the human being above all else, then we will be able to tackle the challenge of how to reduce and eliminate nuclear arms on this planet. Those nuclear arms threaten the survival and the continuation of the human experience. If we really value one another, then we will be in a position to take the steps that will lead to the eradication of the pollution of poverty from this planet which also threatens our very survival.

• (0120)

I wish to sum up by saying that I feel that the challenge we face when asked to address the question of abortion is fundamentally a question which asks us what we value most. I think the answer that has to come from all of us at our best is that what we value most is the human person. If that is what we are willing to state, and if that is what we are willing to live, then what we will have is a spiritual reawakening of our society and our planet. That will give us the wherewithal to make life worth while to live after people are born and to make it possible for them to continue to live on this planet. If we value that, then it means we will take care to see that our children have the education and the assistance they need in order to avoid unwanted pregnancies. It also means that we will have the courage to set a direction on very difficult questions which divide our society, such as what kind of national policy we shall have for abortion.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, my Party proposes that the decision be made by a woman and her doctor and that there be legislation in this area.

I appreciate having had the opportunity to speak in this debate. I want to say that I only spoke after thinking very deeply about the question before the House.

Mr. John Gormley (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take part this evening in what is for all Members of Parliament an historic debate. It is worth noting for the record that it is approaching 1.30 a.m. I was fortunate enough to get the last flight out of Saskatchewan earlier tonight, which gave me the opportunity to take part in this debate.

As we speak, and I know that all my colleagues share this view, we speak of a sense of our own conscience and our own view on this issue, as well as our own concern, and attempt to represent the voices and the convictions of our constituents. As a Member of Parliament who has consistently in other votes before the House and in speeches taken what is called a pro-life position, this is an opportunity for me to convey further to the House, and in so doing to my thousands of constituents who have thought so long and so hard on this issue, my views on the resolution before us.

The present status of this issue in Canada stems from a Supreme Court of Canada ruling on January 28 of this year. That ruling found that certain provisions of Section 251 of the Criminal Code violated a woman's right to security of the person. Upon close consideration of the judgment written by the justices of the Supreme Court, and in consultation with people much more learned than I in law, I have come to the conclusion that while the court ruling did, not surprisingly, rule out parts of Section 251, it did not preclude this Parliament or future Parliaments from enacting a law that gives strong protection to the right of life of the unborn.

As a Member of Parliament who is profoundly concerned about this issue, I am faced with three choices in analysing the issue of abortion. They are the ethical consideration, the legal consideration, and the practical consideration. I want to talk about this resolution before us and how it meets the test of the ethical, legal, and practical considerations.

First, this resolution was a sensible way to go about dealing with this issue by Members of the House of Commons. The issue before us was slow in coming because it was debated for some time by members of all three Parties and by the public at large. The resolution before us is a generally worded so-called middle position. It is open to a number of amendments, and it will be amended by members of all three Parties who have a particular view.

I cannot support the basic resolution as it stands. I believe it does not meet the tests of ethical, legal, and practical considerations. What I am concerned about most in this resolution is the provision that abortion would be essentially a matter between a woman and her physician with no legal sanction or no legal concern up until a certain period in the pregnancy, whereafter the issue would then be dealt with if there were certain conditions that stood in the way of the pregnancy coming to its natural term.

In 1988, I am deeply troubled by the legal view that one can draw an arbitrary time-limit on when in fact we should legislate a right to life. The Supreme Court Justices challenged Parliament to provide a law that would deal with a mutual balance between the mother and the unborn. The Supreme Court of Canada challenged Members of Parliament to define the right of life to the unborn. I believe we can rise to that challenge in a better, more specific way than this resolution does.

At this point I want to indicate to members of the public who will be following this issue what this resolution means. The passage of the resolution before us, or the passage of an amended resolution—and I dearly hope it will be amended—will not immediately change the law. The resolution simply adds a direction to Parliament that should be followed in the drafting of a specific piece of legislation regarding abortion. I think it is reasonable to assert that after this debate and after the vote it might be some time before a specific piece of legislation is before this House. That is why it is of fundamental importance to the voters of Canada to examine the record of their Members on this issue and to watch closely how they vote on the resolution. That will be a determination of those citizens and the people they put here who will largely determine this specific piece of legislation when it is to come forward.

How will I vote on this resolution? I do not support the resolution as it stands because I do not believe it specifically enough deals with the question of a right to life for the unborn. I will vote for amendments to the resolution which will more clearly and specifically afford a strong right to life of the unborn person.

I wish to reflect for a few moments on why I came to that decision. What we are debating tonight and what we have been debating for the past day is a question of the inherent value of human life.

• (0130)

Twenty years ago, in the late 1960s before Parliament brought in the last abortion law which was subsequently struck down by the Supreme Court this year, there was some genuine debate on the scientific merits of life *in utero*. No longer do many of the assumptions of the 1960s stand. We have seen the issue evolve over the years from when does life begin to the current argument of choice and rights. The reason we have seen that happen is that there is clearly no scientific debate any longer on when life begins. It is an unacceptable move for this Parliament or any other arbitrarily to set a gestational period where that life should receive protection. It takes away or derogates from an inherent right to life that all reasonable thinking Canadians accept; there is a right to life and there is a value to human life. When one begins arbitrarily to set a time when the unborn life has sufficient value to protect legally, one may also at some point set an arbitrary time on the other end of the spectrum, when life can still be protected in old age, in infirmity, or disability. To confer upon any Parliament or any group of 295 Canadians the ability to decide when life becomes viable to protect is a power that should not be given to earthly things.

When one starts to talk about the issue of viability and protecting life, one often hears the word "wanted". For example, an unwanted pregnancy and every child a wanted child are two slogans that we have heard at great length tonight. There may be unplanned pregnancies, and there may be inopportune pregnancies, but the question of "wantedness" is not something that should be discussed in a reasonable society when it is concerned with human life. Life is not something that one can want or unwant. The very existence of life merits its protection.

That leads me to the question of legal interpretation of this issue. It should follow that logically we can afford protection to the unborn as a member of the human family, in the same way we afford protection to the chronically ill, the disabled, or those individuals who are innocent, defenceless, and too weak to defend themselves. Why should we not then legally afford the same protection?

I want to address an issue that has often been brought to me as a pro-life Member of Parliament. Sometimes critics ask, how can Members of Parliament vote as they did one year ago for a resolution favouring capital punishment, yet against the issue of abortion. There is no ethical or logical inconsistency in those positions. It is defensible to hold that view from a strictly legal and ethical point of view. In the capital punishment debate we talked about a right to life, about nobody arbitrarily depriving any Canadian of a right to life. However, there is the view held by Members of Parliament that for the greater good of a society or a community, the state in certain circumstances might abrogate that right to life. The state might do that to protect members of society or to deter serious crime. A decision to take away a right to life is a decision that the state undertakes. It is a decision that the state would take in countries where capital punishment is in the legal books, based on aforethought or a knowledge of the individual who has violated those laws.

When one turns one's thoughts to the very sensitive abortion issue we are debating this evening, is the individual who is being deprived of life by a societal decision guilty of an offence that threatens that society? Is that individual guilty of taking away the rights of others in society? Must society be protected from that individual? Clearly the unborn is not in a position to pose that threat to our society, and to take away that right

legally by the state saying that there is a greater good simply is not consistent.

I want to reflect on the practical issue of abortion. There has been a great deal of discussion on statistics in this debate, and I want to deal with several quickly. This Government has an admirable record in promoting and encouraging immigration. In the next year 130,000 people will come to Canada as a result of the Government's policies. It is recognized by all thinking Members of this House and of Canadian society that we need new people in Canada in order to enrich the cultural heritage and the value of our country, and to enrich the economic prospects that will enable our country to have the secure type of future that it deserves. We believe there should be 130,000 new people in Canada next year and that number will continue to rise in future years. Last year we aborted half that number.

There were 65,000 abortions performed in Canada last year, in the same country that requires repopulation through immigration, through the opening of our horizons. I am a strong proponent of more immigration, but if we are pursuing certain immigration policies because our population is below zero replacement, I would suggest that perhaps we turn our thoughts to our own population issues, and the most crucial issue of why and how we have a situation that allows 65,000 abortions a year to take place.

Earlier I spoke on the concept of wantedness. In my Province of Saskatchewan there are 1,200 families on the adoption waiting lists. There are 1,200 families out of a small population of one million people. Last year in Saskatchewan more than 1,200 unborn children were aborted. Those children were wanted by at least 1,200 couples who, through no fault of their own, are not able to conceive and have their own children.

I want to impress upon Members in this debate the importance of leadership, leadership in a political and moral sense, and the need not only to deal with this issue in the isolated focus of abortion. It is not acceptable for Canadian people or for Members of Parliament to call themselves pro-life and yet work against the certain necessities in Canadian life that will enhance the lives of all citizens. I often call it a deception where someone may be pro-birth but not pro-life. We have to strive for the type of Canadian society that does not look with scorn on the kid who made a mistake and then made a very brave decision to keep that child. We cannot continue to have the type of society that does not provide the necessary social services for single mothers, day care for young working mothers, or single fathers who go through with the decision not to deprive a child of the right to life.

It is of critical importance that Members work toward promoting the type of Canadian society that is aware of family planning values, that is aware of responsible sexuality, that is aware of the need to support those people who have children. I caution against the view expressed by certain Members in the House tonight that, because we have not yet reached that state, we should simply abdicate our responsibility on the abortion issue. I do not think that is a responsible view.

• (0140)

If we can be aware of the inherent indignity and the right to life of Canadians, if we have to be working and striving continuously to ensure that we have the type of social programs in place to preserve and promote that dignity, that value, and that right to life, is it appropriate to say that we do not have the social safety net as high as we would like it and as strongly woven as we would like it? Do we then just turn our back on the question of protecting the unborn? I do not think that it is a responsible view, with respect to those Members who hold it, to say that it is a matter of choice.

Scientifically and genetically, morally and legally we are aware that Canadian society should have advanced past the view that it is simply a choice.

In conclusion, this vote will lead, as a pattern of guidance, Parliament to draft a new Bill. I have, in my first four years as a Member of Parliament, spoken to thousands of Canadians across this land, and hundreds within my own constituency, on this issue. It is an issue that I feel passionately about and feel that we must address as responsible parliamentarians.

I do not think that I am a zealot or a whacko or a crazy or a narrow-minded bigot. I pulled those words from some publications by those who do not support the view that I take. I think that this issue must be dealt with and it must be dealt with now.

It is my view that in this debate and in future debates, perhaps in future Parliaments when we will deal with the drafting of this Bill or when we will deal with other Supreme Court cases, we should address the issue of protecting a right to life of the unborn.

I hope that in my opportunity to speak this evening I have had a chance to lay out some of my concerns. I want to simply reiterate for my constituents, for the people of The Battlefords—Meadow Lake who have supported me on this issue so strongly in the past four years, that in this vote, in the drafting of a Bill, and in future years of this Parliament, I hope to continue representing them, secure in the knowledge that we shall work together to build a humane Canadian society, a tolerant and a compassionate Canadian society that realizes the value of its weakest, most defenseless members, those people most needing of our protection—the innocents, the unborn.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Aurèle Gervais (Timmins—Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege to be given the opportunity to speak on a most sensitive issue, namely, abortion. Abortion is undoubtedly one of the most sensitive and complex moral issues ever brought before the Canadian Parliament. It is one that in one way or another concerns and touches all of us.

First of all I would like to thank my colleagues on the government side for having brought this issue before the House for debate. The easy thing for the Government to do would have been to duck the issue until after the next election, but my colleagues in government chose otherwise. They chose to face the issue squarely and to have it debated in this House. For that I congratulate and thank them. I also commend the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), the Cabinet, and my colleagues for graciously allowing all Members on this side of the House to debate and vote freely on the issue, according to our conscience and without being lobbied or pressured in any way whatsoever.

I will be very brief because the hour is getting late, it being 1.45 a.m. However, I would like to make two points in this debate which are very important to me. They are so important that I chose voluntarily to remain in the House until this later hour to make them and to have them recorded.

First, it has been stated in a very unkind and unfair way by both opposition Parties that this Government abdicated its responsibility by introducing a motion instead of a Bill. By virtue of the wide divergence of viewpoints held by Members in all three caucuses, it would have been an exercise in futility to attempt to introduce a specific Bill on abortion and hope to have it passed by Members of this House.

Bill after Bill might have been introduced and voted down by this House because of a lack of consensus. Imagine the tremendously long period of time that it would have taken to introduce Bill after Bill in attempts to get it approved. Instead, this Government had the good sense to introduce a motion, subject to as many amendments as necessary to accommodate the wishes of all Members of Parliament from all three Parties.

In whichever form the motion or the motion as amended finally receives approval, it will give the Government a definite idea of the position of the House on this issue. It will enable the Government to introduce a Bill which will have an excellent chance of getting quick approval and finally give Canada a law governing abortion.

Second, I wish to state my position on abortion. I have listened with an open mind to all of my constituents who have approached me to discuss the issue, but in the final analysis my concern kept coming back to the unborn child.

The information I received when seeking expert medical and scientific advice is that life begins at conception. I therefore find it my duty as a citizen, as a Member of Parliament, and as a Christian to protect life whenever and wherever it must be protected. This conviction is even stronger in dealing with the unborn child that does not have the opportunity to speak for himself or herself. Therefore, my position—and it is a very strong one—is that an abortion should only be allowed when two independent qualified medical practitioners have, in good faith, on reasonable ground, and in writing, stated that in their opinion the continuation of the pregnancy would or would likely endanger the life of the pregnant woman or when a woman has been impregnated by rape or is a victim of incest.

I have been asked to give my opinion concerning abortion on many occasions since the election campaign of 1984. My answer has always been constant, as previously stated.

[*Translation*]

Yes, Mr. Speaker, my position is very firm. An abortion should only be performed when two qualified and independent practitioners have stated in good faith and on reasonable grounds, in writing, that in their opinion the pregnancy endangers the life of the pregnant woman, or when the pregnancy is the result of rape or incest.

Mr. Speaker, I have been asked for my opinion on abortion many many times since the 1984 elections. My response has always been the same, it has always been what I have just enunciated.

[*English*]

I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Léo Duguay (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, as time approaches two o'clock in the morning, I think all of us will reflect on why we are here and recognize the importance of making a statement on behalf of our constituents on what is a very, very important moral issue.

Having spent nearly 20 years of my life working with young people, I think I have grown to have a sense of feeling for what children mean to us as Canadians. My first principle in discussing abortion has always been that life begins at conception.

Some time ago, while working on the parliamentary task force on child care, I had an opportunity to write part of the preface to that report. In it I tried to describe what we as Canadians felt about our children. Our children deserve care. We owe this to them, not only because they are ours but because they are the expression of our hope for the future. As we strive to make a better world for them so will they direct their efforts to their own children. In this way our children will grow beyond us carrying our memories, our dreams, and our beliefs about how our lives and theirs can be made better. How we allocate our country's resources is a reflection of our faith in the future. How we respond to our children's needs is a measure of our society's integrity. If we do not provide for our children, we will have no future. The foundation of our nation has always been the families to which children belong.

• (0150)

Different kinds of families exist. All require our support, some more than others. The provision of adequate financial and human resources to the family by government and by other institutions in our society is an essential investment in our society. We have always tried to talk about the rights of Canadians and the rights of Canada. In this declaration I was referring to the values and the rights which the country has as distinct from those which individuals want.

Over the course of the last four years I, as many other Members of Parliament, have received numerous letters on the matter of abortion. I have responded to all by saying very clearly that I would not support legislation which promotes abortion. After all, who is it in our society who would consider becoming or getting pregnant in order to have an abortion? No one does that. I have always said that I would propose legislation which enforces the equal responsibility that men share with women for the children they conceive.

Why is it that our society continues to say that men are but sowing their wild oats while women who are promiscuous are said to be loose? We have been allowing a double standard for many generations. It is very clear that women bear the brunt of unwanted pregnancies. I have suggested that our Government should support alternatives, the prevention of unwanted pregnancies, the counselling of women who are pregnant, and adoption. All these things would reduce the demand for abortion. Abortion is a cure to a problem that already exists. The answer for our Government and for Canadians would always lie in making sure that there are as few unwanted pregnancies as possible.

Having said all these things, it is very clear to me that the principle of the resolution being introduced by the Government is one that is consistent with the Constitution of Canada. It includes the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. It reflects the fundamental value and inherent dignity of each human being and the worth of human life. It would achieve a balance between the right of a woman to liberty and security of her person and the responsibility of society to protect the unborn. When one looks as those balances all of us are called upon to make judgments, in this case moral judgments and value judgments. Mine will be reflected in the way in which I cast my vote tomorrow. It will go back to my fundamental principles.

I will not support legislation which promotes abortion. I would propose legislation which enforces the equal responsibility that men share with women for the children they conceive.

I would support alternatives, that is, the prevention of unwanted pregnancies, counselling, and adoption support which reduce the demand for abortion.

With regard to the resolution amendments before us tomorrow, I think the appropriate balance between the right of liberty of a woman and the right of the unborn is that abortion should not be permitted unless the life of the woman is in jeopardy, unless there is a serious health problem, or unless the woman has been the victim of rape or incest. I will tomorrow be casting my vote in the manner consistent with those principles.

Mr. Terry Clifford (London—Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to speak on a subject matter that concerns myself and many of my constituents. Over the last few months and as late as yesterday, I have spoken to many people with regard to the abortion issue, from doctors to policemen, even to the ticket agent at the London airport on my way to Ottawa. I have found that most everyone has an opinion on this touchy subject.

As I stated in the 1984 election, and my position has not changed, I have never supported the use of abortion as a method of birth control. I am deeply touched by current statistics which I received showing that the overwhelming number of teenage pregnancies and corresponding abortions taking place in London in 1986 rose to 56 per cent. Teenagers represent the largest proportion using abortion of any age group in my city, let alone the country. As a former educator in the London secondary school system I have seen many a teary eyed student who has found herself facing this predicament. It is one that will warrant a decision that ultimately will change the rest of her life.

Preventative medicine in the form of an integrated educational program including parents, doctors, community resources, and all levels of government is the number one goal which our Government should reach. The fruition of this program will prepare Canada for the 21st century. It should give our youth the knowledge for healthy sexuality and also hold values for life. For this reason I have presented an amendment to the government abortion Motion No. 36 which reads: "The Government of Canada is committed to the sponsorship of initiatives which lead to comprehensive programs that foster the development of knowledge for a healthy sexuality for all Canadians. The Minister of National Health and Welfare shall encourage and assist provincial Governments to support and develop programs aimed at both parental and youth levels which will lead to a better understanding of human sexuality and the value of human life".

I have faith in our youth. If they are armed at a young age with a good understanding, indeed are imbibed with a healthy human sexuality, they will not find themselves making forced choices on the beds of the hospitals of Canada. Clearly I have taken a different tact. I feel that a lot of the discussion has been based on the legalities of the motion put forward for us to decide. If we are talking about the liberty of the woman versus the rights of the unborn, we have to establish with the young people not only an understanding of sexuality but also develop their values which they will hold for life. If those values for life are high, well entrenched by the young people of today, as well as by future generations, then the problem with which we are faced today will not have to be met. In other words, abortions will be on the decline.

This is what we are all striving for. We want this problem that besets our society to go away, but it will not go away in the present setting. I feel that we have not, as a Government or a country, addressed the issue. Our young have to have the information. All levels of governments, associations, people, parents, and kids in the communities must become involved in understanding and developing a value for life, together with the actions to carry out that value system. We have fallen far short. It should be addressed as a national priority by the Government, and we have a great opportunity to do this.

Sexuality and the questions surrounding it have been raised recently as a result of AIDS, what that disease has done, and the potential it will have for society. Our society is ready now to grapple with abortion and with questions of sexuality on a wide scale. The future of Canada will manifest itself safely and securely, if we provide the leadership and a constant inflow of information and resources so that young people can make quality decisions, not forced choices. This is my major concern.

Addressing that and knowing the situation today, I look tomorrow to the main motion. I have some reservations about it but I can see support for that motion, knowing full well that abortion is a current practice in Canada. Abortion has been lawful since the Supreme Court's action in January. I find it to be necessary in cases of rape, incest and anomalies caused by genetic defects. As well, with the gaps of information and the misinformation that exist, there is a great deal of pain, aggravation and uncertainty surrounding the decisions that can be made. We have to address that.

• (0200)

I believe that the motion we will be dealing with tomorrow is an opportunity to address this issue. The potential exists for more amendments in addition to mine which provide for mandatory counselling prior to an abortion, something which I think is a very important step.

The occasion is now. This is a good climate for us to show leadership. The people are looking to us to establish a future for Canada. What better way than to provide a basis for the young so that their decisions to perpetuate Canadians through reproduction can be made on an informed basis. All medical judgment and societal judgment should be taken into account so that these people can feel free to make decisions while at the same time have a very high esteem for what life means in our society and for what it will mean in the 21st century.

In summary, I think it is very clear that we are facing a crisis in Canada. I want to make sure that as I speak out this morning to Canadians, they realize that I am speaking for the future of Canada. I am speaking directly to the parents and to the grandparents on behalf of the young people, the ones who are about to reproduce our kind. I want them to be well informed and to have the highest of values they can get from life. They cannot develop those values without this Government deciding on this issue so that we will never have to deal with this conflict to this extent in the future.

We must develop a long-term solution so that in five years, 10 years or 15 years down the line, the number of abortions will be reduced and it will be a practice used only for necessary medical reasons, in fact, at that stage, the value system of all individuals in Canada will be so high that they will cherish life and the development of Canada.

I urge the Government to consider the amendments I have made on behalf of the young people of Canada. It is their future that we are talking about and I very much look forward to hearing from my children and my grandchildren in the future and to seeing the kind of Canada that they carry out.

Mr. Chuck Cook (North Vancouver—Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in this debate on abortion out of some deeply held views, and also out of a sincere respect for many of the people I have heard and for many of the Members who have spoken on the issue.

There is a spectrum. At one end of the spectrum, of course, is absolutely no abortion, the group that perhaps can be classified generally under the heading of right to life. I respect their views very much. I believe that they are deeply held, and in many cases very deeply held religious views. I respect them for what they believe and for how they are attempting to go about it.

If we go to the other end of the spectrum, there are those who are pro-choice and who feel very strongly about the question of choice. They I equally respect. Again, they have deeply held views, many of which have been expressed in this Chamber with great vigour and force.

However, I tend to be very pragmatic. For that reason, I cannot agree with the absolute position of those who favour a right to life, not because it would not be marvellous but because it simply will not work.

I am old enough to remember when Canada had an abortion law which meant that no abortions were performed in Canada. In those days, there were abortion mills in practically every city across Canada, usually operated by a disbarred doctor of one kind or another. There were many abortion mills at cities in the United States which bordered Canada. Good grief, I believe that there was one doctor in Shelby, Montana, who made a fortune with D&C abortions for the young women of Alberta in the time prior to Canadians becoming a little more realistic about the subject.

I do not want to bring the abortion mills back again. I do not want to create a situation in which one has to break the law. Believe me, abortions will continue to take place in Canada, regardless of what the law is and of what is said here.

How can we be realistic about this and how can we be pragmatic? How can we make some moral sense out of the whole dilemma? Let us look at the other end of the spectrum, at those who are pro choice, those who say that a woman has the right to control her own body and that it is up to her what she chooses to do. There is a certain sympathy in my mind for that point of view as well. Who am I to tell any woman that she must carry a pregnancy to full term and produce, if for any number of reasons, valid reasons, she perhaps should not? One end of the spectrum, the other end of the spectrum. It is a dilemma. I honestly do not know what the right answer is, but I do know that there are two or three things that disturb me at each end of the spectrum.

At one end of the spectrum, there is no choice. It is imposed by law. It is imposed by those with their own moral codes,

their own standards. At the other end of the spectrum, I think women equally have the right to argue that after all, it is their bodies and their choices as to what is to happen with their bodies. The Supreme Court seems to have gone a long way toward saying that women do have that right.

Quite frankly, I find it very difficult as a man, to say that I will legislate what you, woman, will do. I will never know pregnancy. I will never know the pain of it or the joy of it. I am not sure that as a man, I have the right, if there is such a thing, to interfere with a woman and what her choice may be.

I believe that on the side of the right to life, most of what they say is correct and most of what they wish to happen is correct. However, I think their approach is wrong. It is not done by legislation. It is done by persuasion. It is done by raising the moral tone of the country.

We cannot legislate morality, and I would have thought that most in Canada would have figured that out a long time ago. What we can do, and there are examples of this, is develop society to the point where the whole concept of abortion would become terribly offensive to everyone. I believe it is now to a substantial extent. However, there are those who will never accept a moral code and never understand what we are talking about and they will have an abortion anyway.

• (0210)

I think we offend every right thinking woman in Canada with some of the remarks that have been made in this debate. What we are saying in effect is that women do not have the ability to make the right decision on abortion. If that were true, there would be literally hundreds of thousands more abortions than there are.

There have been excellent points made today at both ends of the spectrum, but where is the middle ground? I honestly do not know but I am not prepared to hold a pregnant woman hostage to society. No, I think she has a good many rights in this matter.

I am also one of those strange people who feels that the putative father should have some rights in this matter. It is his child as well and some way must be found to bring him into the equation.

Having said those things, I think you can see that, given the seven or eight amendments and the main motion itself, I will have to examine my conscience very carefully. I do not feel I have any right to attempt to legislate the morals of others. I have heard strong viewpoints from both sides of this issue, all of them held with great conviction, and all of them totally different. However, my thinking on the subject will be on the basis of what is best for a free society where a citizen has the right to make his or her own choice. I am not quite convinced that life does begin at conception. I am not yet quite convinced that until that child has developed to a certain extent it should have the full protection of society. It is difficult. How do you balance the rights of the unborn child against the rights of the mother? That is why I will be concerned about the amendments and how I will vote tomorrow.

I will close by quoting from a letter similar to one I have used with my constituents over the 10 years I have been in Parliament. It does not satisfy everyone. As a matter of fact, I do not really think it satisfies anyone completely, but it does state clearly the position I have taken and will continue to take on this most vexing and difficult problem.

The letter points out that every day in North America over 4,000 human lives are ended by abortion. Over 11,000 abortions are performed annually in British Columbia where the abortion rate is 50 per cent higher than the national rate. One in every four abortions in British Columbia is a repeat abortion.

I am not in favour of making all abortions illegal. To do this would bring back the backrooms, the kitchen tables and the destruction of many women at the hands of abortion butchers. Nor am I in favour of totally free abortions at any time, under any circumstances. In this I believe I am in some disagreement with the Supreme Court of Canada. This in my view would mean that an abortion would be used even more as a method of birth control than it is now. This must be abhorrent to all thinking human beings.

My real difficulty is in attempting to decide on the rights of a woman to control her own body and the rights of the unborn. It is almost an impossible dilemma. Somewhere between the two absolute viewpoints the truth lies.

I believe there must be a law which will ensure that abortion is not abused in Canada. There must be some requirement for what is considered a necessary abortion. I am in favour of a law that will make it much clearer as to the actual responsibility and circumstances under which an abortion may take place, but I will not accept either end of the spectrum. Somewhere in between there is where most of the Canadian public are and, frankly, I believe it is a position I can comfortably take and still maintain my own moral integrity rather than the violent positions on both sides, much as I admire those who hold them.

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, as I begin to address this very difficult issue at 2.15 in the morning, I must in all honesty say that I cannot echo the words of some others who have spoken and who began by saying how much they looked forward to having this opportunity to speak. Quite frankly, I found this the most difficult issue with which I have had to contend. It is anything but a black and white situation for me.

I suppose in a way I envy those to whom the answers have come easily on this issue. They have not had to struggle in perhaps the same way I have had to struggle and continue to struggle. Quite frankly, from a perfectly selfish point of view, and as a father, I would much sooner be at home helping to celebrate our youngest daughter's eighteenth birthday today. However, I feel I have a responsibility to be here and it is for that reason I am speaking this morning.

Like all other Members of Parliament I received a great deal of mail on this issue, I would estimate around 1,400 letters to date, the vast bulk of which have come from the so-called pro-life group, of course. I have met with individuals in my office. I have met with medical doctors who represent both sides of the issue. I approach the debate on this issue within a certain context.

• (0220)

Like the Hon. Member who has just spoken, I am well aware that abortion has been part of Canadian history, whether it has been legal or illegal. I am aware of the so-called backroom or kitchen butchers who provided abortions when they were illegal. I am aware, indirectly, of the consequences which women sometimes faced as a result of seeking that remedy.

I am also aware that the legislation which was in place until the recent Supreme Court decision was not as equitable as we would have liked it to have been in that it was enforced in different manners in different provinces and, indeed, in different communities in the same province. I am also conscious that if we, through legislation, banned all or nearly all abortions in Canada there would in a sense still be a two-tiered system, a law for the rich and a law for the poor. If one has the dollars, one can get an abortion in the United States. The law must treat people equitably and I am worried about the inequity which has existed in the past and could continue to exist in the future.

I am also troubled by the fact that this decision is being made by a predominantly male Parliament. I believe that to a significant degree the issue is predominantly a women's issue in that I suspect, without knowing, that many women have to face the decision of whether or not to have an abortion without the support of the father of the child.

Quite frankly, I feel slightly uncomfortable about my role as a male in a largely male Parliament making this type of decision. I am particularly conscious of the fact that the women Members of Parliament who are on record on this issue are predominantly what we would call pro-choice.

By the same token, I am also conscious of the fact that there are many childless couples in Canada today who speak of waiting for several years in order to receive a child to adopt and love. Therefore, I believe that there may not be as many unwanted children born as some people would have us believe.

Where do I stand on this very important issue? First, I have consistently been opposed to abortion on demand because that suggests to me, rightly or wrongly, that under those circumstances abortion, to a significant degree, would be a birth control device and I do not believe it should be such. I believe that we do need a law that regulates the availability of abortion.

For that reason, I was one of the few to recommend, since the Supreme Court decision, the use of Section 33, the override clause, to reinstate Section 251 of the Criminal Code until we had a chance to draft appropriate legislation. The fact that we are not now proposing that legislation but instead dealing with a resolution tends to confirm to me that my views on Section 33 were appropriate, even if they were not heeded.

While I am opposed to abortion on demand, I believe that in certain circumstances women have the right to an abortion and that they and their doctors are better equipped than am I to determine when that abortion is necessary.

Certainly, in my mind, it is easy to say that a woman who is a victim of rape or incest has the right to an abortion. I have no difficulty with that. I can also say that a woman whose health or life is endangered has the right to an abortion. However, I must confess that I find it difficult to define exactly what I mean by "health" when I say that. I know that there are various interpretations.

I believe that a woman's right to abortion must be balanced with the rights of the foetus or the unborn. As I use both of those words I know that I cannot define, in my own mind, exactly when the foetus becomes the unborn. I also know that the decision even to consider having an abortion, let alone the decision to have an abortion, must be an exceedingly difficult one. I cannot believe that very many women would enter into that debate lightly or accept a decision to have an abortion lightly.

I believe that various institutions including government, and I suggest the churches as well, have a responsibility to provide all of the counselling services which would assist the woman and the father, if he is available, to deal with that decision.

Where I am less precise and less certain is in the area of attempting to justify the instances and circumstances in which abortion is warranted. I do not know how to define the health problems to which I have referred earlier. I also am not clear in my own mind, even though I watched with some difficulty the films which the pro-life organizations have provided, when the foetus evolves into the unborn. I recognize that at the point of conception there is a potential for life, but I believe that life itself emerges at some point thereafter as the pregnancy advances closer to the point when the unborn child could live outside the mother's womb. The question of viability has been discussed here earlier tonight.

I do not believe that we can speak of the fertilized egg having the same rights as the unborn child of four, five, or six months. I make a distinction there in terms of the rights of the unborn. We need a law which specifies quite clearly when abortions can be permitted and when they cannot. We need a law which ensures that abortions will not be available on demand.

• (0230)

I will vote against what many would call the pro-choice amendment. I believe that the law we need should attempt to ensure some sort of balance between women's rights as I would

define them and the right of the unborn because I believe that the unborn, once it has reached a certain stage in the pregnancy, has rights which must be considered and protected by law.

I also believe that those rights grow in significance and in proportion with the advancing stage of pregnancy. I am conscious that I as a legislator am less able to determine when an abortion is necessary or warranted or desirable than are the medical doctors who are professionally competent to evaluate the mother's physical and mental state.

I hope that any law passed by this Parliament will require medical concurrence, preferably with more than one doctor. I also hope that this law will recognize the difficulty the mother faces, contemplating the unwanted pregnancy. I hope it will provide, as others have said, for mandatory counselling and that there will be several opportunities for such counselling made available, and that the churches will accept what I see as their responsibility in assisting in some form.

The decision will not be easy. I say that as a male who has never had to contend with this type of decision, nor have members of my family, for which I am grateful. There must be an immense amount of self doubt and, I fear, there will be an immense amount of guilt after such a decision is made. It is exceedingly important that such counselling and support programs be available.

In the end, regardless of what the law may say, the woman who chooses to have an abortion must live forever with her conscience and with the judgment of her God. I believe that that judgment will be more lasting, more significant than the judgment which any Parliament or court, or any other human being may render.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak on this important issue of abortion. The motion put forward is totally unacceptable to me and I believe to the vast number of people I have the honour of representing in Hastings, Frontenac, Lennox and Addington.

The right to speak on important issues in this House is very fundamental to our system of government and our very way of life as Canadians. I intend to speak very briefly, only to put on record my position on this important moral issue.

We have heard a great deal about free votes in the House of Commons. I question this term, as it is applied here, because I believe the only free vote here or anywhere else is one by secret ballot. Hopefully, however, this debate will put on the record the views of Members in this Parliament and will influence legislation that will be brought forward.

The gestational approach is scientifically and ethically indefensible because it draws an arbitrary dividing line between life which is worthy of protection and life which is not.

As one who believes that life begins at conception and must be valued, I cannot support the motion before the House. This motion abandons a primary function of the law, the protection of the human life. Furthermore, it does not achieve the socially imperative balance between the rights and the interests of women and the equally important rights and interests of unborn children.

As one who values innocent human life, I feel it is incumbent that I work and pray for legislation which recognizes, values, respects and protects human life from conception to natural death. Any new abortion law must be developed in the context of other laws and social policies which, together, will make Canadian society even more hospitable to all human life at all stages of development.

As my amendment pursuant to the special order under notices of amendments to Government business No. 36 states, any legislation must give pre-eminence to the protection of the foetus, should prohibit the performance of an abortion except when two independent qualified practitioners have, in good faith and on reasonable grounds, stated that in their opinion the continuation of the pregnancy would or would be likely to endanger the life of the pregnant woman, or when the pregnancy is the result of rape or incest.

I believe very strongly that the foetus is life at conception and must be protected.

Mr. Allan Pietz (Welland): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this important motion. I believe the Government should be congratulated for its attempt to deal fairly with this very difficult issue by giving Members the opportunity for a free vote.

The legislation recently struck down by the Supreme Court of Canada was compromise legislation in its day. It did not satisfy all Canadians when it was introduced and we would be naive to think that the legislation to be drafted out of this debate will satisfy all Canadians. I, like every Member of Parliament, have received letters from constituents on all sides of the issue. My vote will not satisfy all of my constituents, but this issue is not just a political one. It is both a legal question and a moral question.

I have been in public life for over 35 years and I have had to express my opinion on this issue before. When I was elected to the House of Commons in 1984, my pro-life position was well known.

Throughout my municipal career on township, county, city and regional councils, I served on the social services committee as well as working as a member of the Children's Aid Society. I have watched society change from the days when children were considered an economic asset, when people had children to ensure there would be someone there to take care of them in their old age.

Nowadays, the picture has changed. Children do not grow up to work in the family business and eventually take over. Moreover, in recent consultations between the Minister of State for Seniors (Mr. Hees) and his national constituency, we

learn that independence is one of the things seniors value the most. They do not want to depend on their children to take care of them. But their other main priority was quality of life. As a parent and grandparent I can certainly say that children add greatly to the quality of life.

I am sure you know, as I do, people who would like to be able to have children but cannot. These people are finding it more difficult to find children available for adoption. Recently a former employee of mine and her husband adopted a little boy. This came after more than two years of waiting, and that little boy is a very lucky person.

I do not mean to discount the hardships experienced by women who get pregnant without wanting to be pregnant, but I refuse to see the possibility of new life only as a negative. While it may not be a positive situation for the woman in the short term, it can mean a lifetime of joy for a childless couple. The natural mother's emotions will be affected whether she has the baby or has an abortion, but she will not have to deal with the guilt of having terminated a pregnancy by choosing to have the baby and giving it up for adoption. She could choose to turn a mistake into an opportunity.

It is easy to see an unwanted pregnancy as the end of the world when you are young. As a society, we bear a responsibility for fostering that point of view. But no one said that life was going to be easy. Nine months is a long time when you are young, but in the long run it really is not.

This is not a perfect world. In some cases unmarried pregnant women still get stigmatized. Abortion is a way out of an unpleasant situation. Society needs to change its attitudes and we need to help in that process. There has been much done in the area of providing social services to unwed mothers and, in fact, single parent families are becoming increasingly more common in this age of high divorce rates. People's attitudes are changing. In many ways it is difficult to find family values in this kind of environment. But life is life and respect is fundamental to any value system.

• (0240)

I said earlier that the issue facing us today is a legal matter as well as a moral one. On a question of this nature, I have no hesitation in saying that I am guided in large part by my Lutheran faith. The stance of the Lutheran Church-Canada is that the practice of abortion, its promotion and legal acceptance, are destructive of the moral consciousness and character of the people of any nation and that since abortion takes a human life, abortion is not a moral option except as a tragically unavoidable by-product of medical procedures necessary to prevent the death of another human being, that is, the mother. The Lutheran Church-Canada promotes the idea of community education and the living of responsible sexual lives by men and women. It also offers as an alternative to abortion, supportive understanding, compassion and help to the expectant parents and family, and fosters concern among Lutheran agencies and families to open their hearts and homes for unwanted babies.

I have seconded the motion put by the Hon. Member for Willowdale (Mr. Oostrom) which supports the sanctity of human life. The sanctity of life is something in which I believe and I appreciate the opportunity of saying so.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Ferland (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, to start with, it is getting pretty late—it is a quarter to three in the morning, which means that as I speak here in Ottawa it is nearly 4:15 a.m. in Newfoundland and not far from midnight in Vancouver. I would like to thank the Chair but also the Clerks and all the staff, the interpreters who make it possible for us as MPs to express our points of view on this fundamental question.

As I came up to Ottawa today I was reading in the papers and listening on the radio to the interpretation by journalists and Canadians generally of the debate we are carrying on at this time. I became aware that people do not understand what is happening, and I can understand that. This is only the second time in the history of Canada that Members of the House of Commons, regardless of their political stripe, have had the chance to influence a bill, to impose or direct one. This is due to the McGrath reforms. It has not been mentioned, but I think it should be, because Canadians have the impression that around noon, not tomorrow but in a few hours, noon today, when we vote, we will be settling the question of abortion once and for all. That is not the situation. The purpose of this debate is to establish guidelines. It is to take the pulse of the House in a non-partisan way. It is to find out how, together, we can establish the guidelines that the people of Canada have asked for following the decision of the Supreme Court, a split decision, 5 against 2. It is not astonishing that here in this House we do not seem to have a consensus. The fairly significant number of amendments that have been moved to the original motion show that a consensus has not yet been reached. Let us hope that by noon tomorrow (sic) we will have managed to arrive at sufficiently clear guidelines.

The Supreme Court decision is based on section 7 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which says, "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person, and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice."

What is recognized here are the fundamental rights of women.

On the other hand, I have been listening attentively for I do not know how many hours now. For several hours, anyway, I have been listening to debate that is not really about the question. Does a woman have the right to have an abortion or not? Rather the debate has centred on the rights of the foetus. People have been talking about the rights of the foetus. But what is forgotten in this whole question of the foetus is all the technology that now surrounds the conception, the creation, of life. A few years ago life was created through the union of a man and a woman. Today, we have test-tube babies. There is nothing, there are no rules, no guidelines in our society that deal with this question, sperm banks and like, there is nothing that deals with these questions. We have no guidelines in our society.

I also think that when we talk about the rights of the foetus we also have to talk about rules. We have to decide if we should have rules that would regulate the whole systme or principle of conception. But if we want to stay strictly with the question of whether or not a woman has the right to have an abortion, then I ask myself a question: I am not a woman, I will never have the pleasure of bearing a child, I am not made for that, biologically I was not designed for that. By what right, I ask myself, do I as a man say, "You women"—and there are 14 million women in Canada, and what right do I have as a man and a parliamentarian, what fundamental right do I have to say, "You women cannot have an abortion unless your health is really endangered or it is the only way to save your life. That I do not mind allowing you"?

That would be to deny that those 14 million women in Canada are after all as free as I am to make decisions and decisions that affect them, what is more, there are only 29 women in the House, and it will be interesting to see, during tomorrow's vote—and I ask all my colleagues (and it is astonishing to see how many Hon. Members are still here at this late hour), it will be interesting to see how the women vote. I am going to be paying attention when we get to that noon-hour vote, because I think men ought to be cautious about making a decision that affects women. They have fundamental rights.

Of course, the fact that there are no clear guidelines, the fact that the Supreme Court ruled as it did, has broken that fragile consensus, if I can call it that, that we had across Canada, which was that Canadians were operating in a system that was more or less clear. But the fact that the Supreme Court came down firmly on the side of women being in control of their own bodies automatically provoked reaction from the pro-life people, who give the impression that a woman is incapable of making her own decisions, that there absolutely must be legislation, there must be a legal framework for the decision, there must be a criminal framework. But what does that imply? It implies that half the population of Canada are incapable of making logical decisions for themselves. I do not know any women who would enjoy having an abortion, on the contrary!

On the other side we have the pro-choice groups, and I have met with representatives of those groups, who just about suggest convenience outlets for abortions on every corner. Abortions ought to be something you can get with no trouble at all. I do not think that that extreme is realistic, that it reflects what Canadians think. The choice we are making now is a societal choice. What we are being asked to do is make a societal choice by legislating through the criminal law, the Criminal Code. I find that rather absurd, because it seems to me that a societal choice should be made through dialogue, persuasion, information. Societal choices should evolve normally, gradually, they should not be a provocation. This is not a question that should be given a radical solution.

The motion tabled yesterday by the government isn't perfect. It does not answer all the questions, not all my questions, that is for sure! I'm going to read carefully—I've still got several hours during which I intend to read all the amendments that have been moved to the motion; but at first glance the motion seems to me a reasonable one, a motion that represents the silent majority in this country.

Naturally we hear from the people at both the widely-separated extreme, but the silent majority we do not hear from. I have heard from its members, myself, because I have met with a number of people in my riding. There are the pro-life groups, there are the pro-choice groups. Some are more aggressive than others. The pro-life people even took the liberty of sending me a video. They sent me posters, which I would never display in any classroom, which I will never stick up on the walls of my office, because they are not "displayable". I consider that very aggressive, the kind of lobbying that was directed at me, and, I am sure, at others here in this House. But apparently that is all part of the rules of the game, as MPs we have to live with that, and I accept that I have to live with it. But what is really going to influence my decision is my analysis of all the conversations I have had over the past months, with the young and the not-so-young, with women and men, in my riding and elsewhere. And on the whole, among all those people, there is a widespread general agreement that in certain circumstances abortion should be permitted, a woman ought to be able to save her life. I think that is fundamental. But I also think a woman is just as able to make that decision as I am. We must not come up with such a rigid framework, like the ones suggested in certain proposals, where it is asserted that life is present from the moment of conception and so abortion is impossible. I think that flouts the fundamental law set out in the Charter. If those people want the Charter re-written, they should say so, but they will be an unholy row over it in Canada, because I do not think women are going to accept the idea that Parliament is doing away with their rights, denying them the rights they have, denying them their right to be treated as equals with men in this country.

As a man I have to take that into account. I have to be very cautious in the decision I will be making tomorrow, which is not a final decision, I agree, because what we are establishing here are guidelines. We're giving guidelines to the government and the MPs who will have to formulate and analyse any future bill, which will then be considered at first and second reading, in committee, and at third reading. It will not be passed overnight! A lot of water will go under the bridge before it passes, and I hope people will have the time to make us aware of a more general consensus. But the debate we have been having in the House for the past two days really represents what is happening in the community. The community is undecided, it does not quite know which way to go. Should we opt resoundingly for pro-life, resoundingly for pro-choice? No! I think society is much more in the centre, much more in favour of a decision that would lie between the two extremes and would respect the consensus that has been apparent in Canada for a certain number of years, even if it is not perfect, because we're all human beings, we are not perfect and we never will be.

I don't want my part in the debate to drag on any longer, given the time, and since I know there are still Hon. Members waiting to speak. But I just want to say that in a few hours I'll be making a decision. Between now and then I will be reading all the amendments that have been tabled, and I think I will not be far from the position of the original motion. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to make these few points on so important a subject.

• (0250)

[*English*]

Mr. Jack Shields (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with considerable interest to the debate as it has proceeded over the last couple of days. Indeed, I welcome this opportunity to enter into the debate. I believe that the debate boils down to when it is that our society chooses to protect life by law. If we are to be concerned with human rights and life, I suggest that it follows that we must be concerned with the arguments that allow the taking of life. Some will argue, as we have heard in this Chamber, that abortion does not involve the taking of life. I would therefore ask people who hold this view to examine their arguments. This, of course, is the argument of the pro-choice advocates. I believe that their arguments are not sufficient to allow the taking of foetal life.

Let us examine the term "freedom of choice". Choice should in itself not be determinative in moral debates. Certain terms often relied on by pro-choice advocates are unacceptable. What is meant by "pro-choice"? It has taken a very central position in this debate. Some even see the individual choice of the women to have or not to have an abortion as being self-evident justification for an abortion. The phrase "pro-choice" when examined, I submit, is not a valid position to take in any moral debate. This is a phrase, of course, that is preferred today rather than the earlier term, pro-abortion, because it is argued that people who hold this view of freedom of choice are not really in favour of abortion, but favour the right to choose. The argument is if you oppose abortion, then indeed you are anti-choice. The argument, on the basis of choice, is a poor argument, as I have said, and I would submit that the very same people who use that argument would not allow others to use the same argument in other moral debates, because choice is morally neutral and can only be evaluated as a right or wrong in terms of the context in which it is used. For example, do I have freedom of choice to fire my rifle? That can only be evaluated morally in terms of where, when and at what I am going to fire my rifle.

• (0300)

Let us examine freedom of choice on the pornography debate. Are those who restrict the pornography producers' right to produce pornography anti-choice? I guess in one sense they are. Yet, most of those who are pro-choice in the abortion debate are also anti-choice in the pornography debate. They recognize that there are moral factors which are part of the issue of the pornography debate that would be ignored if choice were the only focus.

Another argument that we hear is that those against abortion are seeking to force their moral views on others. This statement, of course, implies that no person should attempt to force their views on what is right or wrong on others. Most of our criminal law is based on moral notions of what is right and wrong, and of course these rules apply regardless of the views that individuals hold.

Those who say that no one should attempt to force their views of what is right or wrong on others do not function this way themselves in society. There are countless issues where advocates of moral issues expect the law to restrict behaviour. I cite sexual abuse, I cite discrimination in various forms, restriction on the production of pornography. In areas of moral debate we must evaluate the rights that are at issue. The abortion debate requires that we evaluate what the foetus is. Does it have an interest to be considered?

Since human rights are the property of those who are alive, and being a member of the human species undeniably begins at conception because that is a scientific fact, it follows, in my view, that the foetus has moral and legal rights and therefore must become a matter of concern which we cannot avoid by the philosophical unsound use of choice.

The real issue in the abortion debate or, indeed, in all debates involving when we should protect life by law, is when and on what basis do we recognize the right to have rights. I submit that those who seek to remove rights must state why the right should be removed. Therefore, it begs the question: What is the morally relevant distinction between the foetus before birth and a child after birth so that we can say one has a right to life and the other does not?

To my knowledge, there has never been a satisfactory answer to this question. Until an answer to this question is given, I submit that we must support presumption in favour of life that is referred to by the Law Reform Commission of Canada in its working paper no. 28, dealing with euthanasia, in their protection of life series.

I would conclude on this point, that choice itself is incapable of providing a satisfactory resolution in the abortion debate. Since this debate involves the most sacred of issues—that is human life itself—we must proceed very carefully and with an honest, philosophical approach. Choice itself will not do in this and in any other area of moral debate.

What is the nature of the foetus? Pro-choice advocates deny foetus rights because they lack some quality necessary to the

holding of rights. It is not a person, it is not human. Others suggest that the foetus rights should exist only from a certain point. We have heard the arguments; a developed central nervous system, that it must be viable. The trimesteral approach was used notably in the U.S. Supreme Court, *Rowe v Wade*.

I submit that two things are ignored in these arguments. First, these arguments ignore the potential of the foetus and, second, the foetus genetic individuality remains unchanged from the moment of conception through to death, whenever this occurs. All the changes after conception are changes of degree, not of kind. The foetus is the weakest stage of all of us at the beginning of the continuum of life. We get bigger, we get stronger, for some time, but as unique individuals we are the same from conception onward. To suggest otherwise is just pure bad science.

I believe that life begins at conception. Later on today I plan to vote consistent with those views.

Mr. Jim Caldwell (Essex—Kent): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to participate in this debate this morning. It is now 10 minutes after three o'clock in eastern Canada. Out on the West Coast we are on prime time television, I suppose. I have listened very attentively to the debate that has taken place yesterday and also this morning, and certainly to the points raised by Hon. Members from both sides of the issue and both sides of the House. It has certainly given me an opportunity to rethink my position, or to think out as to whether or not I am on the right track.

Many Members have mentioned the fact that it is very difficult for men to be voting on this particular issue, and I tend to agree. None of us are going to get pregnant, none of us are going to carry a baby and none of us are going to give birth. I think it makes it very difficult for men to be voting on an issue such as this when women certainly have a different feeling for birth than men. The fact is that you and I were elected to this House of Commons, and it is the House of the common people. That is why they call it the House of Commons. We are only common people trying to do our best and to make the laws of the land as best we can.

I think most of us wish this debate did not have to take place. It is one of those issues that we as Members of Parliament wish we did not have to face, along with capital punishment, both of which are really a conscience vote where you vote the way that you feel, plus keeping your constituents in mind as to what they might like you to do.

I must say, on behalf of my constituents, that I have received very little pressure to vote one way or the other on this particular issue. The constituents have basically left it up to me and it is my decision to make.

• (0310)

We realize that we try to formulate many laws in this House of Commons having to do with morality. Legislating morality is one of the most difficult things to do. Legislators continue to try to legislate morality and very often fail to legislate in an effective way. We also realize that we can make laws governing prostitution but that there will always be prostitutes. We can make tough drinking laws, but we will continue to have drunk drivers. We can legislate tough punishment for murderers, but we know that there will still be murders. We can ban abortion, but we know that abortions will still be carried out.

When we legislate moral issues sometimes they have an effect. If legislation prevents one drunk driver from getting behind the wheel of a car, it is important. If we can do something about prostitution and it prevents one young girl from becoming a prostitute, that legislation has certainly served its purpose. If we can pass tough laws for murderers and we can stop one murder, maybe we have done our job. If we can pass laws that will prevent abortion, even one, it is important.

One of my concerns in this particular issue is where does abortion stop and where does it start. Once abortion becomes a way of life, can we control it? Under what circumstances can abortion be performed? Is it only for the poor, or if you are poor you cannot have it? Will it be because you are too young that you cannot have an abortion? Will it be because you are too old? Is it because you are not married? If it disrupts your lifestyle should you have an abortion?

I am sure that all of us have heard from our parents from time to time "you cannot afford to get married just now" or "you cannot afford to have children just now". Those of us who are married and have children realize that if you wait until you can afford to have children and can afford to get married, you will probably not get married and you will probably not have kids. I am sure you have also heard that from your mother and father as well, Mr. Speaker.

What kind of society do we want to have? Do we want to have a perfect society where all children are born perfect? When and what is the criteria for having an abortion? We all know that modern medicine can now determine if the foetus is normal or if it is defective. What do we do with the Down's Syndrome child? Do we abort it? What do we do with children who are blind? What do we do with children who are deaf? What do we do about the foetus that might not be the right sex for a particular couple? We have people in our society who would raise those children if they are brought into this world.

These are some of my concerns and the concerns of many of my constituents. I realize that many of my constituents do not particularly agree with my stand on abortion, and I respect their opinions as well, but I must live with myself, Mr. Speaker. For that reason I will be voting in favour of an abortion motion that will control, as much as possible, the abortion of future Canadians. I want to remind everyone that every baby born in Canada whether or not the mother is a Canadian citizen is a Canadian.

Abortion

Mr. William G. Lesick (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to greet you at this early hour of the morning. I know that you are intent on listening to this very heated and impassioned debate on abortion.

The Government's motion is to address the very complex and fundamental issue of abortion. The question of abortion has produced more passionate debate by Canadians than almost any other issue in recent times, possibly other than free trade. The issue has the passion of extreme beliefs, some on one side, some on the other, and many in the middle. Positions by citizens on this issue are very varied, from absolute free choice to the view that abortions should be outlawed completely. In my view neither one is acceptable. The abortion question and ensuing debate have continued vigorously for many years. It is not a new debate. I know that in my City of Edmonton, in front of the largest municipal hospital, we have a big sign which reads "Adoption, not abortion". That is a very simplistic view of abortion.

With this heightened debate and greater passion than ever, especially with the advent of the Supreme Court decision of last January 28, 1988, striking down Section 251 of the Criminal Code which governs abortion, we have had this question thrown wide open to all Canadians. Even though I accept the fact that abortions may have to be performed under stringent guidelines and in special cases, such as when continuing a pregnancy would threaten the life of the mother, I believe that the sanctity of life and ensuring the maximum protection for the unborn is a paramount consideration.

As a pharmacist in the 1950s and 1960s I have known of many instances where abortions were performed in homes with instruments and equipment that did not always protect the pregnant woman from harm. Some of these abortions were successful, but in other instances irreparable damage was done to the woman causing either sterility and in a rare case or two even death. Certainly abortions must be kept out of the kitchens and bathrooms of homes. In our modern society this is not acceptable. The proposed legislation would prohibit the performance of abortion, subject to the exceptions of medical complications as enunciated in the body of the motion.

However, I would like to bring to the attention of the House that the motion before us lacks clarity in its content. The provision that abortion should be prohibited except during the early stages of pregnancy does not provide clarity as to when abortions are permissible. The motion suggests that abortions be performed only by a qualified medical practitioner. This definition is not acceptable as it lacks sufficient clarity as to a practitioner's qualification to perform therapeutic abortions. I see these elements of the motion as being somewhat defective.

The issue of abortion has produced much debate. Several points raised must be seriously considered. In my view greater education of young people, middle aged people, and adults of all ages in Canada is an absolute necessity. It is particularly imperative that unwanted pregnancies among our young people be prevented. This presents a great challenge to all of us. We need greater family dialogue. Mother, father, and child must understand each other. They must speak to each other. They must have dialogue meaningful to the young person especially, not preaching but good honest dialogue and advice always showing love and compassion. Our schools must be more active in this area as well. Abortions are all around us and our students must be made aware of them. I suggest that the churches should possibly do less preaching and more reaching out to women as well as to men. There is also peer pressure to take into account which is sometimes greater than the influence of parents, churches, and schools. Children have to be taught not to be influenced so much by the passion of the moment but to have some restraint.

The dynamics of life are always changing. I believe that greater counselling is essential in order to assist the woman in understanding the implications of her pregnancy. Should she have an abortion? Should she carry the foetus to term? What should be done in light of her needs and her aspirations for her future? We must consider the woman, the mother.

• (0320)

Adoption is an option that must be considered and stressed to the greatest degree possible. Twenty and thirty years ago, adoption was more prevalent. Now, with social assistance and with different values, people say that they will not give up their children for adoption, they will keep them because their mothers, fathers or grandmothers will look after the children while they do whatever they can to start earning a living or getting an education.

I believe that adoption is an extremely valuable way to prevent abortion. Through learning, the pregnant woman who does not want to carry her baby might be convinced that this would be the thing to do because there are virtually thousands of couples who are not able to have children and who would be happy to raise unwanted children in the most loving manner. This option should be stressed to the greatest degree.

The figure of 60,000 abortions performed last year speaks tragic volumes of the heart-wrenching dilemma facing Canadian women and men. Again, I say that education is essential. Let me give Hon. Members a case in point. Almost three years ago, I was the first Member of Parliament who spoke out about AIDS. At that time, there were only two cases of AIDS in my City of Edmonton. I said, based on the evidence of the witnesses who appeared before the Standing Committee of which I was a member, that AIDS is an epidemic. Those words were prophetic. It is considered to be an epidemic.

At that time, I urged the Government to spend more money on education because AIDS will be the death of many of us. AIDS is spreading around the world and we fear it. We are trying to understand it. Our Government is spending over $30 million on the prevention of AIDS. In the heated debate that has gone on, and especially since the Government has proposed this motion, abortion should be considered in the same light.

We have to treat abortion with the same dedication, the same fervour, the same belief that we must help those who want to commit abortion realize that this is not the way to do it.

The National Progressive Conservative Women's Federation met on March 12 and 13 of 1988. The national executive committee stated:

> Be it further resolved that the federal Government be encouraged to do more in the area of birth control research and that the Provinces be encouraged to do more to promote family planning and necessary educational programming within their jurisdictions.

Again, I want to emphasize education.

The motion before us has created this debate in Parliament after consultation with our constituents. I know that I and all Members of Parliament have heard from numerous delegations. People have phoned and written about the position they would like us as Members of Parliament to take in this important debate. The citizens of Canada have written all Members of Parliament because they feel very fervently about this issue. As a result of this impassioned debate, the Government will, in its wisdom, pass legislation reflecting the expressions spoken in this House these two or two and a half days.

I believe that the Government was wise to bring in a motion rather than a Bill. It allows the Government to listen to what we as Members of Parliament representing the people of Canada are expressing.

In essence, I suggest that women must not be compelled to carry out any pregnancy which would or would likely threaten her physical or mental well-being, and I conclude that life begins at conception. I believe in the sanctity of life and in the protection of the unborn.

Mr. Bill Attewell (Don Valley East): Mr. Speaker, I see that it is now 3.26 a.m., and in less than nine hours, Hon. Members will return to this House to make some very difficult decisions on how they will vote. This is a subject that most of us have approached in a very difficult but compassionate way. It is not an easy subject, but it is also not one from which we can run away. We were elected to deal with issues such as this.

I simply want to register my concerns and views on the issue of abortion. Let me say at the outset that I am not comfortable with the main motion. I intend to vote in favour of the amendment submitted by the Hon. Member for Kitchener (Mr. Reimer) which provides that all of the words in the motion after the words "to protect the unborn and" be deleted and the following substituted therefor: such legislation would prohibit the performance of an abortion except when two independent, qualified medical practitioners have, in good faith and on reasonable grounds, in writing, stated that in their opinion, the continuation of the pregnancy would or would be likely to endanger the life of the pregnant woman or seriously and substantially endanger her health and there is no other commonly accepted medical procedure for effectively treating that health risk, but grounds for such an opinion are not to include (1) the effect of stress or anxiety which may accompany an unexpected or unwanted pregnancy or, (2) social or economic considerations.

I am not a lawyer and I am not a doctor, but I am a father and three years ago I became a grandfather and I am a Christian. While we may read a lot on this subject and may hear the views of others, when it comes right down to it, I think our views are substantially affected by our own personal experiences, and I would like to share some of those experiences with you, Mr. Speaker. I have not done any polling but I have had many letters, telephone calls and visits from people with honest, genuine views, and their views range all the way from the pure pro choice to the pure pro-life.

I want to compliment Hon. Members of this House. The quality of the debate has been simply outstanding. I have now been listening for about 10 hours consecutively. The Hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) gave a very moving speech. I can remember several of the comments of the Hon. Member for Scarborough West (Mr. Stackhouse). The Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) spoke very movingly about the plight of her father and how that has so profoundly affected the sanctity of life in her mind.

I also want to compliment the Government for presenting us with this motion, not a Bill, which allows us to look at the issue independently and to vote on it independently, essentially as our consciences would dictate. Regardless of the outcome, and none of us know what will happen nine or ten hours from now, I think the debate will have been worth while.

With the recent Supreme Court judgment, there is a vacuum. I think we as Members of Parliament must show leadership and fill that vacuum because we simply cannot have ten different laws and ten different provinces tackling this issue on their own. We must supply the leadership.

• (0330)

This debate is about two vital issues: the sanctity of life or the protection of the unborn, and the rights and health of the mother. By the end of this debate we must end up with a balance, a blending of these two vital concerns. These issues are not mutually exclusive and I believe a compromise can be reached, and I mean that in the best sense of that word.

I want to share some personal experiences. By the mid-1960s, Sandy, my wife and I had a family of one son, Howard, and two daughters, Pamela and Leslie. I had a good job. We were very involved at Immanuel Baptist Church. Life was very good to us. I sometimes felt guilty in a way that things were going so well. After a lot of thought and prayer we decided to adopt a son to share our family life, our home, and the blessings that we certainly had enjoyed. In 1968 we adopted a young boy. We were not fussy, so to speak, about the age of the youngster. We adopted John Fraser Attewell who was 11 months old at that time. His mother was young, single, and already had a young child and was just financially incapable of keeping her second child. I often think that if abortions had

been easy 21 years ago, then young John Fraser may not have been in this world with us today.

Three years ago Sandy and I became grandparents. On July 18, 1985, Kyle William Strolenberg was born. Our daughter Leslie and her husband John were thrilled. The grandparent stage of life that many in this House now enjoy is a very exciting time. It brings a new awareness just to see the miracle of life unfold, the daily growth, physically, emotionally, and mentally.

On February 18 of this year our second grandchild arrived, Heather Christine Attewell, the daughter of our son Howard and his wife Lynda. However, this was not as happy an event. She was born prematurely, weighing a mere two and a half pounds. Further complications developed. She could not swallow because her oesophagus was not linked to her stomach. She was in an incubator for months and months at Sick Childrens Hospital. We visited her many times and have been so grateful that she is receiving the best medical attention in the world. Heather is now nine pounds and just a few days ago she underwent a four-hour operation to link her oesophagus to her stomach. We visited her yesterday morning at the hospital and this is the first time we had seen this beautiful baby without the tubes running into her nose to drain fluids. There are still some complications and Heather is very much in our prayers. She has never slept in her newly decorated bedroom. She has never seen her home. Her first six months have been spent at Sick Childrens Hospital.

One might wonder why I share these particular details of Heather's young life and struggle. Having visited there several times, I have seen many new babies with various problems surrounding their birth, but I have also heard about the devoted doctors and nurses and other members of medical teams at that first rate world renowned hospital, and these youngsters have many people battling for them. They have many people trying to make them well. Many people are battling for their lives. It made me think in a more profound way about whether we are defending the life of the unborn as much as we should.

Just because we cannot see the unborn, just because we cannot hear them cry, just because we cannot hug them, does not mean they are not every bit as precious. I believe life begins at conception. We must protect the unborn. Our Charter of Rights demands it.

I want to say that I believe I have some empathy and understanding of the anguish a woman goes through when considering an abortion. Obviously we cannot understand that in total, but I think I can empathize somewhat with them. It has to be a very difficult decision. Mother Teresa has said a decision to abort a child can become a haunting nightmare for the rest of the life of a woman.

I respect the women who say that they should have full authority to decide whether or not to abort their child, but I just cannot honestly agree with that position. I believe the adoptive process is part of the answer. My sister Gerry was unable to bear children. She and her husband, Clair, adopted a son, John, and a daughter, Anne. They have done their best to raise their two adopted children in a warm and loving home. We have other friends who have also chosen to share the lives and homes with adopted children. Those children have brought joy and fulfilment to their lives.

In closing, I want to say that I am thankful for the opportunity to speak on this subject. It is a very divisive, very complex issue. Views vary all over the spectrum, but as an MP I have an obligation to participate in the debate and make a decision. I have an obligation to vote in a few hours and, in the final analysis, it will be a vote of conscience. In order to protect the unborn, I intend to vote for the amendment tabled by the Hon. Member for Kitchener.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege to conclude this debate which has lasted for more than two days, and I think it is also appropriate, since the first speaker on this motion was the Minister of State and Parliamentary House Leader (Mr. Lewis), and since I seconded the motion, I think it is no more than fitting that I should speak last, in a debate which I would qualify as having been very civilized, and in which ninety-four Members rose in the House to speak to a very sensitive and controversial motion on the subject of abortion.

Mr. Speaker, during the many hours of debate today . . . it is now twenty minutes to four in the morning, and yesterday morning we finished at quarter to three . . . In the course of this debate, we heard the various views of Hon. Members who expressed their apprehension in referring either to the rights of the fetus or to the right of women to have an abortion, and we also heard an analysis of the various options.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank and congratulate all Members who took part in a debate in which they expressed some very deep convictions.

Speaking on behalf of the government, I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the Chair and all employees of the House, including the translators, official stenographers and all other members of our staff who did their work in a spirit of exceptional co-operation, and especially the Table which has had and still has a great deal of work to do, preparatory to drafting the decision that will be handed down tomorrow by the Chair. That is when the Members of this House will be asked to vote on amendments or groups of amendments, according to the Chair's ruling, and also of course on the main motion, and all this will take place in a few hours' time.

• (0340)

I would also like to include the poeple of the ridings of Chambly and Verchères in my thanks and the thanks of the House which are directed to the Deputy Speaker and Member for the riding of Chambly (Mr. Danis), who presided over the

debate during these many hours, and I want to say: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I know, as you do, that within a few hours, there will be extremely important votes that, depending on the decision of the Members of this House, of course, could give the Government an indication or sense of direction on the drafting of a future abortion bill. Again, in the riding of Chambly, I have personally been approached by various groups and individuals representing many options on the abortion issue. And tomorrow, of course, when we have the various decisions of the Chair in our hands, I will decide to vote as I choose, based on my conscience and morality, and in closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call on all Hon. Members of this House to reflect on the contents of the motion and to elaborate on it. "The Government should prepare and introduce legislation, consistent with the *Constitution of Canada*, including the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, which reflects the fundamental value and inherent dignity of each human being and the inherent worth of human life, and which achieves a balance between the right of a woman to liberty and security of her person and the responsibility of society to protect the unborn."

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that this text really and sincerely reflects the overall debate of the last several hours. It is an extremely difficult choice that each Member will have to make in this House and, once again, I want to thank all employees and the Chair for their diligence and all Hon. Members, of course, for the quality of this debate; I am grateful for the diligent service we have had.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to the Order passed on Tuesday, July 26, 1988, the debate on the motion is adjourned. This House stands adjourned until 11 a.m. today, pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 3.45 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, July 28, 1988

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

[*Translation*]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed without amendment Bill C-58, An Act to provide for the implementation of treaties for mutual legal assistance in criminal matters and to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Immigration Act, 1976; and Bill C-126, An Act to amend the Bretton Woods and Related Agreements Act.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

Government House
Ottawa

July 28, 1988

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Claire L'Heureux-Dubé, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in her capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 28th day of July, 1988, at 11.30 a.m., for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain Bills.

Yours sincerely,
Jean M. Sévigny
Deputy Secretary, Operations.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to 49 petitions numbered as follows: 332-4746, 332-4849, 332-4850, 332-4861 to 332-4863 inclusive, 332-4865, 332-4891 to 332-4894 inclusive, 332-4896 to 332-4898 inclusive, 332-4908, 332-4912 to 332-4919 inclusive, 332-4921, 332-4929, 332-4930, 332-4934 to 332-4938 inclusive, 332-4957, 332-4959 to 332-4969 inclusive, 332-5036 to 332-5048 inclusive, 332-5040, 332-5041, 332-5097 and 332-5099.

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

* * *

[*English*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

AGRICULTURE—NINTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Geoff Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture relating to the $22 billion problem, options for the restructuring of farm debt.

In accordance with Standing Order 99(2), the committee will request a comprehensive response from the Government.

Very briefly, the report makes recommendations concerning the concept of equity financing and suggests that the Farm Credit Corporation have a dual role, carrying out government credit policy, being compensated for it, while at the same time having a commercial role to supply long-term farm mortgages.

Finally, the committee identified a need to stabilize the real agricultural costs of borrowed money and suggests some innovative measures such as interest stabilization plans and variable rate insured risk mortgages.

I would like to close by thanking members of the committee on all sides of the House for their efforts over the last number of months in arriving at a comprehensive report in which all Members on all sides of the House have been able to concur.

• (1110)

BILL C-123—REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Robert Wenman (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Legislative Committee on Bill C-123, an Act to amend the Indian Act (minors' funds and surviving spouse's preferential share), I have the honour to present the report of

the legislative committee, in both official languages, with amendments.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

PROTECTION OF ROUGE RIVER VALLEY WILDERNESS AREA

Mrs. Pauline Browes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present to the House today a petition signed by residents of Scarborough, Newmarket, Don Mills, and Thornhill which states that the Rouge River Valley in Scarborough is a unique and precious natural area, and that protecting the endangered wildlife and wilderness areas in the Rouge Valley is in the national interest. They join with the Scarborough City Council, the federal Environment Minister (Mr. McMillan), Save the Rouge Valley System and the Coalition of Scarborough Community Associations and call on the Government to work with the provincial Government of Ontario to establish the Rouge River Valley as a Canadian heritage park or a provincial park.

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present on behalf of a number of constituents. In one petition, which has been certified as correct under Standing Order 106, the petitioners state that they feel that the fabric of Canadian sovereignty has been threatened by the Canada-U.S. trade deal. They believe that the trade deal will integrate Canada further into the North American defence industrial base. Therefore, they call for a general election on this issue.

I have another petition which is completely different. It is from constituents from western Canada. They, too, believe that the federal Government lacks a mandate from the people of Canada to conclude a trade deal with the United States. They believe that the trade deal as negotiated would deny Canada the policy freedom to determine its own economic future and would undermine Canada's ability to build a society distinct from that of the United States.

I could go on and on. It points out all kinds of problems which they perceive attached to this trade deal.

Basically, they are calling upon Parliament to dissolve now to allow the people of Canada an opportunity to accept or reject the proposed trade deal during a national general election.

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Ted Schellenberg (Nanaimo—Alberni): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty, honour and privilege to present a petition from almost 100 residents of Port Alberni, British Columbia, who call upon Parliament to pass into law legislation that will protect the life of the unborn child from conception and at all stages of development with the exception of the extremely rare situation in which an abortion is performed in order to save the life of the mother.

Mr. Patrick Boyer (Etobicoke—Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of 27 men and women of Etobicoke—Lakeshore I am presenting a petition that has been certified correct both as to form and as to content pursuant to Standing Order 106.

The petition calls upon Parliament to pass a law to protect the life, liberty and security of the unborn at every stage of its development.

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present three petitions signed by residents of Winnipeg who say that the trade agreement negotiated by the Mulroney Government threatens the very fabric of Canadian political and economic sovereignty by removing the power of the Canadian Government to control effectively foreign ownership, to develop Canadian energy resources in the best interests of Canadians, or equalize opportunities between regions.

Therefore, they humbly pray and call upon Parliament to dissolve and allow the people of Canada the opportunity to accept or reject the proposed free trade agreement during a national general election.

RESEARCH INTO PREVENTION AND CURE OF SCHIZOPHRENIA

Mr. Jim Caldwell (Essex—Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present a petition signed by residents of Blenheim, Ridgetown, Morpeth, Chatham and Highgate who humbly pray and call upon Parliament to ensure that research efforts related to schizophrenia will, in the future, be commensurate with the seriousness of this illness in Canada.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, Question No. 360 will be answered today.

[Text]

MEMBERS OF CANADIAN ARMED FORCES RELEASED

Question No. 360—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. In (*a*) 1984 (*b*) 1985 (*c*) 1986 (*d*) 1987 (*e*) 1988 to date, how many members of the Canadian Armed Forces have been released under Canadian Forces Administrative Order (CFAO) 19/20?

2. Is there a new policy in place to replace CFAO 19/20 and, if so, what is it?

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Defence): 1. Number of members released from the Canadian Forces by virtue of the application of CFAO 19-20.

Year	Homosexual	Sexual Deviation	Total
1984	38	9	47
1985	19	13	32
1986	12	15	27
1987	9	12	21
1988	5	4	9
	83	53	136

2. (a) No. (b) The application of CFAO 19-20 was modified on February 11, 1987 following statement of the Minister of National Defence before the Standing Committee on Human Rights on the matter of sexual orientation as it affects the Canadian Forces. The modifications involved removal of the obligation on the part of members of the Canadian Forces to report suspected homosexuals to Canadian Forces authorities and a change with respect to the basis for ineligibility to serve from "propensity" to "acts". Current policy has been further modified in that the involuntary release, under Item 5(d) of QR&O Chap 15, of serving members actually engaged in the practice of homosexual activities has been suspended pending government consideration of the Canadian Force policy.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The question as enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary has been answered.

* * *

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 372 could be made an Order for Return, the return would be tabled immediately.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that Question No. 372 be deemed to have been made an Order for Return?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

EXPENDITURES IN CONSTITUENCY OF ESSEX—WINDSOR

Question No. 372—**Mr. Langdon:**

Since September, 1984, have any government departments or agencies awarded grants or loans to individuals, corporations, or non-governmental organizations located in the constituency of Essex—Windsor, and, if so, in each case (*a*) to which ones (*b*) in what amounts (*c*) for what purposes?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ABORTION

PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

The House resumed from Wednesday, July 27, the motion of Mr. Lewis:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Supreme Court of Canada having declared that the provisions of the Criminal Code relating to abortion are inconsistent with the provisions of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and are therefore of no force or effect, the government should prepare and introduce legislation, consistent with the Constitution of Canada, including the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which reflects the fundamental value and inherent dignity of each human being and the inherent worth of human life, and which achieves a balance between the right of a woman to liberty and security of her person and the responsibility of society to protect the unborn; and

Such legislation should prohibit the performance of an abortion, subject to the following exceptions:

When, during the earlier stages of pregnancy: a qualified medical practitioner is of the opinion that the continuation of the pregnancy of a woman would, or would be likely to, threaten her physical or mental well-being; when the woman in consultation with a qualified medical practitioner decides to terminate her pregnancy; and when the termination is performed by a qualified medical practitioner; and

When, during the subsequent stages of pregnancy: the termination of the pregnancy satisfies further conditions, including a condition that after a certain point in time, the termination would only be permitted where, in the opinion of two qualified medical practitioners, the continuation of the pregnancy would, or would be likely to, endanger the woman's life or seriously endanger her health.

Mr. Speaker: I should advise the House before giving my ruling that, in order to assist Hon. Members, a copy of the ruling is now being taken to each desk by the Pages.

I should say that—and perhaps this is a good time to say it in order to relieve any anxieties that Hon. Members may have with respect to the procedure—when the hour of deliberation commences, all Members are then invited, if they feel that there is anything within the ruling that they want clarified, to avail themselves of the services of the Table Officers.

I shall now commence to read the ruling.

Pursuant to the special order of the House adopted on July 26, 1988 it is my duty now to provide the House with my ruling in relation to the proposed amendments to the motion of the Hon. Minister of State (Treasury Board) (Mr. Lewis) on the subject of abortion.

[*Translation*]

I will begin by dealing with the proposed amendments which I feel are out of order and cannot therefore be put to the House.

Abortion

[*English*]

Motion No. 5 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Kitchener (Mr. Reimer) seeks to amend the main motion by introducing the concepts of both the stress and anxiety which may accompany an unexpected pregnancy and also economic considerations. It is my view that such concepts are raising new propositions which were not contemplated in the main motion. I would refer Members to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 437(2). I therefore must rule Motion No. 5 out of order.

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 15 in the name of the Hon. Member for Kent (Mr. Hardey) is virtually identical to Motion No. 5 and is also out of order for the same reasons.

[*English*]

Motion No. 6 in the name of the Hon. Member for Scarborough East (Mr. Hicks) refers to the possible psychological consequences of obtaining an abortion,the support services available to mothers and the possibilities of adoption. This motion attempts to introduce new concepts into the main motion and is therefore also out of order pursuant to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 437(2).

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 18 in the name of the Hon. Member for Scarborough West (Mr. Stackhouse) is similar to Motion No. 6 and also deals with psychological consequences and counselling and is out of order for the same reasons as Motion No. 6.

[*English*]

Motion No. 9 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York—Peel (Mr. Stevens) also attempts to introduce new concepts into the motion in that it specifies giving pre-eminence to the protection of all life and recognizing that the foetus is a human being. This was not envisaged in the main motion. Therefore, for the same reasons as those given for Motions Nos. 5 and 6, Motion No. 9 would also be out of order.

Motion No. 7 in the name of the Hon. Member for Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington (Mr. Vankoughnet) and Motion No. 8 in the name of the Hon. Member for Willowdale (Mr. Oostrom) would introduce into the main motion a contradiction in giving pre-eminence to the life of the foetus, which would be inconsistent with the thrust of the main question. They would both therefore be out of order and I would refer Hon. Members to Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, Citation 203(5).

Motion No. 17 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Cape Breton Highlands—Canso (Mr. O'Neil) and Motion No. 19 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Nicholson) are virtually identical to Motion No. 8 and are ruled out of order for the same reasons.

• (1120)

Motion No. 11, in the name of the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Ms. Dewar), would introduce a new concept into the main motion by attempting to ensure equality of access throughout the country and through reference to the Canada Health Act. Pursuant to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 437, this amendment is out of order.

Motion No. 14, in the name of the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor), attempts to amend the Criminal Code and is therefore out of order. Also Motion No. 16, in the name of the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway), attempts to add to the motion a new proposition not envisaged in the main motion and is therefore out of order. I again refer Members to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 437.

Motion No. 21, in the name of the Hon. Member for London—Middlesex (Mr. Clifford), in making reference to programs which would foster better knowledge and understanding, is attempting to introduce concepts foreign to the original proposition and, pursuant to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 437(1), this motion is out of order.

In resumé then, Motions Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 21 are ruled out of order.

[*Translation*]

Some of the motions which were submitted are virtually identical to other motions and will not be selected to be put to the House for a vote for that reason. In cases of duplication, the motion submitted first will be the one selected to be put to the House while those submitted later will not be selected.

[*English*]

Motion No. 4, in the name of the Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm), is virtually identical to Motion No. 3 and will therefore not be selected. Motion No. 12, in the name of the Hon. Member for London East (Mr. Jepson), is also virtually identical to Motion No. 3 and will not therefore be selected. This is also the case with Motion No. 20 in the name of the Hon. Member for Dartmouth—Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall). It will not be selected as it is virtually identical to Motion No. 3.

In resumé then, Motions Nos. 4, 12 and 20 will not be selected.

This leaves Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 10 and 13 which will be put to the House.

In attempting to decide in what order the above mentioned motions should be submitted to the House for decision, the Chair has found itself in a totally unprecedented situation and, as I mentioned to the House the other day, there is little direction or guidance in the special order adopted last Tuesday other than that in paragraph 2 of that order found at page 3277 of the *Votes and Proceedings*:

> 2. The Speaker, in a manner similar to the practice at the report stage of Bills, will have power to select, group and determine the voting procedure for all such amendments, with his statement and ruling on such selection,

grouping and voting (consistent with Part (8) of this Order) to be made to the House when the debate is first resumed . . .

[*Translation*]

Ruling on the acceptability of certain of the motions is obviously relevant to the practice of report stage motions relating to Bills.

[*English*]

The selection of motions was therefore made first on the basis of procedural acceptability and, second, they were given priority of selection against other substantially similar motions on the basis of the chronology in which they were received or submitted to the Table. That is also in keeping with the practice of how motions at the report stage are given priority for submission to the House. The voting pattern that I will now list is also strictly in keeping with that same practice and will reflect the chronological order in which the motions were submitted.

Accordingly, the voting procedure on Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 10 and 13 will be as follows:

(a) Motion No. 1, in the name of the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mrs. Collins), will be put first and voted on by the House.

If the decision is affirmative, Motions Nos. 2, 3 and 13 will consequently not be put to the House for a vote, since they attempt to amend the same part of the main motion. But Motion No. 10, in the name of the Hon. Member for Calgary South (Mrs. Sparrow), which affects part of the main motion not touched by the adoption of Motion No. 1, will then be put to the House for a vote.

If the decision on Motion No. 1 is negative, Motion No. 2, in the name of the Hon. Member for Sarnia—Lambton (Mr. James), will be put next and voted on by the House.

[*Translation*]

b) If the decision on Motion No 2 is affirmative, Motion Nos 3, 10 and 13 will consequently not be put to the House for a vote.

If the decision on Motion No 2 is negative, Motion No 3, in the name of the Hon. Member for Grey—Simcoe (Mr. Mitges), will then be put and voted on by the House.

[*English*]

(c) If the decision on Motion No. 3 is affirmative, Motions Nos. 10 and 13 will consequently not be put to the House for a vote.

If the decision on Motion No. 3 is negative, Motion No. 10, in the name of the Hon. Member for Calgary South (Mrs. Sparrow), will then be put and voted on by the House.

(d) If the decision on Motion No. 10 is affirmative, Motion No. 13, in the name of the Hon. Member for Don Valley West (Mr. Bosley), will consequently not be put to the House for a vote.

If the decision on Motion No. 10 is negative, Motion No. 13 will then be put and voted on by the House.

[*Translation*]

e) Finally, the main motion, will be put and voted on by the House either in its original from or amended as the case may be.

[*English*]

I think that it might be appropriate for the Chair to just remark that the Chair has been extremely conscious of a variety of views in the Chamber, and it is the hope of the Chair that the procedure set out in this ruling will, as much as is possible, give Hon. Members a chance to reflect those views in a vote. I know that there has been a sentiment among some Members to proceed in a somewhat different way, whereby we would be voting on each of the motions, no matter what the result of that vote will be. I do want to say that even up to early this morning I have given that further thought than I had over the last number of weeks. I have to say to those Hon. Members that it did not seem appropriate to the Chair to proceed in that way. It would be extremely difficult to justify procedurally, especially in view of the fact that the Chair is bound by the resolution establishing this procedure, and I am in that resolution bound to adhere as closely as I can to the practice at report stage of a Bill.

• (1130)

I thank Hon. Members for their co-operation.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I think I am speaking for all Members of the House, I want to thank you and the Table Officers for the time and effort that has been put into the ruling. I appreciate that it is not one where there is a lot of precedent to fall back on, but I believe, Sir, we have been well served by the debate and well served by your efforts in this ruling.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I want to endorse what the Minister said, but I would also like to say a few words of thanks to the staff of the House, to all those who gave us their support and who worked so hard to help Members during the past few days, and we hope they will be able to have a vacation during the next few days and get some well-earned rest.

[*English*]

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I too want to add my voice to that of the Deputy House Leader regarding your decision. On everyone's behalf may I say that the decision to circulate your ruling in writing and to lay out in precis form how we will proceed is most useful to all Members and will help guide us as we each make up our own decisions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I note that whether a motion has been declared in order or out of order is based on the resolution on the Order Paper. I feel, and many others felt, that the resolution was very faulty in places and not accurate. Since Motion No. 14, the motion that I presented, ultimately does what we have to do, namely, amends the Criminal Code, why would it be out of order in this consideration?

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has, as the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) knows, a most profound regard for the many years of service of the Hon. Member in this place and for his experience. I do not take the Hon. Member's intervention lightly except to say this, and I must say it. It is not always easy to take the number of motions as there were in this case and put them in what had to be as much as possible a cohesive series of votes that would as much as possible again reflect the thinking in this Chamber.

The Hon. Member's motion, in the view of the Chair, and I regret this, is not acceptable procedurally. It may well be that the resolution itself to which the Hon. Member has referred is not as wide or not as flexible as some Members would have wished. I know the Hon. Member knows that the Chair has to take what is brought to me by the House.

I hope the Hon. Member will be able to bear with me, and I hope he will feel, in the other votes available to him, that he will be in a position to express his views.

I think momentarily we will be going to the other place, but I want to reiterate something. The one hour will run after we come back to the Chamber unless there is dissent, and I do not hear any. Again I reiterate that the services of the Table Officers are here at Members' disposal. I urge Hon. Members, if there is some confusion, to consult them.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, we are content to have the hour start to run from now and that the Royal Assent take place within that time, if it is the wish of the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: If that is the wish of the House, that is certainly acceptable. My only concern was to make sure that, because we go to the other place there should be no sense in this Chamber that Hon. Members are losing the full hour of consideration.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, may I just say that in the adopted procedure there was a provision for Royal Assent. I take it we can now proceed with the hour as per the agreement and come back here at 12.30 p.m. or thereabouts to vote.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the exchange. There is agreement.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[*Translation*]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

> Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Deputy to the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

• (1135)

And being returned.

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that when the House went up to the Senate chamber, the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following bills:

> Bill C-58, an Act to provide for the implementation of treaties for mutual legal assistance in legal matters and to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Immigration Act, 1976—Chapter 37.
>
> Bill C-72, an Act respecting the status and use of the official languages of Canada—Chapter 38.
>
> Bill C-73, an Act to provide for the implementation of an agreement respecting Indian lands in Ontario—Chapter 39.
>
> Bill C-105, an Act to ensure the safe operation of railways and to amend certain other Acts in consequence thereof—Chapter 40.
>
> Bill C-121, an Act to authorize the reorganization and divestiture of Eldorado Nuclear Limited and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof—Chapter 41.
>
> Bill C-126, an Act to amend the Bretton Woods and Related Agreements Act—Chapter 42.
>
> Bill C-308, an Act to change the name of the electoral district of Chapleau—Chapter 43.

[*English*]

SITTING SUSPENDED

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to order made Tuesday, July 26, 1988, the sitting is suspended to the call of the Chair. I should advise Hon. Members that the bell will ring when the House is to be reassembled.

At 11.45 a.m., the sitting of the House was suspended.

• (1240)

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 12.47 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Minister of State (Mr. Lewis) is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I rise to seek the consent of the House for a vote row by row on all questions.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the suggestion of the Hon. Minister of State. Is it agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the order made on Tuesday, July 26, 1988, the Chair will now proceed to put all questions necessary to dispose of the motion, standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of State for the Treasury Board, in relation to the question on abortion. May I remind Hon. Members that any bell sounded to call in the Members shall ring for not more than 15 minutes.

Accordingly, the first question is on Motion No. 1.

Mrs. Mary Collins (Capilano) moved:

Motion No. 1

That the motion be amended

(a) by deleting in the second paragraph the words "subject to the following exceptions" and substituting the words "except as follows:";

(b) by deleting in the third paragraph the words "a qualified medical practitioner is of the opinion that the continuation of the pregnancy of a woman would, or would be likely to, threaten her physical or mental well-being; when";

(c) by deleting in the fourth paragraph the words "two qualified medical practitioners" and substituting the words "a qualified medical practitioner" and by adding immediately after the words "endanger her" the words "mental and physical".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Some Hon. Members: Fifteen-minute bell.

Mr. Speaker: Again?

Some Hon. Members: Dispense.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, the understanding that we had is that we begin the voting about 12.30. I suggest that we are all here, and that we should suspend the ringing of the bells.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Minister of State perhaps would assist the Chair.

Mr. Lewis: I think, Mr. Speaker, while any one Member feels that a bell should be rung, the bell should be rung.

Abortion

Mr. Speaker: Call in the Members. I remind Members that it will be a 15-minute bell.

The House divided on the motion (Mrs. Collins), which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 496)

YEAS

Members

Blais
Blouin
Bosley
Bourgault
Browes
Cadieux
Carney
Champagne (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Clark (Yellowhead)
Collins
Cook
Danis
Finestone
Fontaine
Garneau
Grisé
Jacques
Landry
Lapierre
Lewis
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Nowlan
Pépin
Plamondon
Rossi
Sparrow
Vézina
Weiner—29

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Althouse
Andre
Angus
Attewell
Axworthy
Beatty
Belsher
Benjamin
Bernier
Blackburn (Brant)
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Boudria
Boyer
Bradley
Brightwell
Brisco
Broadbent
Caccia
Caldwell
Cassidy
Champagne (Champlain)
Charest
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Clinch
Cochrane
Cooper
Copps
Corbett
Cossitt
Crofton
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Daubney
de Corneille
de Cotret
Della Noce
Desjardins
Desrosiers
Dewar
Dick
Domm
Dorin
Duguay
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)
Epp (Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Forrestall
Foster
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gagliano
Gagnon
Gauthier
Gérin
Gervais
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gray (Windsor West)
Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
Guilbault (Drummond)
Halliday
Hardey
Harris
Harvey
Hawkes
Heap
Henderson
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Holtmann
Hopkins
Horner
Isabelle
James
Jardine
Jelinek
Jepson
Jewett
Johnson (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Jourdenais
Kaplan
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
Kindy
Ladouceur
Langdon
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacKay
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Manly
Mantha
Marchi

Marin
Martin
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCrossan
McCuish
McCurdy
McDermid
McInnes
McKenzie
McKnight
McLaughlin
McLean
McMillan
Merrithew
Minaker
Mitchell
Mitges
Moore
Murta
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Nystrom
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Orlikow
Ouellet
Paproski
Penner
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Porter
Price
Ravis
Redway
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
Riis
Robinson
Rodriguez
Roman
St. Germain
St-Julien
Schellenberg
(Nanaimo—Alberni)
Schellenberger
(Wetaskiwin)
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scowen
Shields
Skelly
Speyer
Stackhouse
Stevens
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Tremblay
(Lotbinière)
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vankoughnet
Vincent
Warner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)
Winegard
Wise
Witer—191

• (1310)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

Mr. Ken James (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Supply and Services) moved:

Motion No. 2

That the motion be amended

(a) by deleting in the third paragraph the words "earlier stages" and substituting the words "first trimester";

(b) by deleting paragraph four and substituting the following therefor:

"termination of the pregnancy would only be permitted where, two qualified medical practitioners have, in good faith and on reasonable grounds, stated that in their opinion the continuation of the pregnancy would, or would be likely to, endanger the life of the pregnant woman or seriously and substantially endanger her health and there is no other commonly accepted medical procedure for effectively treating the health risk; and when the termination is performed by a qualified medical practitioner."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Shall I dispense with the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. James), which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 497*)

YEAS

Members

Blackburn
(Jonquière)
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Cook
Ellis
Halliday
Hicks
Howie
James
Jourdenais
Lesick
Marin
Minaker
Nickerson
Pennock
Reid
Schellenberger
(Wetaskiwin)
Witer—17

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Althouse
Angus
Attewell
Axworthy
Beatty
Belsher
Benjamin
Bernier
Binns
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blaikie
Blais
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Bouchard
(Lac-Saint-Jean)
Boudria
Bourgault
Boyer
Bradley
Brightwell
Brisco
Broadbent
Browes
Caccia
Cadieux
Caldwell
Carney
Cassidy
Champagne
(Saint-Hyacinthe—
Bagot)
Champagne
(Champlain)
Charest
Chartrand
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clifford
Clinch
Cochrane
Collins
Comeau
Cooper
Copps
Corbett
Cossitt
Crofton
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Danis
Dantzer
Daubney
de Corneille
de Cotret
Della Noce
Desjardins
Desrosiers
Dewar
Dick
Domm
Dorin
Duguay
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Epp
(Provencher)
Ferland
Finestone
Fontaine
Forrestall
Foster
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gagliano
Gagnon
Garneau
Gauthier
Gérin
Gervais
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-
la-Madeleine)
Gray
(Windsor West)
Grisé
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Guilbault
(Drummond)
Hardey
Harris
Harvey
Hawkes
Heap
Henderson
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Holtmann
Hopkins
Horner
Isabelle
Jacques
Jardine
Jelinek
Jepson
Jewett
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—
Conception)
Kaplan
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
Ladouceur
Landry
Langdon

Lapierre
Layton
Leblanc
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacKay
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Manly
Mantha
Marchi
Martin
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCrossan
McCuish
McCurdy
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McInnes
McKenzie
McKnight
McLaughlin
McLean
McMillan
Mitchell
Mitges
Moore
Murta
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nowlan
Nystrom
O'Neil
Oostrom
Orlikow
Ouellet
Paproski
Penner
Pépin
Peterson
Pietz
Plamondon
Plourde
Porter
Price
Ravis
Redway
Reimer
Ricard
Riis
Robinson
Rodriguez
Roman
Rossi
St. Germain
St-Julien
Schellenberg
(Nanaimo—Alberni)
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Skelly
Sparrow
Speyer
Stackhouse
Stevens
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Tremblay
(Lotbinière)
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Warner
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)
Winegard
Wise—202

● (1340)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 3: Mr. Mitges moved:

Motion No. 3

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "following" in the second paragraph and substituting the following therefor:

"exception:

When two or more independent qualified medical practitioners have in good faith and on reasonable grounds stated that in their opinion the continuation of the pregnancy would or would be likely to, endanger the life of the pregnant woman."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it. Call in the Members. May I dispense with the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

And more than five Members having risen:

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Mitges), which was negatived on the following division:

● (1350)

[*English*]

(*Division No. 498*)

YEAS

Members

Attewell
Beatty
Belsher
Bernier
Binns
Blenkarn
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Boudria
Brisco
Caldwell
Chartrand
Clinch
Cochrane
Comeau
Cooper
Corbett
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Della Noce
Desjardins
Desrosiers
Domm
Edwards
Epp
(Provencher)
Forrestall
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Gagnon
Gass
Gervais
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Guilbault
(Drummond)
Hardey
Harvey
Henderson
Holtmann
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jelinek
Jepson
Jourdenais
Kilgour
Kindy
Ladouceur
Layton
Lesick
Lopez
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacKay
MacLellan
Malone
Mantha
Marchi
Marin
Mazankowski
McCain
McCuish
McKenzie
McKnight
McMillan
Mitges
Moore
Murta
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Paproski
Penner
Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Porter
Price
Ravis
Redway
Reimer
Ricard
Roman
St. Germain
St-Julien
Schellenberg
(Nanaimo—Alberni)
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Stackhouse
Stevens
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vankoughnet
Warner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)
Witer—105

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Althouse
Andre
Angus
Axworthy
Benjamin
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blackburn
(Jonquière)
Blaikie
Blais
Blouin
Bosley
Bouchard
(Lac-Saint-Jean)
Bourgault
Boyer
Bradley
Brightwell
Broadbent
Browes
Caccia
Cadieux
Carney
Cassidy
Champagne
(Saint-Hyacinthe—
Bagot)
Champagne
(Champlain)
Charest
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Collins
Cook

Copps
Cossitt
Crofton
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Danis
Daubney
de Corneille
de Cotret
Dewar
Dick
Dorin
Duplessis
Ellis
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Ferland
Finestone
Fontaine
Foster
Fulton
Gagliano
Garneau
Gauthier
Gérin
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-
la-Madeleine)
Gray
(Windsor West)
Grisé
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Halliday
Harris
Hawkes
Heap
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Horner
Howie
Jacques
James
Jardine
Jewett
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—
Conception)
Kaplan
Keeper
Kempling
Landry
Langdon
Lapierre
Leblanc
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
Malépart
Manly
Martin
Mayer
McCurdy
McDermid
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McInnes
McLaughlin
McLean
Merrithew
Minaker
Mitchell
Nickerson
Nowlan
Nystrom
Orlikow
Ouellet
Pépin
Plamondon
Reid
Riis
Robinson
Rodriguez
Rossi
Schellenberger
(Wetaskiwin)
Skelly
Sparrow
Speyer
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Tremblay
(Lotbinière)
Tupper
Vézina
Vincent
Weiner
Winegard
Wise—118

• (1400)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. McCrossan: Mr. Speaker, I am rising to record the fact that I abstained on the vote on Motion No. 3, since I will not vote against a pro-life motion. However, since on technical grounds Motions Nos. 5 and 15 were deemed inadmissible and there is no remaining motion which combines the concept of a threat to life in serious or substantial danger to health, I find—

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member, of course, has, as do other Hon. Members, the right to say that they have abstained. I do not think that it is appropriate to go into a speech on the subject matter.

Mr. Duguay: I wish to record that I also abstained, and I think that the Hon. Member has just expressed my point of view as well.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 10.

Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Calgary South) moved:

Motion No. 10

That the motion be amended in the third paragraph by deleting the words "during the earlier stages of pregnancy" and substituting therefor the words "up to and including the 18th week of pregnancy".

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Motion No. 10 (Mrs. Sparrow) negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 13.

Hon. John W. Bosley moved:

Motion No. 13

That the motion be amended by deleting paragraphs two, three and four and substituting the following therefor:

"Such legislation should prohibit the performance of an abortion except when performed by a qualified medical practitioner."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Shall I dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Bosley) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 499*)

YEAS

Members

Blais
Blouin
Bosley
Bourgault
Cadieux
Carney
Champagne
(Saint-Hyacinthe—
Bagot)
Collins
Danis
Finestone
Jacques
Langdon
Lewis
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
Pennock
Pépin
Plamondon
Vézina
Weiner—20

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Althouse
Andre
Angus
Attewell
Axworthy
Beatty
Belsher
Benjamin
Bernier
Binns
Blackburn
(Brant)
Blackburn
(Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Bouchard
(Lac-Saint-Jean)
Boudria
Boyer
Bradley
Brightwell
Brisco
Broadbent
Browes
Caccia
Caldwell
Cassidy
Champagne
(Champlain)
Charest
Chartrand
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Clinch
Cochrane
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Copps
Corbett
Cossitt
Crofton
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Daubney
de Corneille
de Cotret
Della Noce
Desjardins
Desrosiers
Dewar
Dick
Domm
Dorin
Duguay
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Epp
(Provencher)
Ferland
Forrestall
Foster
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gagliano
Gagnon
Garneau
Gass
Gauthier
Gérin
Gervais
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-
la-Madeleine)
Gray
(Windsor West)
Grisé
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Guilbault
(Drummond)
Halliday
Hardey
Harris
Harvey
Hawkes
Heap
Henderson
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Holtmann
Hopkins
Isabelle
James
Jardine
Jepson
Jewett
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—
Conception)
Jourdenais
Kaplan
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
Kindy
Ladouceur
Landry
Layton
Leblanc
Lesick
Lopez
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacKay
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Manly
Mantha
Marchi
Marin
Martin
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCrossan
McCuish
McCurdy
McDermid
McInnes
McKenzie
McKnight
McLaughlin
McLean
McMillan
Merrithew
Minaker
Mitchell
Mitges
Moore
Murta
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
O'Neil
Oostrom
Orlikow
Ouellet
Paproski
Penner
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Porter
Price
Ravis
Redway
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
Riis
Robinson
Rodriguez
Roman
Rossi
St. Germain
St-Julien
Schellenberg
(Nanaimo—Alberni)
Schellenberger
(Wetaskiwin)
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Skelly
Sparrow
Speyer
Stackhouse
Stevens
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Tremblay
(Lotbinière)
Tupper
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vankoughnet
Vincent
Warner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)
Winegard
Wise
Witer—198

• (1410)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I would like it noted that I was in the House for all of the votes and abstained.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Some Hon. Members: No.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Shall I dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Lewis), which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 500*)

YEAS

Members

Andre
Blackburn
(Jonquière)
Blais
Blenkarn
Blouin
Bouchard
(Lac-Saint-Jean)
Bourgault
Boyer
Bradley
Brightwell
Browes
Cadieux
Caldwell
Carney
Champagne
(Saint-Hyacinthe—
Bagot)
Champagne
(Champlain)
Charest
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Cook
Cossitt
Crofton
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Danis
Daubney
Dick
Dorin
Duguay
Duplessis
Ellis
Ferland
Fontaine
Gray
(Bonaventure—Îles-de-
la-Madeleine)
Grisé
Halliday
Hawkes
Hicks
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Howie
James
Johnson
(Bonavista—Trinity—
Conception)

Jourdenais
Kempling
Landry
Leblanc
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald
(Kingston and
the Islands)
MacKay
Martin
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCurdy
McDermid
McInnes
McKnight
McLean
Merrithew
Minaker
Nickerson
Nowlan
Oberle
Pennock
Plamondon
Reid
Rodriguez
Schellenberger
(Wetaskiwin)
Sparrow
Speyer
Stewart
Tardif
(Charlesbourg)
Tupper
Winegard
Wise—76

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Althouse
Angus
Attewell
Axworthy
Beatty
Belsher
Benjamin
Bernier
Binns
Blackburn
(Brant)
Bosley
Bouchard
(Roberval)
Boudria
Brisco
Broadbent
Caccia
Cassidy
Chartrand
Clinch
Cochrane
Collins
Comeau
Cooper
Copps
Corbett
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
de Corneille
de Cotret
Della Noce
Desjardins
Desrosiers
Dewar
Domm
Edwards
Epp
(Thunder Bay—
Nipigon)
Epp
(Provencher)
Finestone
Forrestall
Foster
Fraleigh
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gagliano
Gagnon
Garneau
Gass
Gauthier
Gérin
Gervais
Girard
Gormley
Gottselig
Gray
(Windsor West)
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Guilbault
(Drummond)
Hardey
Harris
Harvey
Heap
Henderson
Holtmann
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jacques
Jardine
Jepson
Jewett
Kaplan
Keeper
Kilgour
Kindy
Ladouceur
Langdon
Lapierre
Layton
Lesick
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Manly
Mantha
Marchi
Marin
McCain
McCrossan
McCuish
McDougall
(St. Paul's)
McKenzie
McLaughlin
McMillan
Mitchell
Mitges
Moore
Murta
Nicholson
(Niagara Falls)
Nystrom
O'Neil
Oostrom
Orlikow
Ouellet
Paproski
Penner
Pépin
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Porter
Price
Ravis
Redway
Reimer
Ricard
Riis
Robinson
Roman
Rossi
St. Germain
St-Julien
Schellenberg
(Nanaimo—Alberni)
Scott
(Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott
(Hamilton—Wentworth)
Scowen
Shields
Skelly
Stackhouse
Stevens
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Tremblay
(Lotbinière)
Turner
(Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Warner
Weiner
Wenman
White
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)
Witer—147

• (1420)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Bertrand: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I was in the House and that I abstained from voting on any of the motions, to be consistent with the opinions I expressed in my speech yesterday.

[*English*]

Mr. Pennock: Mr. Speaker, I erred in my vote on Motion No. 13, paying more attention to the paragraph than to what the deletions would have done.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, for two days Parliament has been wasting its time. We haven't accomplished anything with this charade!

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: I know that Hon. Members would want to join the Speaker in refreshments in Room 16 and also to thank all of the members of the House of Commons staff who have put in a great deal of hard work, and to wish them well.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: It being 2.30 o'clock p.m., pursuant to order made Tuesday, July 26, 1988, this House stands adjourned until Wednesday, August 10, 1988, at 2 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 3(1)

At 2.30 p.m., the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, August 10, 1988

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

HERBICIDES

2,4-D—SUGGESTED BAN FOR NON-ESSENTIAL USES

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, statistics show a steady increase in the occurrence of a form of lymphatic cancer linked to the common weed killer 2,4-D. The frequency of this type of cancer and the number of deaths it causes have doubled, claiming 1,500 lives in 1986, at a time when most other types of cancer have been declining.

About 5,000 tonnes of 2,4-D are sprayed annually on seven million hectares of land including crops, parks, golf courses, lawns, in forests, and under power transmission lines.

We urge the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise), as a first step, to ban all non-essential uses such as municipal and residential spraying, and instruct all federal agencies to stop using 2,4-D immediately. Then, the use should be reduced to a minimum in agriculture and forestry.

At the same time the Government must intensify research on alternatives to 2,4-D instead of cutting research and corners at the expense of public health.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE LATE FÉLIX LECLERC

Mr. Marcel Tremblay (Québec-Est): Mr. Speaker, for the past two days, Quebecers and other Canadians have mourned the loss of our great national poet which filled us with a sense of profound sadness and sorrow. This "Grand Canadien", as the French called him, was the best ambassador we ever had, who not only made his people known but also gained recognition for them as a people.

Mr. Speaker, this man, who was integrity personified, who was both very forthright and extremely sensitive, has left us a treasure that will be a lasting tribute to his memory.

Like Félix Leclerc, let us be proud and stand up for our ideals. Thank you, Félix Leclerc, "le Canadien", we will never forget you!

* * *

• (1405)

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CEASE-FIRE IN IRAN-IRAQ WAR—CANADIAN PEACEKEEPING ROLE

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, my Party has always been a strong advocate of the United Nations and its peacekeeping role. That is why I am very happy that Canada is taking part in the peacekeeping force that is on its way to the Persian Gulf. I would like to offer my Party's official support for this action.

We can only enhance Canada's international reputation as a peaceful nation by helping to supervise the cease-fire between Iran and Iraq. We all hope that this will also contribute to the final resolution of this conflict. It might even show other troubled nations that there is a way to resolve their differences peacefully; and it will surely strengthen the role of the United Nations in resolving international disputes.

I wish our troops well. May they have a safe trip and, more important, a speedy return. Of course that depends on Iran and Iraq. They must show the world that they are willing to resolve their differences peacefully. A cease-fire is better than war, but it is not enough. The world needs a lasting peace in this troubled region.

* * *

DISASTERS

1987 EDMONTON TORNADO—COMMEMORATIVE PLAQUE

Hon. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton North): Mr. Speaker, on July 31 of this year I had the privilege and honour to represent the people of Canada in Edmonton North at a ceremony which paid tribute to those who were lost in the tornado of July 31, 1987.

On their behalf, Sir, they wish me to convey through you their sincere thanks to all Canadians who so generously helped

them in their time of need. On their behalf I am presenting you this plaque I hold in order that you can put it in the Hall of Honour.

* * *

PORTS

PORT OF CHURCHILL—NON-SHIPMENT OF GRAIN

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of the House the very serious circumstances facing the Port of Churchill. That port is an essential part of the grain delivery system for western Canada. At this time of the year it has yet to receive any allocation of any grain shipments whatsoever. In other words, the port is completely dead still and not in operation.

That runs totally contrary to an agreement signed in 1984 with the provincial Government of Manitoba when the Wheat Board offered to make best efforts to ensure that grain shipments would go through the Port of Churchill. What we are experiencing now is not only the loss of jobs in Churchill itself, but the loss of a very vital and essential ingredient in the economic development of western Canada.

I call upon the Government to ensure that there are grain shipments through the Port of Churchill, and that it live up to the commitments made by the previous Government in 1984.

* * *

SHIPBUILDING

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF MINESWEEPERS

Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines): Mr. Speaker, last month the Government announced plans to acquire badly needed minesweepers. In doing so it stated that it hoped to give smaller shipyards with a proven expertise a chance to develop Canadian shipbuilding.

A national consortium of smaller shipyards already exists and is geared up to do the type of work ordered. There are six different yards in four provinces, headed by Canadian Shipbuilders and Engineering Company of St. Catharines. A proposal for design and ship construction has already been made.

It has been stated by people in high places that an unemployed shipbuilder anywhere is still unemployed.

These yards are capable and now available. The Government will be able to close that disgraceful gap in our coastal defence earlier and more economically by negotiating with the CSE consortium without delay.

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

WESTERN CANADA PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, according to the most recent government statistics, the four western provinces, which make up 30 per cent of the Canadian population, received only 11 per cent of national contracts handed out by the Department of Supply and Services in Ottawa.

My home province of British Columbia, with 11.4 per cent of the population, received only 3.6 per cent of the contracts from this administration. Incredibly, the Conservative Government has given the West an even smaller share of these contracts than the previous Trudeau Liberals—and you know what the West thought of them, Mr. Speaker! Ontario and Quebec received between them 77 per cent of federal procurement.

It is an attitude. The Government sees the Province of British Columbia mainly as a source of natural resources. The Government does not understand that British Columbia needs funds for research and development. We are not asking for any more than our fair share, but we want our fair share of contracts for our printers, computer programmers, advertising agencies, consulting firms, and research and development.

There is going to be an election. The Conservative MPs from British Columbia will have to answer to the people of the West on why they have let the West down.

* * *

• (1410)

IMMIGRATION

BOGUS REFUGEE STATUS CLAIMANTS

Mr. John Oostrom (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, the total number of potential refugee claimants reached an all-time high of 56,237 as of July 22, 1988, thanks to the Liberal controlled other place playing cheap political games. This figure is expected to increase dramatically even with the passage of Bills C-55 and C-84, since their provisions to prevent abuse of our immigration system will not be in effect until January 1, 1989. In the meantime, unscrupulous individuals and so-called consultants will have another four and a half months to create further chaos in Canada.

The Government must create a mechanism to prevent this possible onslaught of bogus claimants until the new regulations take effect. The Canadian people will not forget how the Liberal controlled Senate played politics with the lives of human beings.

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

QUEBEC—ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS FOR OUTLYING REGIONS

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, on June 9 the Minister of Regional Economic Development and his Quebec counterpart announced a federal-provincial agreement worth $970 million that would benefit certain outlying areas and Quebec as a whole.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, since then the Canadian Government has been dragging its feet, and none of the regions where announcements were made that several million dollars were forthcoming have been able to benefit from any concrete programs. I personally checked this with all the department's regional offices in Quebec. None of the regions have any programs whatsoever, and no forms are available. Mr. Speaker, this means that at this very moment, developers in Quebec cannot apply to the federal Government for funding.

Again, the Minister is dragging his feet, and Quebec's developers are suffering the consequences. Mr. Speaker, I hope all this was not just a lot of electioneering, that it was not just a smoke screen, and that economic development will take place as promised and that is why it is important to get this program on track as soon as possible.

* * *

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

NIAGARA PENINSULA UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

Mr. Allan Pietz (Welland): Mr. Speaker, in my area the Government's job strategy is working and its success is reflected in the latest unemployment figures for St. Catharines, Niagara. In the Niagara Peninsula we are experiencing the lowest rate of unemployment in 22 years. For the month of July unemployment was at 3.7 per cent, a figure that we have not seen since the 1960s. We are talking jobs, jobs, jobs.

In another few weeks 132 students will complete their summer jobs under Challenge '88 and return to school. Over the past four years hundreds of students have been able to put what they have learned at school into practice. At the same time, they have increased their chances for jobs after graduation.

The success of Challenge '88 and other federal job-creation strategies is matched by the positive response of private industry to the improved economic climate in the past four years. The record low unemployment figure in Niagara is proof that the Government has delivered on its promises. Canadians are working because this Government's initiatives are working.

S. O. 21

SPORTS

"THE GREAT ONE" GOES SOUTH

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, yesterday 99 per cent of Canadian hockey fans across Canada were disappointed to hear that our famous No. 99 will be lost to the Los Angeles Kings and no longer will be playing for the Edmonton Oilers. For all Canadians, especially the youth of Canada, Wayne Gretzky was a model sportsman and a model athlete.

An Hon. Member: He still is. What do you mean was?

Mr. Riis: He was a very special symbol for all Canadians, being not only an outstanding athlete in terms of expertise but also in terms of talent, and he always played fairly and showed great sportsmanship. I simply want to say that we are sad to see him leave Canada and go to Los Angeles. Los Angeles' gain in this case will not only be the Edmonton Oilers' loss but Edmonton's loss and all of Canada's loss.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—POSITION OF CANADIAN FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture has written an urgent letter to all Members of Parliament. The Federation is demanding a meeting with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) because of its concern about the Prime Minister's trade deal with the United States. Canadian agriculture will be compromised by this deal.

• (1415)

The Federation is concerned that the deal will have a negative impact on marketing boards and our supply management system, on the Canadian Wheat Board's marketing system, on the standards of quality of Canadian agricultural products, and on the sacrifice of the horticultural industry. It is also concerned that our existing marketing system will not be protected because there is no action to put poultry or broiler hatching eggs under import controls; because of failures to consult with industry on the administration of the import control system, and because of the failure of the Government to make a strong public commitment to the Canadian Wheat Board.

The Canadian Federation of Agriculture said that it cannot endorse an agreement which would undermine the Canadian farmers' ability to maintain and implement the necessary structures and programs to assist Canadian agriculture. That is exactly what the Prime Minister's free trade deal does, it undermines Canadian agriculture.

[*Translation*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

INAUGURATION OF MISTASSINI ADMINISTRATION OFFICE

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, on August 8, 1988, I attended the inauguration of the administrative office in Mistassini, north of Chibougamau. This is an impressive complex bringing together all the administrative services required by the people of Mistassini.

Chief Henry Mianscum cut the ribbon at the inauguration, accompanied by members of the band and in the presence of Great Chief Matthew Coon-Come and two children.

We then had the opportunity to attend a grand show in pure native tradition put on by the wise men and children of the reserve.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outstanding achievement of the James Bay Cree people and we cannot help admire the way they run their affairs.

* * *

[*English*]

THE FRANCHISE

COURT DECISIONS ON VOTING RIGHTS FOR PENITENTIARY INMATES

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, once again a lower court has decided that under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms penitentiary inmates have a right to vote in federal and provincial elections, in this case provincial, and once again Attorneys General, in this case the provincial Attorney General for Ontario—and recently the Attorney General for Canada—have decided not to appeal these decisions.

I want to express my objection to this interpretation of the Charter, and my hope that these decisions will be appealed by some courageous Attorney General somewhere in our country. To me the idea that inmates ought to be able to vote in federal and provincial elections is totally unacceptable. Losing the right to vote is a sanction, like loss of freedom, which ought to be acceptable in a democratic society as reasonably justified.

I regret very much this turn of events and urge Attorneys General to appeal these lower court decisions.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—*GLOBE AND MAIL* EDITORIAL

Mr. William C. Winegard (Guelph): Mr. Speaker, during the last several weeks we have heard a lot of rhetoric about how the Opposition would rip up the free trade agreement. The Opposition would be well advised to read today's *Globe and Mail*, and I quote:

> It is whistling Dixie north of Windsor to suggest that Canada could tear up this agreement now and make another one with the United States soon. No U.S. administration is going to start over to seek essentially the same ends after such a rebuff. Let us not parade our naivety so conspicuously, or offer comforting assurances so disingeniously.
>
> No one should pretend that rejecting this free trade agreement would not damage Canada's economic prospects and lead to higher unemployment than would otherwise occur. No one should pretend that rejecting this deal would not expose the Auto Pact to early renegotiation in much tougher circumstances.

Let the Opposition deal with reality and let us get on with what is good for Canada, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—REQUEST FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in his very first speech to this House of Commons, in the same speech where he mentioned social programs as being a sacred trust, the Prime Minister said that the Canadian Government, and I quote his words, "must honour that fundamental British tradition in this country which calls for an election within four years so that the people can judge".

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An Hon. Member: What about the Senate?

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Those were the Prime Minister's words. That same day the Prime Minister moved a motion of non-confidence saying that the House of Commons, and I use the words of the motion "requires that an election be called in accordance with the Canadian custom, practice and tradition of holding a general election at least every four years".

Mr. Darling: Wait for the four years.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. Does the Prime Minister still believe that? If he does, why hasn't he called an election to be held on or before September 4, 1988, so that the people can decide and pronounce on the trade deal with the United States?

• (1420)

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman is a lawyer and he has some expertise in constitutional law, and I think he knows—

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Some.

Mr. Mazankowski: Some. I think he knows that the requirements are that elections be held within a five-year mandate. Every Government is elected for a five-year mandate, and any time after the fourth year expires generally we start thinking about an election. When the fourth year comes upon us, maybe we will start thinking about calling an election.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I suspect that four years or so ago the Deputy Prime Minister and Mr. Erik Nielsen drafted that particular motion, and I would have thought he would have held to it today, conceding that the people do have a right to decide.

[*Translation*]

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—
GOVERNMENT POSITION

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister and his Cabinet colleagues told us that no trade agreement with the United States would be signed if the American omnibus trade bill applied to Canada. Furthermore, all the Conservative Members of the House Committee said that it should be abandoned if the American omnibus bill applied to Canada.

The Deputy Prime Minister knows very well that last week, the U.S. Congress officially ratified the omnibus bill. It is ready for the President's signature and this bill applies to Canada.

Can the Deputy Prime Minister explain why the Government persists in going ahead with the Bill to implement the trade agreement with the United States, now that the American omnibus bill applies directly to Canada?

[*English*]

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to the right hon. gentleman. As he knows, the omnibus trade Bill that was looked at by the Standing Committee of the House of Commons has been drastically changed. It has been watered down rather dramatically. Most of the concerns of Canadians have been taken out of it. Others have been watered down rather dramatically. There is nothing in the U.S. omnibus free trade Bill that we can see at this time that is in contravention of the free trade agreement, so we are satisfied that the free trade agreement should go ahead for the betterment of Canada and all its people.

ACCESS TO AMERICAN MARKET

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Parliamentary Secretary to read the new, revised, and completed version of the American omnibus trade Bill. He will find that not only does it apply to Canada, despite the unanimous wishes of every member of the trade committee of the House of Commons, it adds a whole new set of unilateral trade remedies available against Canada at the discretion of the President and the Congress of the United States.

In 1983 the Prime Minister of Canada, in a campaign for the leadership of his Party, said he was against free trade. In 1984 the Prime Minister of Canada did not say a word about free trade during a general election. In 1985 the Prime Minister of Canada began bilateral negotiations with the President of the United States on free trade. In 1986 the Prime Minister of Canada said he would not accept a deal unless there was guaranteed access to the American market. In 1987 the Prime Minister of Canada said that U.S. protectionist trade laws should not apply to Canada.

It is now 1988. We have no guaranteed access to the American market under the trade deal, and now new American protectionist trade laws apply to Canada. I ask the Deputy Prime Minister of Canada if it is not time to let the people decide.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it is rather amusing that the right hon. gentleman would ignore the advice of a $23 million Royal Commission headed by a former colleague of his which came out very strongly in favour of a bilateral trade agreement with the United States of America.

The Royal Commission report said: "The Canadian nation is not a weak and fragile plant doomed to disappearing merely because we trade more freely and securely with our American neighbour. Free trade will reduce regional divisions and enhance Canadian confidence. Canadian nationalism and our collective identity as a people are deeply rooted in more than a century of our evolutionary common existence". I think those were words well spoken.

• (1425)

I find it rather strange that the right hon. gentleman, who sometimes plays a little footloose and fancy free with the truth—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: —even as late as October 26, 1987, in this House said, and I quote from page 10359 of *Hansard*—

Ms. Copps: What page?

Mr. Mazankowski: It is 10359:

> I happen to believe that Canadians can compete with anyone, including the Americans. I believe we can compete without sacrificing our sovereignty and political independence.
>
> I have faith in this country. I have faith in Canadians and I have faith that we are mature enough, talented enough, confident enough and tough enough to make our own choices in our own way—

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: That is exactly what this trade deal does.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for York Centre.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what that statement that the Deputy Prime Minister just read has to do with the pathetic agreement which has been signed between Canada and the U.S. on trade.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

APARTHEID

SOUTH AFRICA—ECONOMIC AND DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister and concerns the regrettable continuing economic and diplomatic relations between Canada and South Africa. I want to remind the Minister that on October 23, 1985, speaking at the UN General Assembly the Prime Minister said the following:

> My Government has said to Canadians that if there are not fundamental changes in South Africa we are prepared to invoke total sanctions against that country and its repressive regime.
>
> If there is no progress in the dismantling of apartheid, our relations with South Africa may have to be severed absolutely.

The situation in South Africa with respect to the black majority has deteriorated. Has the Government taken the Ronald Reagan approach of constructive engagement, or the Margaret Thatcher approach of worrying about the well-being of the South African economy? In other words, when will the Prime Minister be prepared to do what he said he would do in front of the UN in 1985, cut off economic relations and terminate diplomatic relations with South Africa?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, we have not followed the American example or the British example.

Mr. Shields: Or the Liberal example of doing nothing.

Mr. Mazankowski: We have followed a Canadian approach which is thoughtful, and I think the initiatives taken by this Government under the leadership of the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and the very important meeting that took place in Toronto a few days ago, are a clear indication of the work—

Mr. Kaplan: A farce.

Mr. Mazankowski: The Hon. Member says it was a farce. The participants do not share that view. It is clear progress is being made.

Miss MacDonald: The Liberals did nothing.

Mr. Mazankowski: As has been said on previous occasions by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, if you cut off all ties, the opportunity to influence any change in South Africa would be diminished. The Hon. Member may want to engage in tactics, which may not be productive, as a headline seeking game, but the proof is in the pudding. Progress is being made. It is a co-operative—

Some Hon. Members: Where?

• (1430)

Mr. Mazankowski: Progress can only be made through the co-operative efforts of more than Canada alone. It requires the co-operation and inspiration of everyone, and that is the kind of leadership we are providing.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): There is no progress in South Africa. It becomes more of a Fascist state every day, and the Government knows that. Last year, before the Standing Committee on Human Rights, the Secretary of State for External Affairs said he had full authority from Cabinet for comprehensive, economic and diplomatic sanctions against South Africa. Does he still have it? And what is he waiting for to use them?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I can only advise the House that if there are any new initiatives that will be recommended by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, they will be brought forth to Cabinet for consideration, and I am sure they will be announced in the usual manner.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Oshawa.

Mr. Shields: Ladies and gentlemen, Shirley Carr! Give him a hand.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: I see, Mr. Speaker, the days of recess have not diminished the lofty intellectual witticisms of the governing Party.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—WATER RESOURCES

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): My question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister in the absence of the Prime Minister. The Deputy Prime Minister will know that for many weeks the Minister responsible for the trade deal with the

United States has denied there was anything to the concerns Canadians had expressed about the possibility of water being included in the agreement.

Some Hon. Members: Come on!

Mr. Broadbent: After many weeks of pressure coming from this side of the House and from the people of Canada, the Government reluctantly agreed to change the wording of the Canadian Bill during the committee stage. The Deputy Prime Minister will know that many Canadian experts—as recently as yesterday another group of them—have said this approach is totally inadequate to protect our water resources.

Since the Minister for International Trade has said that water is not included, and since he has quoted Trade Representative Yeutter of the United States publicly as saying it is not included, will the Government of Canada—since it has ruled out a change to the agreement itself—at least go to the Americans this week and seek agreement to get letters attached as appendices to the agreement making clear in the view of both Governments that water is not included, and so give legal force to our deeply expressed concern to keep water out of the agreement?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the position that has been stated by the Minister for International Trade is indeed the position of the Government. It is still the position of the Government.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): God help us!

Mr. Mazankowski: We believe very much that this is another example of hysteria and falsehoods which have been perpetrated. But in order to clarify the issue—and that is merely what has been done in this particular area—and for the benefit of the Leader of the New Democratic Party who may not be aware the amendment is simply for clarification, it reads as follows:

> For greater certainty, nothing in this Act or the agreement, except Article 401 of the agreement, applies to water. In this section water means natural surface and ground water in liquid, gaseous or solid state but does not include water packaged as a beverage or in tanks.

This has consistently been the position of the Government. It does not provide for any wide-scale diversion of water.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): It's only an amendment to this Bill.

Mr. Mazankowski: It does provide for the export of water in bottles as a beverage. Why would the Hon. Member be opposed to that?

REQUEST FOR UNITED STATES COMMITMENT IN WRITING

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I want to turn the argument of the Deputy Prime Minister around. If the Deputy Prime Minister has said that water is not included, and if Mr. Yeutter in the United States has said water is not included, and since experts who know something, if I can put it this way, in greater detail than either the Deputy Prime Minister or myself about the law involved—

Mr. Mazankowski: Why beat a dead horse, then?

Mr. Broadbent: —and since they have said the amendment is insufficient, why does the Government refuse to go to the United States and ask them to put in writing what they verbally expressed? Why does the Government not do that?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Well, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to tell the Leader of the New Democratic Party that the United States will be putting that in writing on December 15 when we exchange letters—

Mr. Broadbent: In the agreement?

Mr. McDermid: —and we have put in our Bill implementing the free trade agreement that water is not included. They have to approve in a letter to Canada saying: " We have implemented the free trade agreement". In there it says that water is not part of it. When we exchange letters, they will agree with our implementation and we say it is not part of it. So letters will be exchanged on December 15. Water is out of the agreement.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary knows that the answer he has just given is not at all equivalent to the letters I am requesting, which should be attached—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: He knows that, if his howling back-benchers do not. He knows that what he has just talked about is entirely different from letters of clear understanding, of common interpretation, coming from our Government and the executive branch of the U.S. Government to be attached to the agreement. They are very different processes, indeed.

REQUEST FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): I want to ask the Parliamentary Secretary or, more correctly, the Deputy Prime Minister, since the Government has said no to our proposal to protect regional development programs, and has said no to proposals to protect Canadian culture, and has said no to protecting Canadian water, and since the people of Canada have said clearly that they are saying yes to an election before we proceed, will the Government do the right thing and have an election now on this deal?

Some Hon. Members: Go, go, go!

Mr. Riis: Don't be afraid of the people, Don.

Mr. McDermid: We should just walk away from the negotiations; that's Broadbent's solution.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I hate to disappoint the Leader of the New Democratic Party—

Mr. Broadbent: You do it every day. It's okay.

Mr. Mazankowski: I hate to disappoint him. I know he would love to see inherent in this legislation something to the effect that there would be a large scale diversion of water. Well, there just isn't, Mr. Speaker, and the Hon. Member should start accepting somebody's word.

He says we have said no to regional development. There could not be another instrument or device that would be more helpful to overcoming regional economic disparities than the free trade agreement which has been negotiated with the United States.

Mr. Broadbent: Every economist says that's hogwash, and you know it.

Mr. Mazankowski: Let the Leader of the New Democratic Party go out West to western Canada and speak to the people—

Mr. Broadbent: I will. We will be there this week, and in Edmonton, fellow, right in Edmonton.

Mr. Mazankowski: —rather than to his own partisan friends.

Mr. Broadbent: We'll see you in Edmonton!

Mr. Riis: Call an election and we will go to the people!

Mr. Mazankowski: I say to the Leader of the New Democratic Party through you, Mr. Speaker, to go out to Atlantic Canada and speak to the people—

Mr. Broadbent: I did last week.

Mr. Mazankowski: —and not to his own partisan supporters, and he will find the real truth, because this is the most important initiative ever undertaken to overcome regional economic disparities.

Mr. Broadbent: Go to the people now.

EXCHANGE OF LETTERS WITH UNITED STATES

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. Even though he is not wearing Gucci shoes, he is certainly dancing around on this issue, particularly when it comes to the question of water.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Axworthy: We would like a clarification of the statement that was just made by the Parliamentary Secretary when he said we will be getting a confirmed agreement in letter form from the United States on December 15. Specifically, will we be requesting from the United States Government a confirmation in a letter that the agreement, not the legislation, but the agreement itself, Articles 105, 408 and the tariff schedule, will not apply to the transfer of water of any kind between Canada and the United States? Can we get the commitment that you will ask for that letter, and we will send a letter in return?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, if we followed that principle, the letter would be so long that the Hon. Member would not have time to read it.

Ms. Copps: That's ridiculous!

Mr. McDermid: I can tell the Hon. Member that the exchange of letters is very clear. It says that Canada, the letter from the United States to Canada, has implemented the free trade agreement. Implementing the free trade agreement is Bill C-130, an Act to implement the free trade agreement. In that Act it says that large-scale water exports to the United States are not part of the agreement. They never were. They never were. And the Americans have said that many, many times as well. When that exchange of letters takes place, it will confirm that we have implemented the free trade agreement, and in implementing it Bill C-130 says water is not part of it. That is all that is required. Can the Hon. Member not understand that?

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary is now backing off from his earlier statement.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Miss MacDonald: You didn't understand it.

Mr. Dick: He doesn't want to.

Mr. Axworthy: Go back to your submarine, fellow.

The Parliamentary Secretary will know that in testimony before the committee, the ambassador for trade, Mr. Ritchie, clearly said that the trade agreement will give the right to the United States to challenge Canadian water resources in front of the trade commission. He said that is part of the agreement and that agreement will take precedence. The legislation will not affect that right.

• (1440)

I return to my earlier question. Why is the Government afraid to ask the United States for explicit exemption from water by way of an exchange of letters or an amendment to the agreement, or are we simply getting from the Government, as we have had for the last two and a half years, a total and complete smokescreen about the real impact of the trade agreement upon Canadians?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member sure talks tough when he is in front of the TV cameras, but I noticed that he did not show up for the final vote in the committee on Bill C-130. He just disappeared—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Axworthy: I was there longer than you were, McDermid. I sat longer than you did.

An Hon. Member: Good old Tory sleaze.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FREE TRADE

POSSIBILITY OF TRADE WAR BETWEEN CANADA AND UNITED STATES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

American politicians yesterday spoke of a trade war if Canadians reject the free trade agreement. Is the Minister prepared to accept such threats, or will he protest? Because this is a decision for us Canadians to make without threats.

[*English*]

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, first, the statement that was made by Congressman John LaFalce was not a threat. It was not meant to be a threat in any way that I could see. There is probably no greater friend to Canada in the Congress than Congressman John LaFalce. That should be understood.

Second, he has supported free trade negotiations from the beginning because he saw and understood the protectionist problems in the United States and felt that this agreement was necessary. He knows those concerns are still there. He knows those problems still exist. He thinks the free trade agreement goes a very long way to solving a lot of the problems we have had between our two countries. That is why he is supporting it.

He is concerned that if this free trade agreement is not passed, these problems will come again to haunt us and they will be very difficult to solve. That is what he was talking about. It was not meant as a threat in any way, and the Hon. Member knows that full well.

REQUEST FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I believe that massive vote in the United States was an endorsation of just how well their negotiators had done against us.

My supplementary question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. Will he tell the Americans that this is Canada's decision to make? Will the Government finally call the election that it should have called long ago, to take this legislation to the people, instead of forgetting that it does not have a mandate to take this country into the United States?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows full well that we just spent almost four weeks in committee hearing Canadians in all walks of life. I might say that his union friends walked out of the hearings and would not give testimony because they were afraid of the tough questions they would get. Shirley Carr, Bob White and the rest of them just watched how their times were set, and walked out and would not be heard—these so-called ordinary Canadians.

As far as an election is concerned, the Hon. Member will have his opportunity to debate this on the hustings. I can tell you that this side of the House is really looking forward to it. Be ready.

EFFECT OF AGREEMENT ON NIAGARA PENINSULA INDUSTRIES

Mr. Allan Pietz (Welland): Mr. Speaker, given that grapes and tender fruit are grown on 8 per cent of the land area of regional Niagara, and that major industries in the automotive, paper, chemical, steel, stainless steel, rubber, carbon, and farm machinery production sectors are major employers in the cities of Welland, St. Catharines, and Thorold, with a high dependency on the United States market for the sale of their products, what will be the effect on the workers in these industries if the free trade deal is not passed?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is absolutely right that there are a number of industries in the Niagara Peninsula that will have a very positive effect from the trade agreement and could have a negative effect if it does not go through.

Grant Wilson, past chairman of the Automotive Parts Manufacturers Association, told the committee studying Bill C-130 that if we had not signed the free trade agreement the Auto Pact was in deep trouble and auto parts manufacturers were in trouble as well.

The Hon. Member knows full well that in his riding and many other ridings in the Niagara Peninsula it could be disastrous if the free trade agreement does not go through. He did not mention the area of ship repair. There is a 50 per cent tariff on ship repairs now, and Port Weller can look forward to that tariff being removed and having its fair share of work at Port Weller.

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

REQUEST FOR MORE AID FOR QUEBEC PROMOTERS

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology. The Minister is aware that Quebec has been getting the short end of the stick as far as regional economic development is concerned. Calls were made today to his Department's regional offices, and it seems that as far as regional economic expansion is concerned, no programs are available for Quebec developers. The agreement signed on June 9 has not taken effect, the IRDP expired on June 30, and as far as federal regional industrial expansion programs are concerned, there is nothing on the horizon. I therefore want to ask the Minister how he can be responsible for his Department without having anything available for Quebec entrepreneurs at this point?

Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, unlike the previous Government to which the Hon. Member belonged, the present Government has done more for regional development in Quebec in the past few years than ever before. Recently, we announced a program worth nearly one billion dollars, in fact more than that, to support regional development, and not a program managed by Ottawa but by the regions themselves.

Mr. Speaker, many requests are still coming in under existing programs and being analyzed for suitability under the new programs, and the final documentation is already at the printers. The money is there. Regional development will take place in the regions or outlying areas—something you never did! For years, you left the regions to fend for themselves.

REQUEST THAT QUÉBEC PROMOTERS RECEIVE EQUALITY OF TREATMENT

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, the Minister doesn't know what he is talking about. I wish he would take the time to call his Department's regional offices. They will tell him there are no programs available and no forms, because the Minister is not making decisions as usual. Consequently, I would like to ask the Minister whether Quebec developers will be treated the same way as developers in the rest of this country. Could the Minister give me the assurance that the program he referred to will be available as soon as possible, and not in a month of Sundays? As you know, construction has to be done before winter starts. Will the Minister wake up and start running his Department the way it should be run?

Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, contracts are being awarded every single day of the week. We are getting applications every single day of the week. New programs are announced as soon as the forms are available. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that as far as regional development is concerned, Quebec is much better off with this new program that it was with any of the programs set up by the previous government.

* * *

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt—Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question also concerns the trade deal. United States government spokespeople and U.S. grain trade officials, as well as some Canadians, have been trying for years to undermine the effectiveness of our Canadian Wheat Board. Will the appropriate Minister tell the House why the Government removed the Wheat Board's power over licensing of imports? Was it at the insistence of the United States, or was it done simply because the Conservatives want to return to the grain exchange system of selling?

Hon. Charles Mayer (Minister of State (Grains and Oilseeds)): Mr. Speaker, quite frankly the Hon. Member does not know anything of what he speaks. He is a former member of the Advisory Board to the Canadian Wheat Board and should know better than that.

First, nothing in the free trade agreement diminishes the power of the Canadian Wheat Board to sell. In fact, it is the opposite. Both the Canadian Wheat Board lawyers and Canadian Grain Commission lawyers were involved in the drafting process to see that the proper legal authority was there for them to maintain their selling system. The over-all agreement keeps intact our varietal distinction system that lets the Canadian Grain Commission have such a good reputation.

The end use certificates and those kinds of arrangements that are made are actually under the umbrella of the Canadian Wheat Board Act that will be administered by the Canadian Grain Commission to see that our system stays intact.

• (1450)

The Hon. Member should know that and stop raising matters which are absolutely phoney and which have nothing at all to do with the free trade agreement.

PUBLICATION OF WHEAT SALE PRICES

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt—Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, perhaps some other time the Minister could tell us why these powers were given to the Department which has imports and exports under its jurisdiction rather than to the Canadian Wheat Board.

Considering the immense pressure from the U.S. Government and U.S. grain interests which are putting pressure on the Canadian Government to have Canada comply with their

request to make wheat board sales prices on each shipment of grain available in public—something which the U.S. grain trade does not have to do, yet we have traders in the U.S. and U.S. government officials insisting that this is a requirement for their purposes—will the Minister tell us how Canada is responding to the U.S. on this request since we have not heard a public statement to this date?

Hon. Charles Mayer (Minister of State (Grains and Oilseeds)): Mr. Speaker, again, what the Hon. Member is referring to is a statement of administrative action by the U.S. Government which talks about how it sees this agreement being implemented. Nothing in either the free trade agreement or the implementing legislation has anything to do but enhance the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board and see it does a good job. How we sell our grain is entirely a Canadian affair, and it remains as such under the free trade agreement.

The Canadian Wheat Board, which I assume the Hon. Member supports, is one of the best selling agencies that we have as a country to sell our grain. What is wrong with giving the Canadian Wheat Board better rules and better certainty of access so it can do a better job of selling on our behalf? That is exactly what the free trade agreement does. It gives the Canadian Wheat Board a better chance to sell on a fair and a predictable basis in the United States, which is good for Canadian farmers, good for the Hon. Member who is a farmer, and good for his neighbours.

* * *

[*Translation*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

QUALIFYING ELIGIBILITY PERIOD FOR BENEFITS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Fernand Robichaud (Westmorland—Kent): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister and concerns the changes to the qualifying period for unemployment insurance in southern New Brunswick. The Minister is certainly aware of the problem. The New Brunswick Labour Minister visited Ottawa to talk about it with the Minister of Employment and Immigration and I have already asked several questions on this subject.

Can the Minister tell the House what has been done to correct the situation and solve this problem? Will the Government distinguish rural areas from urban areas?

[*English*]

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I must apologize to the Hon. Member. I do not have an answer to that question at the present time. I will take it up with the Minister and see that either she or I get back to him as soon as possible.

[*Translation*]

SITUATION IN NEW BRUNSWICK—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Fernand Robichaud (Westmorland—Kent): I wish to ask the Deputy Prime Minister a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

I have on hand a document from the Privy Council Office dated July 21, 1988 and published in the *Canada Gazette*. The Government allowed a distinction to be made between the rural area of Gatineau and the urban area of Hull. According to the document, the reason for this is the much higher unemployment rate in the rural area than in the urban one. But, Mr. Speaker, it is exactly the same problem in southern New Brunswick. I therefore ask the Deputy Prime Minister whether New Brunswickers can expect to receive the same treatment from this Government and whether changes will be made and apply to the people of New Brunswick right away.

[*English*]

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I most certainly will take the Hon. Member's question and representation as notice and see that he is responded to very shortly.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

LANGUAGE TEACHERS' STRIKE—RESOLUTION ACHIEVED THROUGH MEDIATION

Mr. Barry Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the President of the Treasury Board. During the last many months federal language teachers have been on rotating strikes, have been through a sit-in, have had emotional demonstrations on Parliament Hill, and have strongly lobbied the Government to resolve their contract disputes. Can the Minister confirm that a resolution has been reached through the mediation of the Chairman of the Public Service Staff Relations Board?

Hon. Pat Carney (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to confirm that we have reached terms of settlement with the education group of the Public Service Alliance of Canada, which of course includes the language teachers. I think at this time it would be appropriate to thank both negotiating teams, and Mr. Deans who, of course, serves as the Chairman of the Public Service Staff Relations Board. He negotiated for eight straight days to resolve this long-standing dispute.

Ms. Copps: He's a triple dipper, he should be staying up all night.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Ms. Carney: They have agreed to send the key issue of hours of work to binding arbitration. All other issues have been

settled. I hope that this will lead to an improved climate for labour-management negotiations in terms of the rest of the contracts.

I am sorry that members of the Opposition consider that this fine achievement is a laughing matter.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HEALTH

IMPORTATION AND SALE OF IRRADIATED PRODUCE FROM THAILAND—CIDA AID—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. CIDA has promised to help Thailand sell irradiated fruit and shrimp to Canada, although it is illegal in this country to import and sell such products. Why is Canada using its international aid program to sell nuclear technology and use the people of Thailand and Canada as guinea pigs?

Mr. Michel Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for External Relations): Mr. Speaker, I would like to set the record straight, because the Canadian Government certainly has no intention of opening our borders to shrimp or any other products, other than those presently admitted under Canada's irradiation standards. I may also remind the Hon. Member that Canada did not pressure Thailand so it could export its technology. In fact, it was Thailand that asked CIDA about our technology in this respect. Canada has been acting in accordance with the regulations that exist in this country, and we intend to maintain our regulations on irradiation.

[*English*]

IRRADIATED FOOD—EXPORT OF TECHNOLOGY

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is addressed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Does the Government not recognize that the Canadian people do not want their food irradiated and that they feel it is immoral to be exporting this technology to the developing world? Why does the Minister allow his Department, and why does the Government allow CIDA to become tools of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, rather than fulfilling their own mandates?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for External Relations): Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the Hon. Member does not seem to understand the process involved in irradiating food. I may remind him that the WHO and the FAO, to name only a few agencies, have said they were in favour of irradiated food because according to them it made the food safer to eat. The Canadian Government has very strict standards in this respect. We are following international standards, and we will continue to do so because some very reliable agencies have said no risk was involved.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

ALLEGATIONS OF CRUELTY ABOARD SUBMARINE

Mr. Howard Crosby (Halifax West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence or the Associate Minister of National Defence.

Many Canadians, especially those who support the Canadian Armed Forces, were shocked by revelations of cruelty and unjustified punishment inflicted on crewmen serving on a submarine, the HMCS *Onandaga*.

I know the Minister must share the concern so I ask this question. First, has the Ministry investigated the incidents involving Petty Officer Farler leading to his court martial? Second, will the Minister assure the public that the Minister and naval authorities will not tolerate cruel and unjustified actions in the Canadian Forces in any circumstances, thereby preserving the high standards of the Canadian military?

Hon. Paul Dick (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Hon. Member that I have been very concerned about the reports and the information which I received regarding this incident. I can say that the incident is still appealable at this time and thus there are certain restrictions on what a person can say.

• (1500)

I would like to assure the Hon. Member that it is the intention of the Canadian Forces, the Minister of National Defence, myself, and this Government to maintain the very high standards that Canada has had from the Canadian Armed Forces, standards that we have been extremely proud of over the years, standards that have taken us to being the leading country in peacekeeping operations around the world, with the high regard and respect that other people and countries have for the Canadian Forces. We are going to maintain those high standards.

* * *

HERBICIDES

2,4-D—REQUEST THAT MINISTER BAN USE ON FEDERAL LAND

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture, if I could have his attention for a moment.

Statistics just released by the Department of National Health and Welfare show a steady increase in the occurrence of a form of lymphatic cancer linked to the common weed-killer 2,4-D, and also show that the frequency of this type of cancer and the number of deaths it causes have doubled, claiming 1,500 lives in 1986, at a time when most other types of cancer have been declining.

Will the Minister of Agriculture, as a first step, ban the use on federal land, in municipalities, and around the home of the herbicide 2,4-D?

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I would have appreciated it very much if the Hon. Member had extended the courtesy of giving me notice of this particular question.

I wish the House and the Hon. Member to know that we are as interested in health and public safety as any Member of the House or any person across the country.

We have a process which we go through to approve pesticides and chemicals of this type. The Hon. Member should know that all the aspects of health and public safety are examined to their fullest.

I will take special interest in the Hon. Member's question, and I would be very happy to supply him with additional information as soon as possible.

REQUEST THAT USE BE PHASED OUT

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister realizes that any delay would be at the expense of public health. Therefore, I ask him specifically if he will show leadership and initiate an action plan to phase out the use of 2,4-D herbicide from the market-place.

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, again relying on memory, and sometimes memory does not always serve one accurately, I am of the opinion that, at the moment, we do have an ongoing monitoring plan for that specific chemical.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Beaches will have the last question.

* * *

HOUSING

ACQUISITION OF HOUSES BY YOUNG PERSONS

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State for Finance. As the Minister probably knows, a recent Gallup poll has indicated that nearly 50 per cent of Canadians do not believe that young people can buy a home any more, and nearly 60 per cent of those people who live in Ontario do not believe that young people can attain the dream of buying a home either.

Given the total absence of assistance from this Government to those young people, and the fact that the Government axed the only program that was available to assist young people to buy their first home, what plans does the Government have to replace that system it cancelled with some other type of program to assist young people to buy housing in Ontario, and in the rest of Canada?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to tell the Hon. Member that business investment is running at 20 per cent above the previous year. That is part of the answer to employing people and giving them income opportunities in order that they can afford a home.

The economy now is at its strongest phase in the last eight years. There is a program in place for the whole economy to moderate interest rates. All of this works to allow people the opportunity to earn income and thereby buy a home.

SITUATION IN TORONTO

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. As the Minister knows, in Toronto it now takes an average income of some $60,000 a year even to get into the housing market.

The question I asked the Minister was whether or not he would replace the program that the Government cancelled several years ago. Does the Minister really believe that Canadians want the Government to spend billions of dollars on nuclear submarines yet it cannot afford to extend some assistance to those young families to get into the housing market?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has a historical memory that is a bit weak. Those programs were put in place to compensate for a weak economy, and to fill a hole that seemed to be developing in a weak economy.

We now have a strong economy. We have strong incomes. We have strong employment. That is the answer to the housing crisis.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to 34 petitions numbered as follows: 332-4856 to 332-4859 inclusive, 332-4883, 332-4907, 332-4924 to 332-4926 inclusive, 332-4931 to 332-4933 inclusive, 332-5143 to 332-

5147 inclusive, 332-5158 to 332-5171 inclusive, 332-5225, 332-5242 and 332-5286.

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

* * *

ENERGY

TABLING OF ENERGY CONFLUENCE REPORT

Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, last week I published the report on energy confluence.

Today, as I promised, I wish to table bilingual copies of the report in the House.

* * *

[*English*]

POINT OF ORDER

ATTIRE OF HON. MEMBER

Mr. Fred King (Okanagan—Similkameen): Mr. Speaker, I represent the Okanagan, the prime apple producing area of Canada. I see the Member present from Annapolis Valley—Hants whose attire I envy but which does not meet the criteria of the dress code. I would like to point this out to the House and ask for a ruling.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member referred to is clearly not dressed according to the customs and traditions of the House and, until he is, he will not be recognized.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

BILL C-130—REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Prince Edward—Hastings): Mr. Speaker, since the advent of legislative committees I have reported many Bills to you; none, however, with as much pride as the one I present this afternoon.

Before I do so, I want to thank publicly the many people who worked so hard on the long hot summer days and hotter evenings. The clerk, Santosh Sirpaul, and researcher Bruce Carson were with me at the table throughout. Thomas Hall, Charles Robert, and literally dozens of others such as translators, recorders, and messengers provided the unseen and unheard but oh so necessary support to us; the many witnesses from the private sector who expressed their viewpoint, and from the public sector the small army headed by Ambassador Ritchie, all co-operated to convenience the committee's rapidly changing schedule; and lastly, my colleagues, the members of the committee who attended conscientiously and represented their constituencies both physical and ideological well and truly. I thank them all.

I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the report of the legislative committee on Bill C-130, an Act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States of America.

NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE—FOURTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fourth report of the Standing Committee on National Health and Welfare which deals with the study of food and drug labelling. It also gives recommendations on the proposed changes to Canadian drug labelling regulations under the Food and Drugs Act.

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

* * *

QUEBEC COURTS AMENDMENT ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Jake Epp (for the (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-145, an Act to amend various Acts to give effect to the reconstitution of the Quebec Provincial Court, Court of the Sessions of the Peace and Youth Court as the Court of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the Hon. Minister have leave to introduce the Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

• (1510)

SENIOR CITIZENS COMMISSION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-313, an Act respecting senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the Hon. Member have leave to introduce the Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 501*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Angus
Benjamin
Bertrand
Blackburn (Brant)
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Bourgault
Boyer
Brightwell
Broadbent
Browes
Cadieux
Caldwell
Cardiff
Champagne (Champlain)
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Corbett
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Daubney
de Cotret
de Jong
Desjardins
Dingwall
Edwards
Ellis
Epp (Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Foster
Fraleigh
Fretz
Fulton
Gagliano
Gagnon
Garneau
Gauthier
Greenaway
Grisé
Grondin
Guilbault (Drummond)
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamelin
Hardey
Harris
Heap
Hicks
Hopkins
Horner
Hovdebo
Isabelle
Jacques
Jelinek
Jepson
Kaplan
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Langdon
Layton
Leblanc
Lewis
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
Mailly
Malone
Manly
Marchi
Martin
Mayer
McKinnon
Merrithew
Mitchell
Nunziata
Oostrom
Orlikow
Pennock
Pépin
Peterson
Pietz
Plamondon
Porter
Riis
Robichaud
Rossi
St. Germain
St-Julien
Scowen
Skelly
Sparrow
Stackhouse
Stevens
Suluk
Tardif (Charlesbourg)
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Tupper
Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Van De Walle
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Winegard
Wise
Witer
Young—106

NAYS

Members

Domm
McCuish—2

• (1550)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, it is a question of principle for me. I do not think we should ever vote on first reading, therefore I was present but I did not vote.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, just to summarize the intent of this Bill, its purpose is to establish a senior citizens commission to study and identify the needs of senior citizens in Canada. The commission would also make recommendations to the Governor in Council with respect to the needs of senior citizens.

Mr. Riis moved that the Bill be read the first time and printed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 502*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Angus
Benjamin
Bertrand
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Browes
Caldwell
Copps
Corbett
Darling
Daubney
Desjardins
Dingwall
Epp (Provencher)
Fennell
Ferland
Fraleigh
Fulton
Garneau
Gauthier
Grisé
Guilbault (Drummond)
Halliday
Hamelin
Hardey
Harris
Heap
Hopkins
Horner
Hovdebo
Isabelle
Jacques
Kaplan
Keeper
King
Langdon
Layton
Leblanc
Lewis
Malone
Manly
Marchi
Mitchell

Nunziata	Plamondon	Tremblay
Oostrom	Porter	(Québec-Est)
Orlikow	Riis	Tupper
Pennock	Scowen	Vankoughnet
Pépin	Skelly	Winegard
Peterson	Sparrow	Witer
Pietz	Stackhouse	Young—63

NAYS

Members

McCuish
Stevens—2

● (1630)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Mailly: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I abstained because this is not a real vote. It is just a tactic to delay presentation of the day-care bill. To me this is shocking, and that is why I decided not to vote.

[*English*]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I will not make a speech because it is not according to the rules.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prud'homme: I have been saying for 24 years that it is a question of principle for me that we should not vote for permission to introduce a Bill. John Diefenbaker taught me that we should not vote for first reading, that we should allow people to discuss freely what they want.

Mr. Winegard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. I think my privileges as a Member of Parliament are being abused here this afternoon, as are the privileges of all Canadians. We are supposed to be debating child care—

Some Hon. Members: Order.

* * *

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-314, an Act to amend the National Housing Act (leases for low-rental housing projects).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Shall the Hon. Member have leave to introduce the Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

● (1640)

(*Division No. 503*)

YEAS

Members

Epp	Pietz	Blackburn
(Provencher)	Scowen	(Brant)
Lewis	Tupper	de Jong
Darling	Caldwell	Fulton
Bertrand	Desjardins	Mitchell
Gustafson	Ferland	Skelly
Halliday	Kaplan	Althouse
King	Hopkins	Keeper
Browes	Gauthier	Young
Fraleigh	Copps	Heap
Guilbault	Isabelle	Angus
(Drummond)	Dingwall	Harris—40
Hardey	Pépin	
Jacques	Riis	
Leblanc	Orlikow	
Oostrom		

NAYS

Members

nil/none

● (1710)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion carried.

Mrs. Mailly: Mr. Speaker, once more I abstained because I protest this waste of time of the House. We are trying to introduce the second reading of a Bill on child care. It is much more important than these tactics by the NDP.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, as you well know, CMHC is exempt from provincial rent review and, more often than not, the rent increases exceed provincial rent increase limits set by the various provinces. Therefore, two-year leases with no increase in this period are required to protect the low and middle income renters from being savaged by CMHC.

The purpose of this Bill is to afford protection to lessees living in low rental housing projects, whose rents are subject to the approval of CMHC. The amendment included in this Bill would require that leases be for a term of at least two years and the rents charged not be increased during that period.

The other point of this is to draw attention to the fact that the initiative that was going to be introduced today, the child care initiative, is woefully inadequate—

Mr. Lewis: Out of order.

Mr. Riis: As opposed to advancing the cause of child care—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order.

Mr. Riis moved that the Bill be read the first time and printed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

• (1720)

(Division No. 504)

YEAS

Members

Althouse	Desjardins	Guilbault (Drummond)
Angus	Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)	Gustafson
Blackburn (Brant)	Epp (Provencher)	Halliday
Blackburn (Jonquière)	Ferland	Harris
Caldwell	Foster	Heap
Champagne (Champlain)	Fraleigh	Hopkins
Clinch	Fulton	Jacques
Copps	Gray (Windsor West)	Kaplan
Darling		Keeper
de Jong		Kilgour
		King
		Leblanc
Lewis	Pietz	Waddell
Manly	Riis	Young—41
Mitchell	Tremblay (Québec-Est)	
Oostrom	Tupper	
Pépin		

NAYS

Members

nil/none

• (1750)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find that there is a disposition in the House, in view of the circumstances, to call it six o'clock.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, again I would like to repeat that I did not vote for the reason I—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Prud'homme: I said it is a question of principle. I have not approved, personally, in my 25 years, of voting for a Bill on first reading and I am not going to start today. Before you do call it six o'clock, I would like, with the permission of the House, to table a petition. I have to be absent tomorrow to be at a function with the two other Parties and I would like to table a very important petition. I am in the hands of the House.

Mrs. Mailly: Mr. Speaker, we have just wasted three hours of the time of the House on these spurious Bills moved by the NDP in order to delay debate on the child care program. I hope the citizens of Canada will realize what happened today.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Does the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) have unanimous consent to present his petition?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I thank the House very warmly for allowing me to table this today.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

REQUEST FOR INCLUSION OF A SECTOR TO YOUVILLE POSTAL BRANCH

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, 15,000 residents of the north-central part of Saint-Denis in the

Ahuntsic area now have to go to an auxiliary office to pick up their parcels and registered mail. A very high proportion of the population consists of elderly people, and that is why today, Mr. Speaker, these people defend their right to receive adequate postal services near the place where they live, and why they want their area to be reconnected to Youville postal station located at 300 Crémazie East in Montreal, where post office staff and letter carriers provide an excellent service. This petition was handed to me by Ms. Martine Blanc, municipal councillor of Octave Crémazie and by municipal councillor Michel Benoit.

[*English*]

REQUEST FOR DESIGNATION OF ROUGE RIVER VALLEY

Mrs. Pauline Browes (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of a number of constituents of Scarborough and residents of Toronto concerning the Rouge River Valley in Scarborough. The petitioners state that it is a unique and precious natural area and that protecting endangered wildlife in wilderness areas is in the national interest. They join with the Scarborough City Council, the Federal Minister of the Environment, the Save the Rouge Valley System and the Coalition of Scarborough Community Associations to have this area made a Canadian heritage land or provincial park.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being 6 p.m., pursuant to order adopted on Monday, June 27, 1988, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

At 6 p.m. the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, August 11, 1988

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

JUSTICE

TABLING OF MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN CANADA AND POLAND AND OF DIPLOMATIC NOTES BETWEEN CANADA AND YUGOSLAVIA

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, as well as in Polish, copies of a Memorandum of Understanding between Canada and Poland.

I am also pleased to table, in both official languages, copies of exchange of diplomatic notes between Canada and Yugoslavia.

Both these agreements will enable Canadian officials to gather evidence in Poland and in Yugoslavia for use in legal proceedings in Canada against individuals charged with war crimes and crimes against humanity.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour of tabling, in both official languages, the Government's response to 33 petitions numbered as follows: 332-4910, 332-4911, 332-5113 to 332-5142 inclusive and 332-5152.

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

RESEARCH, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

TABLING OF THE FOURTH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Leblanc (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of tabling, in both official languages, the Fourth Report of the Standing Committee on Research, Science and Technology respecting centres of excellence.

Today, science and technology have an impact on all sectors of the economy and on all spheres of human endeavor. To adapt to the changes stemming from the applications of science and technology, we must concentrate our efforts on providing quality education at all levels. Furthermore, we must establish and maintain ties between universities and the private sector, where research is carried out.

The centres of excellence program was announced earlier this year with these specific objectives in mind. In view of this program's importance as a means of making Canada more competitive on world markets and since it is a new way for the federal government to fund research activities, the Standing Committee on Research, Science and Technology wanted to study its provisions closely. In so doing, it wanted to gauge the reaction of those whose primary concern is the quality of research in Canada and to make recommendations with a view to ensuring that the program becomes a major initiative in our drive to enhance our competitive position.

Among other things, the Committee notes in its report that this initiative will go a long way toward ensuring a pool of trained, highly qualified researchers and quality research projects. However, it also states clearly that the centres of excellence program should not be viewed as a substitute for the invaluable research funding provided by the three grant councils.

The Committee believes that ties must be forged between universities and industry to help the latter develop a more innovative approach. This is precisely the goal of this innovative program and the Committee hopes that this report will contribute to the development of truly excellent and successful scientific networks.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 99(2), the Committee asks the government to provide a comprehensive response to this report.

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

• (1110)

[*English*]

TAX COURT OF CANADA ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-146, an Act to amend the Tax Court of Canada Act and other Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the Hon. Minister have leave to introduce the Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

PETITIONS

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106, it is an honour to present a petition on behalf of a number of constituents who are of the opinion that the federal Government has no mandate from the people of Canada to conclude a trade deal with the people of the United States. That believe that Parliament should dissolve now to allow the people of Canada an opportunity to accept or reject the proposed trade deal during a national general election.

I also have a second petition which contains pages and pages of signatures. They believe that the sovereignty of Canada is being threatened by the proposed trade deal and that the trade deal itself would reduce our country's ability to plan our economic, social and cultural future. They ask Parliament to ensure that a national debate take place on this trade deal and indicate that the debate should result in a national general election before such a trade agreement is signed, in the final analysis.

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I, too, have the privilege to rise under Standing Order 106 to present a petition from several of my constituents who are very concerned about the proposed trade deal with the United States, in that it will prevent Canada from being able to determine its own economic and social future and to create a society distinct from that of the United States.

They also call upon the Government to call an election right away so that the people of Canada can vote on this very important issue.

REQUEST FOR EQUITABLE TRUCKING AND FREIGHT RATES TO QUEEN CHARLOTTE ISLANDS

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions to present to the House today. The first one is certified correct pursuant to Standing Order 106 and is from a large number of residents of the Queen Charlotte Islands, from Sandspit, Queen Charlotte City, Masset, Port Clements, and other communities on the Queen Charlotte Islands. They petition Parliament regarding the cost of living on the Queen Charlotte Islands which is already high.

There is a federal subsidy to the ferry to offset its operating costs, but it is not reflected in the freight rates. An example they give is that a 50-pound sack of flour costs $16.50 in Vancouver, whereas once it is shipped to the Queen Charlotte Islands it costs $26.90. Since freight costs have doubled in a year, the petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to ensure, possibly by reallocation of part of the subsidy, equitable trucking and freight rates to the Queen Charlotte Islands.

OPPOSITION TO BILL C-33—SUPERANNUATION

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I also have a petition, which has been certified correct pursuant to Standing Order 106, from residents of the Queen Charlotte Islands and other areas. Since the Government, through Bill C-33, seeks to deindex the pensions of federal public servants which now have complete inflation protection through full linkage to the Consumer Price Index and other points, the petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to reject Bill C-33 as regressive, unfair, untimely, and against the best interests of public servants and all Canadians, and to affirm full indexing to the Consumer Price Index as the model for inflation protection for all Canadians.

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition, which has been certified correct pursuant to Standing Order 106, with a large number of signatures from Smithers and Telkwa, which, as you would know, Mr. Speaker, is in the Bulkley Valley of British Columbia.

The petitioners point out that since the distinguished justices of the Supreme Court of Canada in striking down Section 251 of the Criminal Code of Canada have left Canadians without any law restricting abortions, they call upon and pray that Parliament will pass into law legislation that will protect the life of the unborn child from conception and in all stages of development, with the exception of the extremely rare situation in which an abortion is performed in order to save the life of the mother.

RESEARCH INTO PREVENTION AND CURE OF SCHIZOPHRENIA

Mr. Bill Gottselig (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to rise on behalf of a number of constituents to present a petition which has been certified correct under Standing

Order 106. The petition concerns the funding for schizophrenia, and it is the wish and the prayer of my constituents that the funding be commensurate with the seriousness of this illness.

REQUEST FOR RETENTION OF TEN-WEEK QUALIFYING PERIOD FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Fernand Robichaud (Westmorland—Kent): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to present a petition. The petitioners are from the communities of Port Elgin, Bayfield, Cape Tormentine, and Murray Corners. It relates to the recent decision by the Department of Employment and Immigration to increase the qualifying period for unemployment insurance, from 10 to 16 weeks.

They say that this decision does not take into account the high unemployment rate and the seasonally short-term nature of employment in the rural areas of the region. They ask that this Parliament to bring justice to the situation by keeping in place the 10-week eligibility period for southeast New Brunswick.

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present two petitions under the provisions of Standing Order 106. The first one is from residents of Winnipeg, Manitoba and of Kamloops, British Columbia who say that the trade agreement negotiated by the Mulroney Government threatens the very fabric of Canadian political and economical sovereignty by removing the power of the Canadian Government to control foreign ownership effectively, to develop Canadian energy resources in the best interests of Canadians, or to equalize opportunities between the regions.

Therefore they humbly pray and call upon Parliament to dissolve and allow the people of Canada the opportunity to accept or reject the proposed free trade agreement during a national general election.

The second one is signed by a substantial number of residents of Winnipeg. They say that the Conservative Government has no mandate from the Canadian people to conclude a free trade agreement with the United States. Therefore they humbly pray and call upon Parliament to dissolve and allow the people of Canada the opportunity to accept or reject the proposed free trade agreement during a national general election.

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I also have a petition from quite a number of people who are objecting to the Canada-U.S. trade agreement, because the Conservative Government had no mandate from the Canadian people to negotiate this deal. They feel that the Mulroney Government threatens the very fabric of Canadian political and economic sovereignty with this deal by removing the power of Government to control foreign ownership effectively, to develop Canadian energy resources in the best interests of Canadians, and to equalize opportunities between the regions. For many other reasons they object to this trade agreement and call for its rescission.

ALLEGED INEQUITY IN TAX SYSTEM

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to introduce a petition that has been certified as correct under Standing Order 106. The petition contains well over 1,600 signatures of construction workers who have been working on the upgrader in Regina.

• (1120)

The petitioners point out the inequity in our tax system, especially as it pertains to construction workers. Construction workers have many unavoidable expenses and yet many of these expenses are not tax exempt. The petitioners also point out that in the construction field it is feast and famine, yet there is no forward and backward averaging.

Therefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to create true equity in the tax system by reducing the tax levies to construction workers, by paying interest on taxes to be refunded to construction workers, and by reintroducing forward and backward averaging.

The petitioners are from many parts of Canada, and it is a great pleasure for me to introduce their petition to Parliament today.

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition on behalf of Canadians from the Province of Alberta, from the cities of Edmonton, Calgary, Red Deer, Leduc, Fort McMurray, Wetaskiwin, and Lethbridge.

The petitioners are concerned that the Government had no mandate from the Canadian people to conclude a free trade agreement with the United States, and that the proposed trade agreement will deny Canada the policy freedoms to determine its own economic future and will undermine our ability to build a society distinct from that of the U.S.

The petitioners pray that Parliament be dissolved and the people of Canada be given the opportunity to accept or reject the proposed trade agreement during a national general election.

RESEARCH INTO PREVENTION AND CURE OF SCHIZOPHRENIA

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and an honour for me to present a petition on behalf of persons concerned about schizophrenia. They declare that schizophrenia is a major illness in Canada affecting about 1 per cent of the population, causing severe mental anguish and suffering to the patients and their relatives, and costing Canadian society more than $3 billion annually in direct health care and other support costs.

They note that recent research findings, including those obtained in Canada, have shown the illness to be a biochemical brain disorder in part caused by a genetic malfunction, and they hope that a cure might be found or a method of prevention discovered. They also note that research effort in Canada dedicated to schizophrenia is very limited.

They call upon the Parliament of Canada to ensure that research efforts related to schizophrenia in the future will be commensurate with the seriousness of the ailment. The petition is signed by persons from all over Ontario, namely, northern Ontario, the Ottawa Valley, and southern Ontario.

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, my second petition is from people who are concerned about the trade agreement before the House. They note that the Conservative Government had no mandate from the Canadian people to conclude this free trade agreement with the United States. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) promised in the course of the bilateral trade negotiations that Canadian sovereignty would not be compromised, but in fact it threatens the very fabric of Canadian political and economic sovereignty by removing the power of the Canadian Government to control foreign ownership effectively, to develop Canadian energy resources in the best interests of Canadians, and to equalize opportunities between the regions.

In recognition of these dangers, the petitioners call upon Parliament to dissolve and to allow the people of Canada the opportunity to reject the proposed free trade agreement during a national general election.

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and privilege to table a petition that has been certified correct as to form and content pursuant to Standing Order 106. The petition is signed by a number of residents from the Province of Manitoba who express their concern about the Canada-U.S. trade deal. They point out that the proposed trade agreement would deny Canada the policy freedom to determine its own economic future and would undermine our ability to build a society distinct from that of the U.S.

They call upon Parliament to dissolve and to allow the people of Canada the opportunity to accept or reject the proposed trade agreement during a national general election.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Shall the questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADA CHILD CARE ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved that Bill C-144, an Act to authorize payments by Canada toward the provision of child care services, and to amend the Canada Assistance Plan in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to commence debate on the Canada Child Care Act, legislation necessary to implement agreements with the provinces on the expansion of child care services across the country. As Members are aware, this represents a major element of the national strategy on child care which I announced last December. Before I get into the detailed substance of the Bill, I want to talk briefly about our Government's approach to social issues and how the child care strategy relates to this approach.

As a national Government, we are committed to improving opportunities and the quality of life of all Canadians. After all, that is the reason we have a social support system to help people experiencing difficulties, to ensure a basic equity in Canadian society, and to assist people to realize their fullest potential. For any Government addressing social issues and problems it is always difficult. The problems are often complex. The issues are interrelated and opinions on the appropriate way to proceed are usually very divided and quite firmly held. In a country as diverse as Canada, individual lifestyles and values vary considerably even in the same community, and community values may be quite different from one end of the country to the other.

In contributing to the resolution of a social issue, government must always find the proper balance between direct intervention and a *laissez-faire* approach. If direct intervention seems to be the right answer, government must still ensure that it encourages participation of individuals involved in order that it does not take over the problem or force people to adopt a single solution to that issue. The Government believes very strongly in achieving a balanced approach. We believe that a caring social policy perspective means developing an environment in which people are encouraged to help themselves and in which differing personal and community values are respected. A caring social policy requires thoughtful planning and expertise in its development and a great deal of flexibility in its implementation. That is not new to the child care policy. That, in fact, has been the hallmark of every social policy issue initiative that has been presented in this House throughout the past.

Those who feel there are easy answers or those who feel there is only one answer deny not only the present reality but our history. It means working closely with individuals and groups most affected by the issue, recognizing that they can make important contributions to both policy development and the operation of resulting programs. I do not believe any Government is in a position to solve all problems and should never attempt to dictate a single solution to a problem that affects people in different ways.

Another important aspect of our approach to social policy is to focus as much as possible on the future direction of society rather than root our solutions in the past. A good example of this approach is the seniors initiative which my colleague, the Minister of State for Seniors (Mr. Hees), and I announced earlier this year. The initiative concentrates on enhancing health and social services for seniors in a manner designed to maintain both independence and choice for this increasingly significant age group within Canadian society. For example, through the seniors independence program will be funding projects aimed at improving the quality of life and dependence of seniors. Priority is being given to projects involving community groups of seniors and to research activities directed to those diseases most affecting the ability of seniors to function independently.

• (1130)

As in other social policy areas, we believe an effective approach is to put the people most concerned with a problem in charge of developing solutions that work rather than impose solutions from outside the community or from social planners in Ottawa. Where the Government can act to increase the independence of the elderly, such as in the area of more economic self-sufficiency, we have acted as a Government. We have extended the spousal allowance benefits, implemented pension reform, and increased the flexibility of the Canada Pension Plan so that Canadians can make choices with respect to their retirement planning.

Consistent with our focus on the future, we are also assisting Canadians to plan much earlier for financial independence in their retirement years. This has included improving the portability of pensions in the federal sector and encouraging pre-retirement savings through higher RRSP contribution levels and more equitable contribution rights. We have also taken steps to ensure that men and women retiring under similar circumstances have equal pensions. We have also provided for the splitting of pension credits earned during marriages in which divorce occurs.

We have also taken the same approach with respect to health care. Until recently, the sole focus or primary focus of our health care system was to deal with injury and disease, to take an unwell person and make him or her well again. While this will always remain a priority, important new challenges to prevent and where this is not possible to enhance the ability of Canadians to cope better with disease, disabilities and stresses of modern living has become the focus of the health care policy of our Government. By promoting more healthy lifestyle choices, we can reduce dependence upon the health care system as well as improve personal quality of life at the same time.

This health promotion strategy also encourages self help and mutual aid practices since it is the community that provides the emotional and practical support to help people make the right choices and to live independently. Over the last few years we have seen the great success of groups addressing alcohol and drug abuse issues. Need I remind Hon. Members who said just a few months ago that there was no drug crisis that they are now seeing the wisdom of the forethought of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) when he made the announcement of a drugs strategy.

We involved ourselves much more deeply in impaired driving programs. We are finding that teens are taking those programs to heart and are now leading in the development of those programs and in the education of their peers. I need only to mention to the House our strategy on smoking as further evidence of this involvement.

While the Government has instituted national public awareness campaigns and tougher legislation in these areas, community based concern and action have really been responsible for the significant change in public attitude across Canada. One of the more difficult challenges we have responded to is, as I have already mentioned, drug and substance abuse.

Drug dependency claims many victims and can have an absolutely devastating impact on young people, their families, and entire communities. Public awareness can help limit the demand for illicit substances and can bring a hidden activity more into the open, but solving the drug abuse problem requires a deliberate, encompassing and co-ordinated strategy at the local, national, and international levels, including support of innovative community based research and self help.

Like substance abuse, child sexual abuse is a hidden social problem. It has a serious and long-lasting impact on our children, children who in most cases are unable to defend themselves. We are trying to bring the problem into the open, to sensitize communities to the issue, and to soften the impact of the judicial process on children who have been caught up in court proceedings. At the same time, we have severely increased penalties under the Criminal Code for people who abuse the trust that children place in them. However, penalties only deal with the problem after the fact. Improved community awareness and action will ensure that our children are better protected.

Under the pressures of modern life, the Canadian family is undergoing unprecedented changes. There are more single parent families than ever before, more families in which both parents work full time in order to meet their economic obligations, and unfortunately we also see more family breakdown in society.

As more women participate in the paid labour force or raise children on their own, the need for adequate child care services has become an increasingly pressing. Before I get into the substance of the Bill, I should make the point that the Government is using its data bases to bring responsibility to men especially those who have not taken the responsibility of child support. In some provinces as high as 85 per cent of court orders are either in arrears, are being partially paid, or are not being paid at all. There are many issues to be dealt with as we try to provide policies to improve the society in which we live.

Over the past four years the Government has made a substantial commitment to policies and programs which help Canadian families to deal with these realities. New divorce legislation, better means of enforcing custody and support orders, and a harmonization of federal and provincial efforts in the area of family law are some of the initiatives that have been taken. Programs to deal more effectively with family violence, including the increasing prevalence of abuse of the elderly, are also being worked on in conjunction and co-operation with the provinces.

The national strategy on child care which I was proud to announce on behalf of the Government seven months ago was designed to increase the number of quality subsidized child care spaces that meet the standards parents demand for the care of their children. As I said earlier, the development of an effective, workable social policy is always a difficult endeavour. As is the case with the development of other social programs, individuals have very definite ideas about the extent of the child care problem and about the most effective way to respond. As with other policies, this Government has attempted to bring sensitivity, understanding, and flexibility to bear on developing what I believe to be a very caring national strategy.

While our goal is to increase the affordability, availability, and quality of child care services, we realized that we had to respect the rights of parents to choose the kind of care they thought best for their children. We also had to respect the existing programs and services which provincial governments had developed in response to their own past needs and circumstances. We have also had the advantage of two major task force reports and extensive consultations with interest groups and individual Canadians across Canada. The result, our national strategy on child care, reflects a proper balance of choice, quality and quantity.

While it is a very expensive program—$6.4 billion is the federal commitment alone over the next seven years—it does not place an undue burden on either federal or provincial taxpayers. These are important considerations in developing a policy that is not only workable today but also does not create new problems or burdens for future generations. In fact, in the development of social policy, governments of the past used a similar approach.

As Hon. Members will recall, our strategy consists of four primary components: enhanced tax assistance for families with young children, a new child care initiatives fund, an initiative to stimulate accredited day care for Indian children, and a new federal-provincial cost-sharing program. The first two components are already in place and operating. The Indian day care initiative is in development, and authority to put the cost-sharing element in place is provided by the legislation we are discussing today.

• (1140)

The details of the components of the strategy have been made public before. Members have had several opportunities to discuss and debate them over the last few months. However, let me reiterate one important point. The supplement to the Child Tax Credit, $100 this year and $200 in subsequent years, is a targeted credit like the child tax credit itself. It goes to low and middle income families where parents remain at home to care for their children or use less formal child care. This tax measure makes up by far the greatest part of the new tax assistance we are making available in the national strategy on child care.

Additionally, it should be remembered that the child tax credit is additional to the increases made in former budgets by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson). Members should also recall the early prepayment of the enhanced child credit when looking at the entire record of child care. As well, the enhanced child care expense deduction is for those families of whatever income who are using receipted child care arrangements. Under our strategy the deduction more accurately reflects the total cost of child care, thereby reducing the financial burden of child care services. These tax initiatives will be effective this tax year.

The $100 million child care initiatives fund has been designed to support innovative research and demonstration projects to improve and expand child care services. We all know there are many needs which are not now being met by current child care services in systems. Parents who work irregular hours or on shifts, parents in remote or rural areas of Canada, parents of children with special needs, all have requirements for child care services of a different nature than that which the mainstream delivery system provides. The fund will help us develop ways of meeting these kinds of needs so that the quality of services may be improved and all Canadians may have better access to the services they need. This fund has already been established, looks to the future as well as to the present, and involves parents, community groups, and non-profit organizations in the effort.

The complicated part of the legislation is the new cost-sharing Bill before us, the Canada Child Care Act, Bill C-144. It is the means through which the federal Government is going to work with the provinces to double the number of child care spaces across Canada over the next seven years. It follows the tradition of consultation that this Government established in working with other levels of government, rather than dictate to them in their own areas of jurisdiction. I can say quite bluntly that when I had my first meeting with social affairs Ministers of the provinces almost four years ago, they clearly stated to me that they felt the federal Government had no role in child care, that it was solely within provincial jurisdiction.

I think it is important for the House and the country to understand the jurisdictional arguments in any social policy development. While I know that Members opposite in their political rhetoric or editorial writers might feel that those are not major considerations, some of us have had enough experience in social policy to know that if we cannot consult and do not work with the provinces on social policy those policies are doomed to failure.

I remind Members as they begin debate not to forget the history of social policy programs. If they were to be effective, they had to be flexible and involve provincial co-operation. I do not say 100 per cent unanimity or consensus, but we need to have provincial co-operation. If people do not believe in flexibility, may I remind my colleagues opposite of 1966. Pensions come under provincial jurisdiction. Canadians wanted a national pension plan. Today we call it the Canada Pension Plan. In Quebec we call it the Quebec Pension Plan. Even at that time we got a national plan with a distinct component for Quebec. It was said at that time that we needed a national plan but that to get it we had to have flexibility. We had to understand the regions. We had to be respectful of that. If that was valid in 1966, and today the Canada Pension Plan and the Quebec Pension Plan have become a major component in pension and retirement planning, then is it not surely valid today, in 1988?

The other point I make to Members opposite, and regrettably I have had too much experience in opposition—

Mr. Keeper: And you are going to get some more.

Mr. Epp (Provencher): I hear the NDP from Manitoba again. I ask them to look at the record in Manitoba and I wish them luck.

Their argument has been: "This is not enough, put in more". What they propose is something Canadians do not want. What they propose is a universal plan. They simply take a statistical model and say there are *x* number of children under a certain age, and because the NDP has so decided, every parent wants their child in this form of child care. Not true.

In addition, there is the cost factor, in their case $11 billion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Vancouver East rises on a point of order?

Ms. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, since we are listening to a Minister of the Crown, I wonder if he would please make sure his facts are correct.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That is a form of debate. The Hon. Member will have an opportunity to debate that.

Mr. Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased I now have their attention.

What they have been saying constantly is that we need more money, more money from the taxpayers. Their program in full bloom is an $11 billion program.

Mr. Gagnon: Per year.

Mr. Epp (Provencher): Annualized. That is the program they have in mind. I say to them that they can criticize, but what they should not be quite so sensitive about is our looking at their proposals, analysing them, and criticizing them. They also must meet certain criteria. Are they acceptable to Canadians? Are they affordable?

This program follows a long-standing tradition with respect to cost-sharing arrangements between the federal and provincial levels of government in addressing social problems, that is, a 50-50 balance in sharing the financial load. At the present time, the provinces are receiving, on average, about 35 per cent from the federal Government. Our strategy calls for a doubling of spaces, that is, 200,000 new and subsidized spaces over the next seven years. The federal Government is committed to providing 75 per cent of provincial capital contributions to develop these new spaces in non-profit facilities, as well as 50 per cent operating subsidies for both existing and new non-profit and commercial spaces.

I say to members of the Opposition that they are opposed to this legislation and they want to delay it as we saw yesterday in the House. They will have to go back to the people, and we will have to let the people decide why they do not have spaces and why the money is not flowing. It is because the NDP and Liberals decided not to approve the legislation.

• (1150)

The "not for profit" spaces which provinces create during this seven-year "boost" period will be eligible for the 75 per cent capital financing. This will substantially reduce the burden on provincial treasuries and help to make our goal a reality. The legislation will also expand eligibility for matching operating funds to both the "not for profit" and commercial sectors, in recognition of the fact that about 40 per cent of the existing number of spaces are in the commercial sector. We would have a great deal of trouble meeting our twin goals of improved quality and availability if we were to ignore almost half the existing system and in some provinces, such as Newfoundland, because of financial considerations, 90 per cent of the system.

Our national strategy and this legislation also recognize that all provinces are not at the same stage in developing their child care services. Some are behind others. That is why the Government has built into the Bill a provision to increase funding for certain provinces based upon the national average entitlement per child. We believe that child care services should be more equally available across the country because Canadian families are facing similar needs no matter where they live. I suggest that if Liberal Members want to criticize that part of the Bill, they should take a look at their own experience in the fifties and sixties and how the medicare formula was used at that time.

I said earlier that both quality and availability are objectives of our national strategy on child care. It is insufficient simply to create new spaces. Those spaces must provide the kind of quality care that parents demand for their children. At the same time, improving the quality of existing spaces without increasing the number of spaces fails to meet the increasing demands of the services.

That is one reason for the increase of $1 billion in our allocation to the federal-provincial program which I announced a few weeks ago. It is also the reason this Act requires that provincial and territorial governments specify child care service standards as part of the agreements between the two levels of government. It is that method by which we can address the standards issue. Provinces will also be required to establish methods to enforce those standards and to ensure that both the standards and enforcement procedures are widely publicized within each province.

The areas in which standards are to be developed are those areas that contribute the most to improving the quality of child care services. These will include child-staff ratios, group sizes, staff qualifications, program content, parental involvement and, of course, health and safety measures.

I am sure that parents, care givers, and professional groups will be working closely with provincial authorities in developing these standards where they do not now exist. The agreements that we will be negotiating with individual provinces will also include a time period within which these standards are to be put in place.

Under this legislation we are giving provinces the option of negotiating agreements consistent with the national child care strategy or remaining within the day care provisions of the Canada Assistance Plan.

I believe the approach we are taking has significantly higher benefits for provinces than the Canada Assistance Plan program. If we examine the recent history of provincial day care expenditures and reimbursements under CAP, it is clear that we are proposing a significant increase in our commitment to child care services across the country. Over the last few years the federal Government, through CAP, shared about 30 per cent of provincial expenditures on day care. As I have mentioned, that figure will be substantially higher under the Canada Child Care Act.

In addition, I remind Members that in the four years the Government has been in office, even under the Canada Assistance Plan we have increased by 100 per cent the amount of money the Canada Assistance Plan has made available to the provinces and child care givers for child care.

When I hear Liberals saying "you haven't done enough" or "you haven't done anything", in relation to what they were doing that is a rather interesting wicket on which to try to build a case.

Under the terms of the new Canada Child Care Act, the federal Government alone will be committing some $4 billion to child care services, or twice the total combined federal and provincial expenditures of the last six years. The federal proportion of expenditures will increase on average to about 50 per cent and could, in some instances in some provinces, be as high as 90 per cent given the funding formula and the top up provisions for certain provinces.

I think those few statistics demonstrate how much better off provinces will be under the Canada Child Care Act and how much more they will be able to do with the stronger financial support being provided by the Government. The point of our strategy is not to reduce what provinces have been doing but to provide the financial incentive for them to be doing more. Our commitment reflects what provinces can realistically achieve over the next seven years.

All agreements signed with provinces prior to April 1, 1990 will be retroactive to April 1, 1988. For the benefit of our viewers, April 1, 1988, is the beginning of this fiscal year. We have said right along that the money would flow in this fiscal year, and the money will flow as of April 1, 1988. All we now need for the money to be available to the provinces is the passage of this Bill in order that we can sign the federal-provincial agreements. This means that the provinces need not fear that their current activities toward expanding child care services will not be covered, despite the fact that this legislation is being given second reading today and needs passage.

I know that some Members opposite hold some strong views on the issue of child care services. I am sure that all Members agree, however, on the need to improve the availability, quality, acceptability, and afffordability of child care services as a necessity for working parents and for healthy, happy families and children.

On this side of the House we have concluded that our national strategy on child care best meets this need in a manner that respects the rights and obligations of parents, addresses the concerns of provincial authorities, and adapts flexibility to differing regions and community values. As I said when I began my remarks, determining the proper balance and flexibility in social policy initiatives is an important although difficult undertaking. In the final analysis, setting realistic objectives and developing a workable means to achieve those objectives is the only way to achieve progress.

I truly believe that this policy represents a substantial step forward in meeting the needs of Canadian families and children. I am looking forward to the passage of this legislation so that we can finalize the arrangements with our provincial counterparts and realize the goals that we have established together. I look forward not only to the debate but to the passage of this legislation.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this House to reply to the Government on Bill C-144, the Canada Child Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, when I read this Bill, I ask myself, while noting that it is a start, where our priorities as a society are and where the priorities of the Mulroney Government are, in view of the fact that a child care system is not a luxury but an urgent necessity.

Our society has changed radically over the past 20 years. Today, less than one Canadian family in six takes the traditional form of the mother working at home and taking care of the childen while the father works outside the home. Moreover, in many families there is only one parent—in most cases a woman raising her children alone. More than half of Canadian women who have pre-school children work outside the home, and in 45 per cent of families with children, both parents have to work outside the home.

However, only 20 per cent of the children have the benefit of licensed day care services. We also know that 57 per cent of children between the ages of 6 and 14 are left alone after school.

Some people say day care is the woman's business. That is false and completely unfair, Mr. Speaker! Day care services are for the couple to choose, for society to choose, and they are a priority the Mulroney Government has already taken too long to get around to.

• (1200)

[*English*]

It is with great regret that I rise today to discuss the Government's feeble child care legislation. The need for an increase in adequate child care spaces in Canada has been fully explained and documented since the first royal commission on the status of women in 1970. The need for child care is widespread.

[*Translation*]

Let us recall Katie Cook's task force on child care, which revealed that back in 1985 there were no day care spaces for over 1 million children between the ages of 0 and 12 whose parents worked more than 20 hours a week.

[*English*]

We deem this to be the core need group. It is not surprising, then, that this need has inspired a consensus among Canadians, a consensus to the effect that the time has come for the Canadian Government to implement a cost-sharing program which will meet the needs of Canadian families.

There are three essential problems with the Canada Child Care Act. First, it is not part of a comprehensive program as far as we can see, as no mention is made of other related legislation, notably full employment, parental leave, fiscal reform, beyond certain inadequate tax credits mentioned in the White Paper.

[*Translation*]

Second, this Bill in no way meets the needs of the Canadian family. The mere fact that the target or goal of this Bill is to create only 200,000 spaces over a period of seven years is arguable and unacceptable, since one million children currently lack day care spaces. And when we realize that the special needs of low-income families and latchkey children are completely ignored in this bill, we are faced with a very serious problem, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Third, as we have seen over and over again, there is no mention of standards, or even objectives if the Minister prefers that term, criteria supported by the report on the task force on child care, the report of the Senate subcommittee on child care, and virtually every child care advocacy group that has been consulted.

Before I continue, I want to discuss the idea of choice. The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) has chosen to present himself as the sole advocate of choice for Canadian families. Let me go on record now in saying that the only way to provide choices for Canadian parents is to provide the necessary funds through a cost-sharing agreement which ensures universal access to child care.

If the Government fails to take this next step, it is denying a number of parents the right to participate in the workforce as well as failing to provide the necessary assistance to single parents and parents of low income families to meet the needs of day-to-day living in a Canadian society. In so doing it will be denying choice, the choice to work in many instances. It will also be preventing Canadians from providing the best possible future for their children.

[*Translation*]

Living as we are in a time when the birth rate is very low, when poverty afflicts women most, we must face the fact that in Canada today, one child in five is living in poverty and one child in every three is sexually assaulted.

The Government has a responsability to Canadian families, a responsability to our children, and that responsability must be discharged by creating day care spaces and a good child care system. Yet the Mulroney Government says nothing about low—and middle-income families in this bill, and the witnesses who appeared before the child care sub-committees were particularly concerned about this aspect of the new program. They were afraid that the ceiling mentioned in the new program would force the provinces to cut the funding used to subsidize child care for low-income families. I would like to quote a few passages from the Committee's proceedings, as follows:

[*English*]

I want to talk about the traditional view of child care as a service for low income families under the Canada Assistance Plan. The reality of this new funding program is that provinces such as Ontario will be forced to make hard choices. The Minister said a few minutes ago that the money was flowing. Upon closer examination we can see that it is not flowing that well.

Assuming that there is a limit on the amount of money that provincial Governments will get from this new plan, these Governments will have to choose among subsidies to low income or moderate income families; expansion of the system providing direct funding to improve wages to keep trained people within the system because they leave the system in droves presently; improving the quality of programs which will have to be dealt with in different ways.

The bottom line is to ask what will happen to single parents who are on low income. What will happen to people who, without child care, will be forced out of the labour force, will be unable to enter the labour force, or will be unable to get training? I am not suggesting that this is happening in Ontario. I am suggesting that the possibility of it happening is much greater at present. It is possible for subsidies from the federal Government to flow through to the provinces because CAP is an open-ended program. Under this strategy there is a limitation to the source of the money coming from the federal Government, which presents a whole new ball game.

The report further indicates that witnesses from Quebec and Ontario were concerned that the ceiling in the program might penalize populous provinces with well established programs or plans for expansion. In contrast, witnesses from the Atlantic provinces fear that their provinces will not be able to offer help with the expenditures of a program developed under the more generous cost-sharing formula of the first seven years.

[*Translation*]

What has the Government done to allay these concerns? It has proposed a cost-sharing program for the creation of 200,000 new day care spaces. Those 200,000 new spaces are only 15 per cent of what is needed. At present, we are meeting only 15 per cent of the demand. That means the remaining 70 per cent of the demand is not being met, and that 70 per cent represents one million children who have no day care spaces. This is based on the assumption that the 200,000 spaces will actually be created. We also wonder whether the 200,000 spaces will be created, since it is stated in the Bill that the Government intends to increase the number of spaces across Canada by 200,000 over a period of seven years. Nowhere in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, does the Government make a firm commitment to create the 200,000 spaces it refers to. It does not say that the spaces will necessarily be created. It hopes to create 200,000 spaces.

[*English*]

While the Government will attenuate some of the need, and only part of the need as we have seen above, it has from the beginning blocked itself from allowing flexibility and increasing the inadequate amount of spaces in the future. It is thus possible that Canadian parents would have been better off without this Canada Child Care Act despite all the inadequacies of prior cost-sharing agreements under CAP.

• (1210)

[*Translation*]

For example, if a province pledges to create a certain number of spaces in the first year and fails to reach its goal for that year, it will not be permitted by the federal Government to carry those spaces over to the second year even though in that second year, since the program will be running more smoothly by then, the province could achieve the new goal. Since the bill now before the House will under no circumstances allow the funds equivalent to the undeveloped spaces to be carried over from one year to the next, a province could be penalized and might not reach its goal for the seven-year period, even though with adjustments along the way, it would easily have done so.

There is no flexibility in the carry-over of money from one year to the next.

Furthermore, the Bill provides for a seven-year program. What will happen in the eighth year, Mr. Speaker? When all the programs have been put in place and the provincial governments are relying on the federal Government to share the costs, who will pay? Will the provinces be left to their own devices with regard to capital expenditures and the creation of new spaces? Where will the federal Government be? The Bill does not say a word about that. The provinces are anxious to know whether they will have to assume all the unforeseen risks of the child care program in the eighth year.

[*English*]

After the Government's national child care strategy was announced, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, pursuant to discussions with various provincial agencies, had to increase the infusion of money in order to meet his original objective of 200,000 spaces. Extra funds were added, but the result is not exactly promising. Although people may think that the $1 billion announced in July is more money which will create more spaces, it is just the amount of money really needed to create the 200,000 spaces announced in December, 1987. The Government only corrected its own error, its miscalculation of December, 1987 with this extra billion dollars.

As we now debate the legislation provincial governments are undoubtedly restructuring their programs, unable to go ahead with plans they had prior to the introduction of this Bill. The projected plan of the Government of Ontario has already been cut by 12,000 spaces. We do not know how all governments are reacting in the restructuring of their own programs, but we know that different provincial Ministries across the country are entertaining reservations. We know that national child care advocacy groups are displeased with the situation, and due to quick and insightful comments made after the fact we know why.

[*Translation*]

The Mulroney Government has been trying to convince us since 1984 that all is well in the best of all possible worlds with the provinces, but when we look at this bill more closely, we have to wonder if that . . .

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would like to bring to the attention of the Hon. Member that she has mentioned the Mulroney Government three times now. It is the Government; it is not the "Turner" Opposition nor the "Broadbent" NDP Party. I do not like to disturb the Hon. Member's speech or debate, but it is the federal Government. She should not use Members' names nor the Prime Minister's name. He should be referred to as the Prime Minister and not by his name. Thank you.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pépin: Very well, Mr. Speaker. May I continue? May I say the Conservative Government, then?

The Government would like us to believe that is well with the provinces—sorry, I already said that. If we take a closer look at the present Bill, I wonder if that is true! I wonder what the provinces really think of the regulatory powers provided for in the bill, of the definition of child care services, of the definition of funding! All this is very vague, and you would have to ask the provinces that want to achieve their targets for the creation of spaces and related services whether they feel secure with a Bill that is so vague about the federal Government's true commitment. We do not know the federal Government's true commitment.

The Minister recently alluded to the 1966 pension plan Bill and the role of the provincial governments, and I would like to say that the federal Government at that time, with all due respect to the provincial governments, demonstrated some leadership, which I think is missing in this child care Bill.

[*English*]

We know that while the Government is providing funds "to create new spaces, much of the money to be provided will not be going to the creation of new spaces but rather to the funding of already existing spaces. We do not know how much of this money will be poured into the costs of sustaining programs already in place, but some estimates reach as high as $340 million.

While specific groups are particularly touched by lack of child care, Bill C-144 does not mention the specific needs. Until now, various child care organizations were funded through the Canada Assistance Plan. While demand was not met, it should be noted that CAP was geared specifically to lower income families. We have to guard ourselves against locking any groups out of the national child care plan in a time of increasing poverty for children and women.

While CAP dealt with this problem by adding day care and similar services to welfare services, the Canada Child Care Act, which is destined to replace CAP, does not address the problem of low to middle income families. With an inadequate number of spaces being created and no priority being set, is the Government not failing to meet the needs of the most disadvantaged parents of our society?

[*Translation*]

But there is more! The Bill completely ignores the problem of latchkey children. We know that 57 per cent of children between 6 and 14 are left alone after school. They clearly have special needs. In order to realize their potential and ensure their future, these children must have adequate services, Mr. Speaker; this would also help reduce delinquency and drug abuse among young people. Not only are they ignored in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, but the Government states in the Bill that it will do nothing for them. It is stated clearly in section 2, and I quote:

> . . . does not include . . . any service relating wholly or substantially to education.

How are we going to take care of latchkey children?

I recently heard the Minister tell us how important it was to have anti-drug programs for teenagers. In my view, a good after-school child care system is one of the best means of prevention. As you know, Quebec is currently the only province that has a school day care program. There are over 30,000 spaces in educational institutions in Quebec. Yet, unfortunately, under the bill we have before us today, there will be no money for all the children between 6 and 14 in Quebec and elsewhere in Canada, from Victoria to Newfoundland, and all the programs for latchkey children will be abandoned. That is unacceptable. We must remember that in all the reports on child care—Katie Cook's report, the report by the three political parties—it was stated that children must be taken care of, that it was a priority.

However, in our opinion, the Bill's major shortcoming is its failure to provide for quality standards. Bill C-144 makes no mention whatsoever of the quality of child care services. We believe in the importance of quality standards in day care centres, such as the space provided for each child, the number of children per child care worker, training, the quality of the staff, nutrition and so forth. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Bill is silent on these points. The federal Government should demand that the provinces develop quality standards and that these be incorporated into the federal-provincial agreement before the provinces receive any funding. In so doing, it would avoid creating two classes of children in day care. Unfortunately, a parallel situation has been allowed to develop, perhaps unwittingly, in the case of senior citizens who now fall into two categories, namely those who have the ability to pay for services, and those who do not.

• (1220)

[*English*]

The Senate committee also found that witnesses want funding to be adequate, but they also want the federal Government to ensure that provinces have standards necessary for good quality care, that care givers are properly trained and adequately paid, and that services are aimed and managed by those who are interested in children rather than profit. The committee responded with its own concerns and asked: "Will provinces be asked to commit themselves to advancing specific objectives regarding standards in the initial period?" The committee asked before the legislation was introduced: "What other assurances will there be that provinces will set and enforce standards?"

[*Translation*]

Thus, the provinces must develop standards and these must be incorporated into the agreement before the federal Government provides any funding at all.

[*English*]

But there are no assurances, Mr. Speaker. The legislation states: "An agreement shall specify the aspects of child care services in respect of which standards are required to be implemented in the province and the time within which they are to be implemented". These may not include accessibility to low income families, affordability, or any other specific standard suggested by advocacy groups or task force reports. The result could be substantial disparities from province to province. I submit that the mention of standards and of priorities is essential to any socially just child care program. The federal Government must ask provincial Governments to develop standards before it gives them money.

It is also to be noted that contrary to what the Minister of Health and Welfare stated in the House, it would very definitely be possible for the Government to include various objectives in the legislation, notably accessibility, upon which I commented earlier. Such objectives might also include parental involvement. It is noteworthy that while the Government kept mentioning the rights of parents and the needs of the family, it never addressed parental involvement. Yet, it would have been possible to set such objectives, to set a minimum standard of parental involvement. Precedents already exist. In Saskatchewan, for all centres licensed after October 1, 1982, 50 per cent of board members must be parents. The Government does not seem to have commented on such possibilities, yet it endlessly speaks of parents and choice.

It is strange that on the one hand the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) argues in his tax reform proposals that it is more advantageous to get a tax credit than a deduction, and in this Bill the Minister of Health and Welfare insists on allowing the least advantageous deduction. He would have had here a fine occasion to follow in the footsteps of the Minister of Finance but has failed to do so.

[*Translation*]

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I failed to mention the issue of parental leave. The Government totally ignored the recommendations of the principal report on child care, as well as those of the Katie Cook and Forget reports, which called for extending the period or parental leave from 16 to 26 weeks. A Liberal Government would never have ignored a recommendation of such great importance to families. The proposed legislation makes no mention at all of parental leave.

The Bill is also silent on the question of child care services in the workplace. It is hard to believe that the government would turn a blind eye to this issue when studies have shown that such services reduce absenteeism and provide better accessibility to both parents.

Mr. Speaker, as it now stands, the Bill is totally inadequate and fails to meet the needs of today's families. In 1984, the Conservative Government dangled the prospect of wonderful legislation before Canadians and raised many expectations which it has failed to fulfill. True, it is going to create 200,000 new spaces over seven years, but what of the one million children on the waiting list? The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the wait will never be over for them.

Summing up, I wonder what the priorities of Canadians are and I question those of the Conservative Government. Children and families are certainly not number one on its agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to move an amendment, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hamilton-East (Ms. Copps).

[*English*]

That the motion be amended by deleting all of the words after the word "That" and by substituting the following:

"This House objects to the principle of Bill C-144, an Act to authorize payments by Canada toward the provision of child care services, and to amend the Canada Assistance Plan in consequence thereof, which is to establish a program that does not provide access and services in all provinces and equal access to low and middle income families".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will reserve the decision on this amendment. I recognize the Hon. Member for Vancouver East.

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, child care in Canada is in crisis. After waiting four years for the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) to deliver on his campaign promise of an effective national system of child care, Canadian families have been let down once again. The inadequate strategy of the Government will not meet the needs of Canadian families and children. In fact, this fundamentally flawed legislation moves us backwards. There will be fewer child care spaces for our children after the seven years of this government program than would be developed under the existing system.

This Conservative legislation also fails to establish the principles upon which to build an effective national child care system. We should be building the first major national social

program since medicare, but the Government has failed to provide leadership and has not set out principles and objectives for quality child care in Canada. Canadian families and their children need greater access to quality child care at lower cost. This Government has not delivered.

• (1230)

We have said and continue to say that the Prime Minister should go back to the drawing-board. He should bring forward a child care program to meet the needs of average Canadian families for child care services, and this should be done now.

Over two million children across Canada under the age of 14 have parents who are in the workforce either full time or part time or perhaps are studying. A great percentage of them are single parents.

Over the past generation there is no doubt at all that families in Canada have changed dramatically. Working parents are now the norm for a variety of reasons, and studies show that this trend will continue. Therefore, it is obvious that every community must have a range of reliable, good quality child care services. Unfortunately we are far from achieving this goal.

It is interesting that for many years in Europe, most western European countries considered child care to be an essential community social service available to all families, but Canada is far behind, and this Bill does not help.

What happens to our children when Mom is at work and there is no reliable child care? This is a constant worry for working parents. Across Canada there are only about 243,000 licensed child care spaces, and almost all these are for 3 to 5-year old children. The care for infants and toddlers is virtually unavailable in most communities or is far too costly. Only 11.5 per cent of children of working parents are assured of good, quality licensed child care. The others are cared for by relatives, neighbours, nannies, and babysitters who very often prove to be unreliable.

Many school children have no care at all and, as my colleague just pointed out, this program of the Government does not provide for school age children who often go home to an empty house. Instead of benefiting from child development programs, many kids are left glued to a TV screen for their pre-school education.

For over 20 years women of Canada have been pressing for adequate, affordable child care. In 1984, the Leaders of all three Parties promised the women of Canada that a national child care program would be a priority. For four years the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) repeated this promise, while plans were delayed, press releases were issued, not one cent was spent, and a generation of pre-schoolers went without care.

One reason for the long delay was the resistance of the Government to accepting the reality of today's changing families and its denial that there is a child care crisis in Canada. We have heard this over and over again from Conservative Members on the child care committee. Because of the Tory philosophy that favoured the traditional family, the Government repeatedly tried to think of ways to persuade working women to return home. A $200 per year child tax credit was one very expensive tax measures that was introduced in the last Budget for home-makers and for those who had no day care receipts.

As I have said before, this is an insult to women and does not recognize the important role of home-makers. It gives no real choice to women. It would have been far better if the Government had reindexed the family allowance or the child tax credit and provided a much needed improved system of parental leave under the unemployment insurance.

Many parents want to be at home during the first year with their infants, and they should have this choice. We should have a decent extended program of parental leave under unemployment insurance, and the Government has done nothing about it.

Another Tory bias was the opinion that quality licensed child care was not really needed. We have heard over and over again that parents could make their own arrangements and did not need government programs.

The Government doubled the child care expense deduction to $4,000 to help compensate parents with higher incomes, not lower income people who cannot afford to pay taxes. Single parents and poor parents, of course, were not covered by tax credits.

At the same time as they were talking about tax reform and tax credits, they introduced a regressive child care expense deduction which took $2.3 billion in child care moneys away from much needed child care services. We have objected to it all along. It does not give parents a choice.

The Tories have also imposed their market-place philosophy on young children. Children are for profit and federal funds are to go for commercial child care, even though several studies have shown that "for profit" day care centres have lower quality care and very minimal standards. To make a profit, care givers are paid lower wages, staff turnover is higher, staff are less qualified, and the ratio of staff to children is often lower. The Tory strategy even tolerates giant child care chains coming into Canada, offering glitzy laid on programs with a minimum of individualized child development.

It is deplorable that the Liberal child care philosophy also supports federal funding for commercial child care operations.

When the Government eventually announced the national child care strategy in late 1987, it proposed spending a total of $5.3 billion over the next seven years. Some of this money was already in the Budget. We felt that this was a generous amount, but we were astounded that this would create only 200,000 new spaces—the same amount that we have now—over a seven-year period. This is only an average of about 30,000 spaces per year, and it is to cover 10 provinces and two territories, all of which desperately need increased and better quality child care. Therefore, two million children of working parents would still have a total of 4,000 spaces after 7 years.

An analysis shows that this increase of 200,000 spaces is less than the growth rate which would occur if we maintained the *status quo* under the Canada Assistance Plan. This is ridiculous. Under the Canada Assistance Plan the projected growth rate is 15 per cent, while under this new Bill the growth rate of child care spaces will only be 10 per cent. We would be going backwards. It is evident that Tory strategy and Bill C-144 are being used to limit the number of day care spaces that provinces can developed. There is no flexibility. It is an arbitrary plan which makes no attempt to assess the real needs of children and families across Canada. It is no wonder that provinces and territories have serious concerns.

It took the Minister four years to realize what research had documented long ago, that care givers have abominably low salaries, many of them under $10,000 a year. In July, he acknowledged his mistake in calculations by adding $1 billion to cover the real costs of child care and to provide for some Indian child care programs, which I agree are desperately needed. However, as was pointed out by my colleague, there was no increase for the 200,000 spaces to which I am sure provinces must have objected.

The new allocation still caps the number of new spaces at 200,000, which does not recognize real child care needs in Canada. As a result, many child care experts and several provinces feel that it would be better to maintain the *status quo* temporarily, until we can have an election and a new Government with a more progressive plan and with more flexibility to allow child care services to grow in the future. This program caps everything at the end of seven years.

Now, at long last, we have Bill C-144. It is the culmination of the child care strategy that refuses to deal with the real needs of Canadian parents and children and misuses child care dollars. I gave an example of the tax measures earlier. It offers an inflexible, unrealistic plan with no national objectives and no requirements for provinces to develop quality, affordable non-profit child care.

There will be great disparity in the kind of child care that is developed across Canada, which undermines the whole concept of a national child care program. We have only to look at medicare, a far better model which should have been followed. It leaves to the provinces how they would use federal tax dollars. It almost encourages them to use them for poor quality commercial day care. Because the government child care strategy and this Bill are so seriously and fundamentally flawed, we cannot support them.

• (1240)

The Minister has refused to listen to strong submissions from parents and care givers across this country who have years of commitment, experience, and expertise. He has refused to look at research studies and to follow the recommendations in a number of very important studies.

We agree with these groups that the most important priority should have been to establish those clear principles and objectives in the Bill itself and that federal tax dollars should have been directed first to the establishment of a network of quality, affordable, non-profit child care services across Canada with flexibility to meet the real needs of children. There should be program guidelines to require provinces to develop such services, with a period of time for conversion to non-profit societies for centres that want subsidies. We know that it will take many years to develop an ideal child care program, but surely we should be starting in the right way with clear, progressive objectives and flexibility that would allow this program to grow in the future and not be capped after seven years.

Our great concern and the concern of most Canadians interested in child care is that Bill C-144 limits the number of new spaces to only 200,000 at the end of seven years. Studies show that the present limited inadequate system of subsidizing child care under the Canada Assistance Plan has resulted in a 15 per cent growth rate. This Bill will result in only a 10 per cent growth rate. It just does not make sense. I do not know how the Minister can justify it.

Some provinces, like B.C., should be very concerned that by not using the Canada Assistance Plan in the future they will not have the open-ended kind of coverage for children with special needs. This program of the Minister's has not dealt with these children. In a province like British Columbia almost all spaces could be used by disabled and other children with special needs. There is no provision for the extra cost of such services.

Child care needs are greatest in poorer regions of Canada where few centres exist and workers are grossly underpaid. Bill C-144 does have a very complicated, variable cost-sharing formula. It was interesting that the Minister indicated that this could go up to 90 per cent in Newfoundland, I think he said. I am not sure, though, that people understand this. We feel very strongly that this is important. We are worried that the Northwest Territories, which has a very high birth rate, has warned that it can put no money into child care and must have 100 per cent federal funds.

Another concern with this Bill is that it offers capital funding of up to 70 per cent for building non-profit centres for only seven years. What happens afterward? Incidentally, commercial centres will still be able to get tax breaks for their capital expenses after that time. Since it often takes several years to establish a new centre, particularly in rural communities, this is quite unrealistic. It is another indication that the Bill is designed to limit child care rather than to develop a sound national program for child care which is flexible, meets future needs, and improves as the years go by.

I wish I had time to speak of the special needs and concerns of different regions, but I will have to leave that to my colleagues. I am glad that my hon. friends to the right will join us in opposing this regressive Bill. I am glad my colleague from the special committee on child care has spoken today. I note that none of our Conservative colleagues are here. I must say that the Liberals had over 20 years to take action on child care ever since the royal commission on the status of women—

Mr. Gauthier: We did.

Ms. Mitchell: —but the Liberals did nothing that was effective in meeting child care needs. I wonder why the Liberal child care policy endorses commercial child care when it has been proven over and over that it is poor quality care with minimum standards. Other aspects of Liberal policy are very fuzzy.

A New Democratic child care program would be phased in. We know that we cannot achieve the ideal immediately. We have both a short-term and a long-term plan. We would make provincial funding conditional upon meeting national program objectives. We would recognize the present crisis in child care. We would have done this four years ago by introducing direct grants to provinces to assist with the crisis until all these changes could take place. We would use child care dollars for direct funding of capital and operational grants for licensed child care services as opposed to tax expenditures which are targeted only to the wealthier families. We would aim to have parent fees reduced to 50 per cent of the total costs by the early 1990s, with a longer term goal of eventually reducing costs even further. We would provide up to 80 per cent of all government funding for poorer provinces and territories with underdeveloped services. We would insist on parental and community involvement in the development of child care in Canada. This is only common in non-profit centres. We would improve care giver training and wages.

Most important, and I am glad the Minister is here, we would amend the provisions of the Unemployment Insurance Act to give all parents a real opportunity to spend some time at home with their infant children. The Minister has not mentioned this very important aspect which our committee also recommended.

Working Canadian women and their families have great needs for reliable quality child care services. They had hoped for a national child care program which would be a model social program and which would develop progressively into the future. This is the first social program we have had since medicare. We should have built it on the lines of medicare with national standards, with equal access, and with quality services across the country. Taxpayers want their child care dollars to be well spent.

The Government is generous in the amount of money that is going in at the first stage. I must admit that our plan had even less money targeted during the first stage. We want the money to go directly into child care services so that parents will have a choice and will be assured that they do not have to use an unreliable babysitter or in fact provide no care but can go to their neighbourhood child care centre or have other forms of family support and in-home services available to them.

This child care legislation is the final straw in a flawed and regressive Conservative child care strategy. It does not even attempt to deal realistically with child care needs of Canada. The Minister has made no attempt to assess the real child care needs. He has taken an arbitrary 200,000 spaces over seven years, laid it on, and, boom, there is nothing after that.

We cannot support this program. We ask the Government, in all sincerity, to withdraw the Bill. Children and women deserve better.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I believe there is agreement to call it one o'clock.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

ENERGY

OWNERSHIP OF PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, this morning the Petroleum Monitoring Agency released the Canadian petroleum industry 1987 petroleum monitoring report which related some distressing news. In dealing with Canadian control and ownership of the petroleum industry, the status of control of Husky Oil Limited has been changed from the Canadian category as established by Investment Canada to a foreign classification, by Energy, Mines and Resources. The result is a 1.5 per cent reduction in Canadian revenues from the petroleum industry.

This obviously highlights the Government's sell-out of our country's resources. Indeed, Investment Canada has reviewed and approved 443 out of 443 acquisitions, valued at $38,203,721,000. In other words, no foreign acquisitions have been disallowed.

The Conservative Government is misleading Canadians by stating that it wants to maintain 50 per cent Canadian ownership of our energy resources and will not sell a financially healthy Canadian company with assets over $5 million. As stated in the report of the Petroleum Monitoring Agency:

S. O. 21

Canadian ownership of the petroleum industry, based on upstream revenues, declined from 46.7 per cent in 1986 to 45.1 per cent in 1987, while Canadian control decreased from 49 per cent in 1986 to 45.2 per cent in 1987.

Why is the Government clandestinely promoting the reduction of Canadian control and ownership of our energy sector?

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

ROMANIA—PLIGHT OF MINORITY GROUPS

Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines): Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago, on August 1, 1975, Canada, along with 33 other nations, including the United States and the Soviet Union, signed a landmark agreement which came to be known as the Helsinki Accords. Canada, under the leadership of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark), has given leadership and direction to honour this country's commitment to human rights.

What about elsewhere? Even since *glasnost* and *demokratizatsia*, some 300 political prisoners, including 10 Helsinki monitors, still languish in labour camps and exile. The recent decision of Romania to bulldoze 7,000 villages, uprooting and scattering the 2.5 million native Hungarians throughout Romania, is a direct affront to those Accords.

Romania undertook to succour all persons under its jurisdiction without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, just as we did. I would urge the Department of External Affairs to show Canada's displeasure at this ruthless uprooting of defenceless minority groups in Romania today.

* * *

NATIVE PEOPLES

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR—CALL FOR APPOINTMENT OF ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, the native people of Newfoundland and Labrador have been the victims of an apparently intentional effort by the Government of Canada to deny them the full rights to which they are entitled under Section 91(24) of the Canadian Constitution and the provisions of the Indian Act. Studies commissioned by me, including an examination of official documents, have revealed that from early after Newfoundland joined Confederation in 1949, a systematic denial of rights has been a fact of our history and continues to affect the lives of native people in Newfoundland and Labrador. It amounts to discrimination against native people because they live in this province. It is time for this hidden history to be fully exposed.

I have therefore called upon the Government of Canada to establish immediately a Royal Commission on Native People in Newfoundland and Labrador. Such a commission would have a mandate to inquire into the treatment of aboriginal peoples since 1949, with specific focus on the rejection by the federal Government of its constitutional responsibilities with respect to the native people in the province. The commission should have the authority to recommend measures to correct the historic and current injustices, and to ensure cultural survival and promote self-government for the native people of Newfoundland and Labrador. This record of official injustice must be exposed and redressed.

* * *

SPORTS

TRIBUTE TO WAYNE GRETZKY, CANADIAN

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to a great Canadian, Wayne Gretzky. He has lived his life up to now in Canada and for the last nine years has been an Edmonton Oiler. With his tremendous ability as an athlete, the greatest among them all, he won the hearts of every Albertan with his kindness, his courage, his excellence, and his humility. Being the leader in winning four Stanley Cups was a tremendous achievement, but even that was superseded by the honesty of this man who never lost the common touch.

He is and has been Canada's greatest ambassador. He is properly called "The Great One" who, wherever he went, promoted Canadianism, honesty, fair play, decency, and respect for all humans irrespective of race, colour or creed.

We have not lost him; we have gained a great representative. Wherever Wayne Gretzky goes, Canada's best will be on display because in his heart there is a maple leaf. This Parliament applauds "The Great One", Wayne Gretzky.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE LATE FÉLIX LECLERC

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, today Quebecers are in mourning. Félix Leclerc is being taken to his final rest. A giant is being put to sleep. Félix Leclerc is one of our Québécois and Canadian poets and singers who set the tone for us, who gave us a taste for Quebec, especially in his songs and poems. Who among us has not hummed *Moi, mes souliers* and *C'était un p'tit bonheur*? He reminded us of our origins and made us proud to be Quebecers. He was a great-hearted man who gave us not only the desire to be but also, and especially, the desire to be what we are and what we want to be.

I conclude this humble tribute by extending my sincerest condolences to all his family and friends and reminding them that Félix Leclerc will always have a special place in our hearts. I would like to repeat what Félix wrote about death:

"It is better to die on a task that cannot be done than to live resignedly but uneventfully."

* * *

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

ACID RAIN—ACTION TAKEN BY UNITED STATES PRESIDENT

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound—Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, Canadians across this great country can rejoice at our latest victory in the fight against acid rain. This Government has been pursuing quiet diplomacy. Perhaps it is not the confrontation method the Opposition would have preferred, but we have succeeded.

Last Friday, President Reagan announced that his administration would freeze U.S. emissions of nitrogen oxides at 1987 levels for seven years. Finally, all the hard work of this Government and the Acid Rain Committee is paying off.

No one in Canada doubts that acid rain is a killer and that a great deal of work needs to be done. This summer the information campaign engineered by the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) has proven to be highly successful in making the average American aware of our concerns and the damage this problem is creating for both our countries.

This is only the beginning, and every day we are making progress. The Americans realize more and more how critical this problem is and that we must combine our efforts to combat this menace called acid rain. Let us give credit where credit is due and encourage our Minister of the Environment to continue his good work.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE LATE FÉLIX LECLERC

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, a singer has died but his songs live. For Canada, Félix Leclerc is proof of the benefits of the Canadian mosaic over the American melting pot. For Quebec, he became the spirit, voice and pride of a whole generation. Félix Leclerc: we remember!

[*English*]

MULTICULTURALISM

CULTURES CANADA 88—CEREMONY ON PARLIAMENT HILL

Mr. Bill Gottselig (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, there was a very interesting headline in our local newspaper, *The Outlook*, this past Monday. "Noisy Jim is on the road again," the headline read, and the article went on to say that Jim Kook was going to Ottawa to participate in Cultures Canada 88 as a result of having previously participated in a similar program at Expo 86.

I was very pleased last night to be with Jim and his wife May on the parliamentary lawn, with the historic Peace Tower in the background, at a very special ceremony in which the Minister of State for Multiculturalism (Mr. Weiner) as well as Mrs. Jean Pigott, representing the National Capital Commission, participated.

The various participants in Cultures Canada 88, many displaying costumes from their native lands, were taking part in this very colourful ceremony on Parliament Hill which is the heart of Canada. This once again displayed the colourful mosaic of our country which is greatly enriched by maintaining this heritage. I salute my constituent, Noisy Jim, as well as all participants in this cultural event.

* * *

DISASTERS

1985 GANDER AIR CRASH—CALL FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, the investigation into the 1985 Gander Arrow air crash has been plagued with controversy, contradiction, resignations and confusion. Crucial testimony has been neglected, documents have been hidden from the Canadian Aviation Safety Board members, and tentative conclusions have been nothing short of illogical.

Now there are new revelations. Several firemen who worked on extinguishing the fire resulting from this unfortunate crash are ill from what they believe to be the ingestion of toxic gases. What caused those toxic fumes? What caused fire extinguishing equipment to activate prior to the plane crashing? Why is information being withheld from the Canadian Aviation Safety Board? More important, why blame the crash on the pilot of that plane?

We need a public commission of inquiry into the Gander air crash. We must find out the truth about this most unfortunate disaster.

S. O. 21

• (1410)

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

FEDERAL MEASURES TO ASSIST WESTERN CANADA

Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, our Government has made three particularly significant contributions toward the economic health of Canada's West.

First was the Western Accord which started the process, now completed, of dismantling the punitive National Energy Program.

Second was the Western Economic Diversification Program which, in its first year, approved 231 proposals for $44 million in assistance to Alberta businesses as of the end of July. There were 503 proposals in the whole of western Canada for a total investment of $345 million. Twelve Calgary companies received assistance ranging from $20,000 to $720,000. Not only does this assist in broadening our economic base, it also creates jobs.

Last month we had the announcement of the western procurement initiative which will increase the amount of federal procurement carried out in western Canada by more than $600 million over the next four years. That is an increase of 16 per cent. In addition, our Government is committed to sourcing a greater portion of contracts over $100 million from western suppliers.

Who can say that this Government has not responded to the needs of western Canada? No one!

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

EAST TIMOR—OCCUPATION BY INDONESIA

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow at the UN, the Special Committee on Decolonization will consider the illegal occupation of East Timor since 1975 by Indonesia. Since that time Indonesia has waged a genocidal war against the people of East Timor.

This is the human rights situation that Canada chooses to ignore. Because of extensive trade links with Indonesia, Canada turns a blind eye to its human rights abuses. Indonesia has been called the most totalitarian country in the world, and its doors are closed to such organizations as Amnesty International and the International Red Cross.

In spite of Canada's pretence that our development assistance is linked to human rights, Indonesia remains one of our largest aid recipients. Our ambassador even went to the extent of accompanying the former Minister of External Affairs, Mr. Mochtar, on a visit to East Timor during a phoney election campaign.

Canada must recognize that it is time to end the double standard and speak up for human rights in East Timor.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—POSITION OF LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, you may recall that on June 29 the Right Hon. Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Turner) made a speech in this House on the subject of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. Two days ago the *Winnipeg Free Press*, commenting editorially on that speech and other statements made by the Right Hon. Member, said, and I quote:

> "Mr. Turner took phrases from one part of the agreement and applied them to another; distorted the meaning and intent of other passages, and simply falsified the application of yet others. It is a surprising performance from a man who was once regarded, whatever his political strengths or weaknesses, as a man of integrity."

The editorial went on to say:

> "There is room for honest disagreement over the likely effects of free trade. The point at issue in Mr. Turner's approach to free trade is not one of honest disagreement but of simple deliberate distortion."

The editorial concluded:

> "John Turner these days has a liking for slogans. "Let the people decide" is his latest. Before the people do decide he might direct another slogan to himself, "Tell the people the truth".

Amen, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

BACKLOG IN PROCESSING SECURITY CLEARANCES

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I defy the Tories to tell the truth about the immigration mess they created in this country. I speak not only on behalf of hundreds of people in the Hungarian community of the city of Hamilton, but thousands of Hamiltonians who would like to know when the Government is going to clean up the immigration mess it created.

I met this week with a gentleman by the name of Francisc Anghi in my office. He has been waiting for almost two years to get security clearance so he can apply to bring his family from Romania. He is a Hungarian refugee whose family is under political pressure in Romania. In the meantime, one of his sons has died. Another son is suffering a fatal illness. All he wants to know from the Government is how much longer it will take before he gets security clearance so he can apply to bring his family members to Canada. He is desperate, and there are thousands of other Canadians like him.

The Government claimed to be working on a national emergency concerning immigration policy but it created an incredible backlog in security clearances which leaves thousands of frustrated landed immigrants and Canadians waiting for their families to be reunited. What kind of a humane Government will allow a son to die while the father is waiting for his security clearance?

Let us clean up this immigration mess by bringing back a Liberal Government.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—POSITION OF LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec-Est): Mr. Speaker, on July 21, I told the Leader of the Opposition that the serious Liberal Senators would not agree to submit to his orders. I therefore suggest that he check or inquire with his Senators and Members of Parliament to see whether others are not preparing to imitate the Johnstons and Van Roggens. What you are asking them, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, is to act undemocratically, and they are opposed to that.

All the major newspapers in the country have called your position irresponsible and partisan. In the space of a few weeks, you have contradicted yourself by saying that you were committed to not asking the Liberal Senators to assume your responsibilities for you in the coming weeks.

I hope that you are aware of the gratitude you owe Canadians who will keep the Right Hon. Brian Mulroney as Prime Minister and who may once again give you the chance to be just the Leader of the Opposition, which is already a very big favour in your case.

* * *

[*English*]

VISIBLE MINORITIES

INTERMENT OF JAPANESE-CANADIANS DURING WORLD WAR II—CALL FOR PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of State for Multiculturalism is touring the country these days celebrating the new Multiculturalism Act. As a result, he is too busy to consider the redress for Japanese-Canadians the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) promised four years ago. Meanwhile, the U.S. House of Representatives followed the U.S. Senate's lead in passing a redress measure for Japanese-Americans. The U.S. President signed a Bill which provides $20,000 U.S. for every Japanese-American survivor.

The Mulroney Government should be ashamed of itself. Successive Ministers have failed to deal properly with the National Association of Japanese-Canadians, and they have refused to consider compensation for individual Japanese-Canadian survivors. It is hypocritical to celebrate high sounding principles while one is refusing to act on those principles. The Prime Minister should hide his face in shame for having failed to act on the promises of June, 1984.

Canadians will remember this broken promise as one of the most shameful in the entire Mulroney record.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—SUPPORT FOR QUÉBEC INVESTORS AND INDUSTRIES—PRIME MINISTER'S POSITION

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. We all know that members of Cabinet have not even read the trade agreement with the United States. Nevertheless, the official statement or official interpretation by President Reagan says, on page 86, that a province shall grant investors from the other country the same favourable treatment granted investors from that province. President Reagan is saying that the Government of Quebec cannot use special measures to encourage Quebecers to invest in their own province.

What impact does this have on Quebec's stock savings plan? What impact does it have on possible changes in the plan? And what impact will this have on efforts by the Government of Quebec to ensure that Quebec industries are developed and financed by Quebecers?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken, the Government of Quebec has just issued a statement expressing its satisfaction with the trade agreement, and especially with the provisions relating to investment. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition should also read the press releases and major documents issued by the Government of Quebec.

• (1420)

SUPPORT FOR INVESTORS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think the Prime Minister of Canada should get in touch with the Premier of Quebec and advise him to read the official U.S. text which makes it quite clear that the Government of Quebec would be prevented from promoting investment by Quebecers in Quebec industries.

Mr. Speaker, I am positive that not a single member of Cabinet read the official statement made by the U.S. President

on July 25. I am equally positive that not a single member of Cabinet has read the U.S. bill.

President Reagan also says that no Canadian province may impose local equity provisions. The President also says in his document that no province may give preferential treatment to investors from that province.

What does this mean for a province like Quebec that wants to encourage investment by Quebecers in that province? What does it mean for the Canadian Government, if it wants to encourage Canadians to invest in their own country? I repeat, what are regulations on foreign investment doing in a free trade agreement?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition says not a single member of Cabinet has read the agreement and that not a single member of Cabinet has read President Reagan's statement. He is entitled to his opinion, but I think he is wrong. He is also assuming, since his question directly refers to the powers of Quebec, that the Premier of Quebec and, for that matter, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Parizeau, have not read the document. However, Robert Bourassa, Jacques Parizeau and practically all Quebec's economic partners have read the document and approved the free trade agreement with the United States.

SMALL PRINT PROVISIONS OF AGREEMENT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): The Prime Minister should explain to his Quebec counterpart that President Reagan's statement or official interpretation will prevent the Government of Quebec from using specific preferential measures to promote investment by Quebecers in their own industries.

[*English*]

No wonder there is uncertainty in the country. No one in the Cabinet appears to have read either the Canadian or the American documents. The President's official statement of July 25 says that no province can give a special break to investors from that province.

What is more, page 58 of the American legislation says that the United States will negotiate, in the words of the American Bill, "the elimination of direct investment screening" by Canada including the elimination of all screening of energy and cultural industries.

Does the Prime Minister not realize that not only are all future investment rules out the window but the United States plans to eliminate any rules at all affecting Canadian investment which are currently on the books? Why has no one in his Government bothered to read the fine print in the documents which the Americans have published?

[*Translation*]

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, that is an insult to the Hon. Robert Bourassa, the Premier of Quebec! It is a direct attack on the credibility of Mr. Bourassa, who says he has read and understood the entire free trade agreement and endorses that document on behalf of the Government of Quebec and the people of that province. The Leader of the Opposition has grievously insulted the Premier of Quebec, and I think the Premier and Quebecers will remember this as one more insult to Quebec.

[*English*]

With regard to the point made by my friend, the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): You don't know what is in the Bill, that's the problem.

Mr. Mulroney: He says I do not know what the issue is. Perhaps I could point out to him what the *Winnipeg Free Press* said yesterday. It said, "the point at issue in Mr. Turner's approach to free trade is not one of honest disagreement but of simple deliberate distortion". That is the opinion of the *Winnipeg Free Press* and of most Canadians.

* * *

VISIBLE MINORITIES

INTERNMENT OF JAPANESE CANADIANS DURING WORLD WAR II—REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT NEGOTIATE WITH ASSOCIATION

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of State for Multiculturalism I will direct my question to the Right Hon. Prime Minister.

Several days ago the staff of the Minister of State for Multiculturalism openly admitted that the Minister was too busy on a Conservative campaign tour across the country to deal with trying to settle the Japanese-Canadian redress issue which has eluded the Government and four different Conservative Ministers of Multiculturalism for four years, despite the personal assurances and promises made by the Prime Minister.

Rather than having the Minister indulge in a self-flattering campaign tour to bolster a very desperate record, why does the Government not first honour the Prime Minister's commitment to the Japanese-Canadian community on this issue, establish serious, ongoing negotiations with the NAJC, and genuinely try to solve a very sensitive and emotional issue which is affecting so many Canadians across the country?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend says that the solution to the very serious problem involving Japanese Canadians has eluded the Government. I think he would recognize that we began the process of trying to resolve the problem. We have not achieved

that yet, but we were the first Government to begin the process of attempting to solve a historic injustice.

We began that work in light of the statement of the former Leader of the Liberal Party in this House in June of 1984, who said that the Liberal Party and the Liberal Government had no intention of ever paying compensation to or looking after the problems of the Japanese Canadians. We are in the process of improving a great deal on that. I hope there will be a solution very soon.

PRIME MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has made promises and four of his Ministers have issued dozens of press releases saying that there is progress when there really is not. In the meantime, the American experience of a few days ago has quietly but successfully reached a satisfactory conclusion to the Japanese-American redress issue.

Four different Ministers have failed to come up with a resolution. While the Prime Minister was Leader of the Opposition he gave his very clear undertaking that the matter would be resolved, and he has not involved himself since assuming office.

Therefore, can the Prime Minister now give this Parliament the assurance that he will become personally involved and offer political leadership from the top to try to initiate negotiations for a settlement so that the Government, but more important, Parliament and the country, can successfully close a dark chapter in Canada's history? Will he become involved as he said before the last election that he would?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is very unusual and should be noted that an official spokesman of the Liberal Party is favourably invoking a precedent just signed by President Ronald Reagan. The President will be delighted to hear that.

Mr. Riis: He imposed a minimum corporate tax too, Brian.

Mr. Axworthy: You make Ronald Reagan look good.

Mr. Epp (Provencher): Nobody can make you look good, Lloyd.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Right Hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. Mulroney: Mr. Speaker, my friends from the NDP who were in the House at the time will remember, because I think they shared our view, that we were all quite aghast at the statement by the Leader of the Liberal Party and the lack of sympathy which he evinced for Japanese Canadians. The NDP and Conservatives spoke very strongly in favour of an attempt to resolve this sensitive and important matter.

We have moved to the point where we have agreed upon an official apology to the Japanese Canadians who suffered by this unjust action, the creation of a fund on behalf of the Japanese Canadians to deal with the problem of racism which affected them so tragically, and we have another step to take. I think my hon. friend would agree that another important action taken by the Government was the abolition of the infamous War Measures Act which violated the rights of so many Canadian citizens.

* * *

• (1430)

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt—Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Since last October 5, Canada's major farm groups neither supported nor rejected the free trade agreement with the United States. Instead, they attempted to identify clearly issues which must be addressed to maintain the programs and policies which make Canada's agricultural industry "uniquely Canadian".

Now that groups such as the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, Prairie pools, the Wheat Board Advisory Committee, the Union des Producteurs Agricoles de Québec, the National Farmers' Union, the Maritime Farmers' Council and others say that their concerns over that period of time have been ignored, will the Minister explain why the Government chose to ignore all these important farm groups?

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member is fair, I think he would withdraw the final part of that comment. This Government has not in the past and will not in the future ignore Canadian farm problems. I challenge him to examine the record. To date we have taken some 660 initiatives delivering over $10 billion. That is a record that is unchallenged in the past.

I recognize that some general farm organizations have some difficulty with the bilateral trade agreement. However, if we look to see what the commodity organizations are saying about the agreement, we find that there are about 100,000 grain farmers in the country who support the agreement. There are about 80,000 beef farmers in the country who support the agreement. There are about 70,000 hog farmers in Canada who support the agreement.

Supply management is secure. Since we went forward with the amendments to the CAPS Act that the previous Government did not have the courage to proceed with, there are about 25,000 horticultural people who recognize that the bilateral trade agreement is in their interest.

POSITION OF CANADIAN FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt—Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, the Minister seems to have ignored or is perhaps unaware of the fact that the Canadian Federation of Agriculture which

speaks for nearly all the groups he just cited said: "The CFA cannot support implementation of the FTA in its present form". That is dated July 30, 1988.

Since this is the position of the CFA and the position of most of the component groups of the CFA, will the Minister tell us what, if any, changes he proposes at the last minute to make this agreement acceptable to the farm groups?

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am very much aware of the recent statement issued by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. I have to take issue with certain of their observations because I think they are false. The future picture of the agri-food marketing systems and supply management in Canada is not in jeopardy at all because they are secure under the bilateral trade agreement.

They also challenge the integrity of the Canadian Wheat Board. I believe that is false. They also made some observations about the quality standards of Canadian agriculture commodities. They are not in jeopardy at all.

They recognize as well that we have to take some action to tie up some loose ends. I recognize that, particularly as it relates to the hatching egg industry. We have given a commitment to that industry and we have fulfilled our commitments to the agricultural industry in the past. We have every intention of fulfilling the commitments in the future, including many that are mentioned here.

[*Translation*]

PROTECTION OF POULTRY SECTOR—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt—Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, what is the Government doing to protect the processing and poultry sectors, as requested by the *Union des producteurs agricoles* in their meeting with the Senate yesterday?

[*English*]

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I recognize that there are some loose ends to be tied up. We recall that we were challenged on the fact that we would not proceed to transfer a number of dairy items from the tariff list to the import-export list. We gave a commitment to that industry that we would go forward and do so. Of course, the Opposition Parties should recognize that we have already carried that out.

The other loose ends to which I have referred are the other commodities under the feather industry. We will continue to consult with the industry in order to arrive at a sensible action that will again transfer those items from the tariff list to the import-export list. We have made a commitment on this side to ensure continued day-to-day operation of supply management in Canada. We have full intentions of carrying that out.

UNITED STATES OMNIBUS TRADE BILL

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. He will recall that some three or four months ago a Commons committee unanimously reported to the House a recommendation that with the omnibus Trade Bill in the United States not giving an exemption to Canada we should not proceed with the trade agreement. At the same time, Ambassador Gotlieb, on behalf of the Government of Canada, wrote to the United States administration and Congressional leaders that: "The proposed redefinition of subsidy represents a significant and dangerous departure from generally accepted international norms. If enacted, they would undermine the GATT".

On Section 103 of that same Bill, Ambassador Gotlieb said: "These proposals could lead to U.S. actions inconsistent with the GATT and would exacerbate international trade tensions".

Yesterday the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade said the Government of Canada no longer has a problem with that Bill. He said that all of the matters have been dealt with and that there is no problem. Yet the very same concerns and issues raised by Ambassador Gotlieb are still in the Bill.

Is the Parliamentary Secretary speaking for the Government? If so, why has the Government changed its position? Why is the Government abandoning its previous position stated by the full Commons committee? Why is the Government not protesting U.S. trade action that will continue to harass Canadian exporters?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the question by my hon. friend is whether the Parliamentary Secretary, in his response, spoke for the Government. May I say that not only has the Parliamentary Secretary spoken for the Government, he has done so in an eloquent, effective, and tremendous way here in the House of Commons.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Riis: We are talking about McDermid.

Mr. Mulroney: The House Leader of the New Democratic Party insists on naming him. Yes, it was McDermid who did such a wonderful job.

CANADIAN POSITION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, if it is true that the Parliamentary Secretary in his own fashion is speaking for the Government, then the question stands. Why is the Government retreating from its position? Why has it changed the stated position of the Minister in the House that we would protest those measures in the omnibus Trade Bill which contravene the trade agreement even though those measures are still in the Bill as it has been passed by the Congress? Why has the Government once again lost its backbone when it comes to protecting Canadian interests and has subjected Canadian exporters to further trade harassment?

Why are we perpetrating a joke on the Canadian people by having tougher trade laws?

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, first, the House and the country owe a great deal of gratitude to Ambassador Gotlieb for his work in fighting this omnibus Trade Bill, in having the most severe sections of it removed and other parts watered down. He has done a masterful job of representing our interests in Washington and should be recognized.

• (1440)

Second, we have reviewed the text of the omnibus Trade Bill and we are satisfied there are no provisions in it that would require the administration to take any action which would be inconsistent with the free trade agreement. We have examined that. We have not retreated one iota on this. The free trade agreement is going ahead. We look forward to debating the silly amendments the Hon. Member has brought into the House.

* * *

VISIBLE MINORITIES

INTERNMENT OF JAPANESE-CANADIANS DURING WORLD WAR II—ISSUE OF INDIVIDUAL COMPENSATION

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister who has already recognized the long-standing support of the New Democratic Party for redress to Japanese-Canadians and which, of course, remembers his own question that last day in June of 1984, to former Prime Minister Trudeau when he asked for redress.

The Prime Minister knows that the American President has signed a Bill authorizing compensation to individual Japanese-American survivors. Recognizing that the issue of individual compensation has been the sticking point in all the discussions with the National Association of Japanese Canadians, will the Prime Minister now authorize negotiations with the National Association of Japanese Canadians on the issue of individual compensation for Japanese-Canadian survivors?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to refer again to the support of the New Democratic Party for the position I raised in the House of Commons in June of 1984. My hon. friend refers to the fact that compensation was the "sticking point". Compensation was not the sticking point. The sticking point was the refusal of the Liberal Government for 40 years to even acknowledge and apologize for what had taken place.

Mr. Cassidy: What about right now?

Mr. Mulroney: Since this Government has been sworn in, and with the support of my hon. friend in the New Democratic Party, certainly not elsewhere, there has been arranged an agreement whereby there is to be a trust fund with respect to anti-racism. There is to be a formal apology delivered in the House of Commons on behalf of the Government and the people of Canada with respect to this tragedy that took place so many years ago.

Ms. Mitchell: But no negotiations.

Mr. Mulroney: There are ongoing discussions with the representatives of the National Association of Japanese Canadians at this very moment. I know my hon. friend will be happy to learn that those negotiations are moving ahead and they are in the extremely competent hands of the Minister for Multiculturalism.

REQUEST FOR COMMITMENT TO DISCUSSIONS

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the Prime Minister's word "negotiate" describe a reality that has not been followed since January of 1985. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Prime Minister to give his word on behalf of this Government that there will be full and fair discussions with the National Association of Japanese Canadians to arrive at an agreement acceptable to the association to provide the kind of redress that is essential if this blot on the national honour is finally to be expunged.

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. friend for referring to this matter because it is indeed a very serious blot on Canada's honour and, to me, it is a matter of very considerable regret that for over 40 years this matter was left untouched by the previous series of administrations. We have made some important progress with respect to resolving the matter and, with the support of my hon. friend, hopefully this matter can be brought to a proper and appropriate resolution which will be satisfactory to all concerned.

* * *

FINANCE

TAX TREATMENT OF COMPANIES DONATING TO FOOD BANKS

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Are the reports true that the Government intends to give a tax break to food companies which donate surplus food to food banks? Whether this is true or not, would the Minister of Finance not agree that it would make much more sense to address the problem of why the number of food banks is increasing even though we are in a period of relative prosperity, rather than giving tax breaks which will in fact encourage more food banks to be created?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the last part of the Hon. Member's question, but I should point out to him that there is a means now whereby companies which are producers or wholesalers of food are able

to provide food to food banks and receive a tax credit which will provide them with the encouragement I think the Hon. Member is seeking.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

ADMISSION OF SOUTH AFRICAN IMMIGRANTS TO CANADA

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Employment and Immigration my question is directed to the Prime Minister. It concerns the Government's soft policy on South Africa. There are in Canada a number of white South Africans here as draft resisters, unwilling on conscientious grounds to serve in the Armed Forces to enforce apartheid, who face possible imprisonment if they return home. They are uncertain as to whether they will be allowed to remain in Canada. There are non-white South Africans here in Canada because they oppose living in a racist society and fascist country, who are also uncertain about their future in Canada.

Will the Prime Minister today declare that South Africans will have blanket approval to obtain landed immigrant status in Canada provided they are admissible under the Immigration Act, as did the former Government with its B-I list, including such countries as El Salvador and Lebanon, countries in Eastern Europe and other countries as well?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we will, of course, as a Government, look with care at any question that is raised with respect to Canada and Canada's role, and the succour Canada can provide to refugees or people seeking our assistance. We have done that before and we will do so again in this case.

My friend will understand that I must take exception to his reference to a "soft policy" of this Government on South Africa. The former Ambassador to the United Nations, Stephen Lewis, referred to the tremendous leadership shown by Canada in the United Nations with respect to South Africa. The comments of my hon. friend have been repudiated by President Mugabe, President Kaunda, and Prime Minister Ghandi, all of whom believe that Canada since 1984 has been playing a particular and effective role of international leadership with respect to South Africa.

STATUS OF IMMIGRANTS

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have raised a number of specific measures in the House which my Leader mentioned in his speech last November as the policy of the Official Opposition, the Liberals, and I have asked a very specific question today. The Prime Minister refuses to give a specific answer. Will South Africa be added to the B-I list of the Minister and the Department of Employment and Immigration so that blanket approval will be available to South Africans seeking haven here, and so a signal will be sent to South Africans in their own country who want to resist the official policy of apartheid in that country?

Hon. Jean J. Charest (Minister of State (Youth)) and Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Employment and Immigration, I will be happy to take notice and transmit the question to the Minister on behalf of the Hon. Member. In the meantime I want to remind the Hon. Member that there is a process now by which people can acquire refugee status, if that is the case, through legislation if they feel compelled to do so because for political reasons their lives may be threatened. That process is there for people who want to make that case and argue it before an adjudicator.

I think it is quite clear that this Government has made its position known on South Africa very forcefully. We have assumed a position of leadership as was demonstrated recently in the sports community. We are very conscious of the role we want to play in the world in this respect.

* * *

WESTERN DIVERSIFICATION FUND

ALLOCATION OF GRANTS TO MANITOBA

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister responsible for the Western Diversification Program. From information provided by his office a few days ago on all projects released in each of the four western provinces up to July 31 of this year, we see that Manitoba received the smallest amount of any of the provinces, $2,800,000. Saskatchewan with a slightly smaller population received $9,500,000. That is more than three times as much as Manitoba. Alberta received $27.5 million, and British Columbia received almost $50 million.

• (1450)

Some of us suspected that as long as Manitoba had an NDP Government it would be ignored, but since April Manitoba has had a Conservative Government. I would like to ask the Minister what has he got against the people of Manitoba and Premier Filmon so that Manitoba gets grants that are so abysmally small.

Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to reply to the question of my hon. friend. Over 500 proposals have been approved by Western Diversification in the last 12 months since the Prime Minister established it, totalling some $345 million, to build and strengthen the economy of western Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McKnight: I know the Hon. Member has a concern for his home province, as do Members of Parliament from that province on the government side. I would like to inform the Hon. Member that some 40 projects have been approved in Manitoba for $20 million.

Yesterday I had the opportunity to provide over $1 million to Otto Bock. That company is processing and putting in a CAD-CAM prosthetic operation to bring technology from Germany. It is investing $3 million of its money and $1 million from western economic diversification to diversify the economy and to serve Winnipeg and Manitoba.

Yesterday I also had the opportunity to participate in an agreement with Morfee Wheel. This is technology developed in British Columbia and transferred to Manitoba by the company to develop truck wheels. It is the first new development in truck design since the disc brake.

I can tell the Hon. Member that everything is well in Manitoba and well in western Canada.

GRANT TO STEINBACH

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, the figures I quoted were not pulled out of the air. They were figures released by the Minister's office as of ten days ago.

Why is it that when the City of Winnipeg has so diversified an economic base that it can produce almost anything in the list which he provided, the only grant for over $1 million was to the town of Steinbach which happens to be in the constituency represented by the Minister of Health and Welfare?

It reminds us Manitobans of the type of things we heard when the Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry was a Minister and his grants were so political.

Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Steinbach is well known for representing his riding. I would like to inform the Hon. Member of the activities that took place yesterday in Manitoba, and the opportunities to sign prior to that meeting with our colleagues from the Province of Manitoba. My colleague the Minister of Health, the Hon. Member for Provencher, on behalf of the Government of Canada was able to sign an agreement on a health strategy with the newly elected Government in Manitoba. This health strategy agreement will contribute greatly to the economic activities that will take place in Manitoba.

The announcement yesterday with Otto Bock for $1.4 million which created a company—

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Shefford.

[*Translation*]

TRADE

SHARE SAVINGS PLAN

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): My question is for the Right Hon. Prime Minister and follows on my leader's. I would ask the Prime Minister not to hide behind Robert Bourassa.

If, for example, the federal Government wanted to match Quebec's stock savings plan, can the Prime Minister tell me how, under the terms requiring certain results and national treatment, we could continue to require something like the head office being located in Quebec or Canada, or at least 50 per cent of the salaries being paid to employees in Quebec? Would such conditions for a stock savings plan be acceptable under the Free Trade Agreement?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition hears the Member for Shefford speak of his leader with affection, he must be worried when he hears such things.

The question from the Hon. Member for Shefford, who has set the record for hypocrisy... The Hon. Member for Shefford is more or less repeating his leader's question, except that the question from the Leader of the Liberal Party was more precise.

I took the liberty to answer by using not only the arguments in the document but also the arguments made by Premier Bourassa and his Liberal Government in Quebec. He says that the Hon. Member for Shefford need not worry, Quebecers approve of the free trade treaty.

PRIME MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, an unsatisfactory answer if there ever was one! I want to ask the Prime Minister, and I am not asking him to repeat Mr. Bourassa's arguments, I want to ask him whether he is prepared to set up a federal stock savings plan and whether, in that case, the free trade agreement wouldn't be an obstacle because of the standards of performance and national treatment provisions. My question is this: Wouldn't all more or less generous stock savings plans be at risk as a result of the free trade agreement?

[*English*]

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the Hon. Member's question is that there is nothing in the free trade agreement which would affect the ability of the Government of Canada to establish a stock savings plan.

Oral Questions

TRANSPORT

MOVEMENT OF GRAIN THROUGH ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Transport and the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. The Deputy Prime Minister will know that those two Ministers met with officials from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway industry approximately three weeks ago. They offered a plan of action to the Government to deal with the current crisis in the movement of grain and other products from the West through Thunder Bay, the Great Lakes, and the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Is the Deputy Prime Minister prepared to advise the House and the thousands of men and women who are affected along the system what action the Government is now prepared to take?

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, anyone with a knowledge and understanding of the importance of the agri-food industry in Canada would not be surprised by the negative effects on a whole variety of aspects of the Canadian economy.

The Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board is in Winnipeg today meeting with the provincial Minister of Transport with respect to the Churchill issue. The Department is analyzing the report of the coalition. The Hon. Member will appreciate the fact that any decision that is made will have to be made in the interests of the coalition of the ports in all regions, Canadian farmers, and certainly in the interests of our grain customers.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. It has now been three weeks, and there are more layoffs every day. At the very least could the Minister indicate when the people of Canada can expect a decision and an announcement by the Government on the actions that it will take to assist those who are suffering because of the lack of movement of grain?

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member must also appreciate the fact that the federal Government stays out of the day-to-day operations of the Canadian Wheat Board. The Canadian Wheat Board does not tell our grain customers where to buy their grain.

The Hon. Member might take some satisfaction from a copy of a telex I have here. It is signed by the Commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board. It states: "I can assure you that we are continuing to pursue all possible marketing opportunities".

PUBLIC SERVICE

SECOND FIRING OF IMMIGRATION OFFICER

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. I would like to ask the Prime Minister why the Government continues to wage a campaign of harassment against Canadians and, in particular, government employees who want to tell the truth to Canadians about a number of issues.

I would like to ask specifically why, for the second time, the Government has fired John Quigley, the immigration officer from Toronto who last year had the guts to tell the truth about a bad immigration policy.

Hon. Jean J. Charest (Minister of State (Youth) and Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): Mr. Speaker, my information is to the effect that Mr. Quigley has been informed that his services are not required any more because of an abuse in telecommunication privileges. Mr. Quigley has all recourses open to him from now on. If he wants to appeal that decision, the law provides for that type of recourse.

* * *

CANADA POST CORPORATION

DISMISSAL OF HAGERSVILLE EMPLOYEE

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Prime Minister. I have a case here of a woman who, for 15 years, delivered rural mail. Last month she was terminated by Canada Post allegedly because of a disagreement over air conditioning, but the real reason was because she was a founding member of the Rural Route Mail Carriers of Canada and a founding member of Rural Dignity. Why was Sue Eybel fired from Hagersville? Why was John Quigley fired from Toronto? Why is the Government running a campaign of harassment against employees who are trying to fight for Canadian rights?

• (1500)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Lise Bourgault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the question about the alleged firing of the post mistress in the riding referred to by the Hon. Member. Mr. Speaker, I intend to ask for a full investigation of this matter, and I will get back to the Hon. Member with a detailed reply.

[*English*]

BANKS AND BANKING

SERVICE CHARGES APPLIED TO SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of State for Finance. The Minister is, of course, aware of the hearings which the Finance Committee held on bank charges. He is also aware of the representations the small business community across Canada has been making to him and to Members of Parliament that many of the same recommendations, made concerning bank service charges to the consumer, by the Finance Committee, be applied to small business. Many small businesses feel captured by the banks and feel that they are unable to object to many unfair charges imposed by the banks.

Is the Minister prepared to act on behalf of the small business community of Canada against the big banks?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Of course, Mr. Speaker, the Government is prepared to act. We made this clear a good number of months ago.

First, all the principles which we came up for the consumer: disclosure, advance notice, a complaints mechanism, and abolishment of obnoxious charges, should be applied to the business community as well.

The Hon. Member is very late in coming to this issue. We have a meeting today between the small business organizations and the Bankers' Association. I hope they will be able to resolve the details to make sure that we can have in place a regime just as strong for the small business sector as we have for consumers.

REQUEST FOR INTRODUCTION OF REGULATORY LEGISLATION

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, my second question is for the same Minister.

The Finance Committee has issued a good report dealing with credit card charges, bank services charges, and yet we are afraid that once the public spotlight is removed the banks will revert back to former practices as they are now beginning to do with increases in credit charges. Is the Minister prepared to introduce legislation to regulate the banks to ensure that there will be fair banking practices not only for consumers but for the small business community of the country?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the Hon. Member is coming from. His Party wanted a voluntary agreement for bank service charges a month or two months ago. Suddenly the Member and his Party want the Government to do it all. What we have accomplished is that together with legislation and a voluntary approach we have protected the consumers, and improved their relationship with the banks. We will do the same for the small business community as well.

Mr. Speaker: There will be a single question from the Hon. Member for Algoma, followed by a single question from the Hon. Member for London East and that will close Question Period. The Hon. Member for Algoma.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

GRAPE ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture.

Last week he issued a press release announcing the grape adjustment program as a result of the trade deal with the United States. In that press release the Government is committed to a strong and viable grape and wine industry in British Columbia.

Could the Minister explain, since approximately over 2,000 of the 3,400 acres of grape vines are expected to be removed, how you could have a strong and viable grape industry when more than two-thirds of it will be removed? Could the Minister answer even one question for the grape growers? Is the adjustment assistance subject to income tax? The growers have no idea about the program or whether the adjustment assistance will be taxable.

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture): We have not reached a final decision on that particular issue, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS INDEPENDENCE PROGRAM—EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

Mr. Jim Jepson (London East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Veterans Affairs.

Last June at a Royal Canadian Legion Dominion Command convention the Minister announced that the Veterans Independence Program would be extended to those veterans serving Canada in Canada during wartime. We hear from the Opposition of a very imminent election. Could the Minister tell this House whether this program will be in place prior to the next election?

Hon. George Hees (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Minister of State (Seniors)): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to answer this very good question from a Member who pays particular attention to the welfare of our veterans who deserve our attention so well.

I would like to advise the Member and all Members in this House that we have been working on this matter very, very hard, with good progress, and by about the middle of next month we expect to be able to announce the date when this will actually take place.

PRIVILEGE

REQUEST FOR REFERENCE OF DRESS CODE TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in deference to the Chair with a tie around my neck and a shirt on my body.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: I rise in deference to the Chair but not in deference to common sense. I did not mean to stimulate a national debate yesterday. I really thought we were going to go on to serious things yesterday. In view of the ungainly, unseemly conduct of the New Democrats on something so fundamental as child care, I suggest today, because of the way the New Democrats treated child care yesterday, that my question of privilege on dress for Members is most relevant indeed. If the legislators of the land cannot be dressed comfortably in the halls that make laws, what hope do we have for child care, Mr. Speaker?

Having said that, I am not trying to impede the progress of the House. I sit on the far right wing of the front bench of the Tory Party, and I am glad to be a member of the Tory Party and/or sit on the right wing. Having raised the question of dress I would like to show to my colleagues and to you, Mr. Speaker, that I am not necessarily right wing totally in most situations. If we are inane and stupid enough to meet here on August 10 in the middle of the summer, then I suggest it is time we got our dress code to conform to the realities of the land.

I wrote a letter to you yesterday, Mr. Speaker, after, with respect, you gave a very impetuous and interesting decision.

To quote your words, you would not recognize me "because he was not dressed according to the customs and traditions of the House and, until he is, he will not be recognized". This was your reply to my hon. friend, the Hon. Member for Okanagan—Similkameen (Mr. King), whose area raises second grade apples.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: Because he prefaced his remarks on the apple industry and you would not recognize me, you did a great disservice to the apple growers of the Annapolis Valley. Because the bells rang yesterday afternoon I did not want to create a constitutional conference and crisis. If I had come in in my garb as I did in the Question Period, I would have put the Table, the Clerk, the Greffier, Mr. Marleau, and you in an unconscionable position as to whether or not to count my vote. Quite frankly, most of the votes yesterday did not matter a gosh darn anyway.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: It could have been that way. I would suggest, Sir, without making a federal issue of the matter—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: —that it is time this matter of dress code was referred at least to the Standing Committee on Management and Members' Services so that we could come up with a rational, reasonable code for the middle of the summer.

• (1510)

I just want to put on record, without taking any more time of the House, my letter to you yesterday:

"Dear Mr. Speaker,

My dear John. With the greatest respect and thoughts to you personally, you made a G.D. ruling. I did not want to create a scene but only to have the matter referred to the Members and Services Committee. For surely if there are summer dress codes everywhere else in the land, ie: messes,—"

That is for the neutral people over there in the NDP. That is armed services messes. It continues:

"—and if we are stupid enough to be here in the summer, then we too should have a summer code.

On the basis of your impetuous and ill-considered ruling, I may come into the House tomorrow in Bermuda shorts and a bikini shirt and reverse the outfit the next day.

Quite frankly, as a Back Bencher, I am not too worried about the recognition from the Chair—that is the perpetual state of all Back Benchers, for I truly am concerned about the health of the Members during the summer.

Yours in the Twentieth Century and no bib and tucker for the eons before.

Yours sincerely,
Pat Nowlan

PS: I know I am being presumptuous, and you of all people know the reason for the tie, for the men of the old world—chasing women with one hand and eating bones of lamb with the other and sometimes slurped gravy on their waistcoats—those days are gone. There is no more dripping gravy, women are free and so should we—be."

I ask for this matter to be referred to the Management and Members' Services Committee.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I know that Hon. Members would want me to thank the Hon. Member from Annapolis Valley—Hants (Mr. Nowlan) for his impetuous and interesting intervention.

Of course, I responded immediately to the communications which the Hon. Member sent to your chairman and left a verbal message. It was an extremely polite message, but it was a direct one. I said, of course, that I would be very pleased to hear the Hon. Member today if he was properly attired according to the customs and traditions of this place.

I must say that the question the Hon. Member raises puts the Speaker in a harrowing position. It is extraordinarily difficult for anyone who is a Member of this place and a colleague of all the others to place greater distinction or prominence on one person's dress as opposed to another. That is why I think perhaps it has always been so easy to ignore dress, whether elegant or something less, provided that there was a tie around the neck.

I am not suggesting that this is the only test. If there was only a tie, there might be some other problem. However, I am always in the hands of Hon. Members as I am your very humble servant, and if it should happen that a committee would wish to give some guidance to the Chair, I would be guided by it and accept it most willingly.

I want the Hon. Member for Annapolis Valley—Hants to know that I knew full well that he had a contribution to make to this important matter yesterday and that given its importance the Hon. Member would at least conform with present standards and approaches and make the intervention that he did as I said, in such an impetuous and interesting way today. I have, out of friendship and a long comradeship that I have enjoyed with the Hon. Member from Annapolis Valley—Hants, put aside and ignored perhaps some of his other remarks, recognizing that all Hon. Members use humour and sometimes shock value to bring attention to the burning issues that they bring to us from all across this land.

The Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata) on a point of order.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a non-impetuous submission on the same subject. With the greatest of respect for the Hon. Member for Annapolis Valley—Hants (Mr. Nowlan), the issue is not whether there should be a summer dress code or a winter dress code. I would ask you, Sir, to review the dress code in the House of Commons in view of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Under the Charter one is not permitted to discriminate based on sex. In the House of Commons, our female colleagues are not required to wear ties. Whereas it may be a custom and a tradition here in the House of Commons that men are required to wear ties, I would submit, Sir, that you as the Speaker of the House of Commons and the House of Commons itself should adhere to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and lead by example.

In other words, males should be entitled to the same privileges as female Members in the House. The issue is not whether a male should or would or would not wear a tie. The issue is whether we are required to wear ties. Sir, I would ask you to review your policy and the policy of the House of Commons on that requirement. It is in breach of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms to require a male to wear a tie.

Rather than referring the issue to a committee, I would ask, Sir, that you honour the letter and the spirit of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and allow men the same freedom and rights that you allow women in the House of Commons.

Ms. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I must say on the same subject that I concur with the statements of the previous Member. I look forward to the day when indeed the Speaker has the privilege of perhaps wearing the kilt in the House. Perhaps even more important is the dress code for pages and clerks who wear very heavy woollen winter clothing because of tradition. I would ask that they have a summer attire of some description.

Mr. Speaker: Before I recognize the Hon. Member for Windsor West, (Mr. Gray) I should respond to the Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata) and the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Mrs. Mitchell). Your Speaker has listened very carefully to the important intervention that has been made. I am not sure that it is my place to consider the dress code against the Charter of Rights, but perhaps there is another place where that can be done. Both Hon. Members will note that I confined my remarks strictly to the dress of male Hon. Members. Not even the Speaker would have the nerve to get into the question of dress for Hon. Members who are ladies.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, this being Thursday, I want to ask the Government House Leader for a statement of business which the Government intends to call over the next several days.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, we will be continuing today with Bill C-144 and hopefully we will conclude that by this evening, and it will be followed by Bill C-130.

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) exactly what are the Government's intentions with respect to Bill C-273, the Bill on political rights. Prior to the brief recess that Parliament took, the Government House Leader and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister made very clear that the Government had no intention to interfere in any way with the private Members' procedure. As a consequence they were not prepared to co-operate with Members from all three Parties, including the Hon. Member for Ottawa West (Mr. Daubney) who proposed the Bill, to accelerate the consideration of Bill C-273, the Bill on political rights.

I have before me the letter which the Government House Leader has sent to my Leader today. It requests support for or co-operation with a series of killer amendments which were put forward by government back-benchers, clearly at the behest of the Government. I understand they were prepared by senior officials of the Government, the Privy Council Office, the Treasury Board, and elsewhere.

• (1520)

Three weeks ago the Government was saying that it would not interfere with Private Members' Business in any way. Now the Deputy Prime Minister is involving himself in it directly. His officials are involved in it. He has had a couple of backbenchers put forward a series of amendments which he knows very well repudiate the commitment made by the Conservatives in 1984 to grant political rights to the vast bulk of people working for the Government of Canada. This also frustrates the private Members' procedure which had led to the unanimous reporting of the Bill from the legislative committee, with support from Members of all three sides and particularly from Members from areas where the Public Service is represented. These Members felt that we had come up with a good Bill, but the Government has now decided to meddle in it.

What is happening? Could the Deputy Prime Minister explain what the devil is going on? He should know that the amendments he has had proposed on behalf of the Government are completely unacceptable to those of us who have been trying to get a reasonable balance between the need for very senior people in government to be politically neutral and the need to give political rights to the vast bulk of people working for the Government, and that was the promise of the Conservatives before they took power back in 1984.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the Hon. Member is taking such a strident attitude and referring to these as killer amendments and interference. The fact is that there is an NDP caucus and there is a government caucus. This issue was debated in our caucus, and some concerns were raised about it. The amendments that are being proposed are being proposed as a caucus initiative by private Members. I do not know why the Hon. Member would want to take offence with that.

The fact is that we are trying to achieve what the Hon. Member suggests he wants to achieve, except he wants to play politics with the issue. All we are trying to do is strike a reasonable balance, a balance that would maintain the impartiality of public servants while at the same time give public servants political rights. There is a gross over-exaggeration in the Hon. Member's interpretation of the amendments, and I regret that very much.

I think we all recognize that we have been served very well by a Public Service that is impartial. There are concerns in all corners of the House and indeed throughout the country about the need to maintain that kind of impartiality. It was in that spirit that members of caucus on this side of the House have debated the matter somewhat thoroughly and—

Mr. Cassidy: That's not true.

Mr. Mazankowski: The Hon. Member says that that is not right. I do not normally talk about what goes on in our caucus. I certainly do not hear the NDP Members talk about what goes on in their caucus nor do I care.

This in fact is the case, and if it is the case, I would ask the Hon. Member to withdraw his charge that this is government interference. This is a party matter. Certainly Members on this side of the House have the right and indeed the obligation to put forth their views, especially on a Private Member's Bill. I take exception to the Hon. Member.

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I would like to—

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Deputy Prime Minister could stay in the House. On a point of order, the Deputy Prime Minister should stay in the House for this matter. He shouldn't fly away on this issue. What a cop-out.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cassidy: You will not be here next time, Mailly, not after that performance.

Mrs. Mailly: Do not hold your breath.

Mr. Cassidy: You will not be here. How are you going to vote on these amendments?

Mrs. Mailly: I won by 9,000, you won by 64.

Mr. Cassidy: Why are you not getting your Deputy Prime Minister to come back into the House? Why do you not get him here to face the music? Where is he? Go and get him now; show you care about your constituents.

Mrs. Mailly: Show respect for the Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier has the floor.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I—

Mr. Cassidy: Show that you care about your constituents. Do not just sit there like a lump on a log.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): We have had the opportunity to listen to the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre. He has received a reply from the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister. I would now like to hear the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier.

Mr. Cassidy: I find this totally preposterous, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the same question. I am sorry to see that the the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) had to leave. Nevertheless—

Mr. Cassidy: He chose to leave.

Mr. Gauthier: In the spirit of the new rules that apply to this House, the rules we call parliamentary reform, there is indeed a Private Members' Hour tonight at five o'clock, at which time private Members' initiatives are taken up and studied. Tonight, we are taking up Bill C-273 which proposes to extend certain political rights to public servants. I agree

with that Bill. I was a member of the committee that studied it and I know that the Bill submitted to the House at report stage, amended by serious consideration of all members of all Parties and in consultation with experts in the field, represented the viewpoint which I supported and endorsed.

At the time I was sorry that the Government did not take the initiative to make the Bill a government order so that we could indeed have sufficient time for all Hon. Members to ensure that the Bill was properly discussed. That was not done. I now find the House in a situation which is very difficult.

There are 25 amendments to this Bill and we have one hour to discuss them. It will be physically impossible. I do not criticize the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) for getting quite upset. It is impossible for the House to deal with these amendments by the Government, on the order of the Government, and by government members acting in concert with the government initiative. I therefore take great exception to this whole process.

I would hope that the Hon. Member for Ottawa West (Mr. Daubney) would withdraw his Bill. That is the only decent thing that can be done because the Bill has been absolutely torn up by the Government. As the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre said, killer amendments will not help this Bill in any way.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would hope that the House Leaders would be able to discuss this matter without discussing it now on the floor of the House of Commons because we have Orders of the Day to consider. The House Leaders could discuss the matter and then return to the Chamber and make the agreement. I do not think that this is the time to continue raising these points of order.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader arising out of the Government House Leader's statement.

I would like to know what are the Government's intentions if by ten o'clock this evening or at ten o'clock this evening, Bill C-144, the child care Bill, has not yet reached the point of second reading. Will the Government call Bill C-144 tomorrow, or will it instead proceed to Bill C-130, the Bill to implement the trade deal?

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, as the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) said a few minutes ago, we will now proceed with Bill C-144 and, if we find agreement in this House to conclude the second reading stage tonight, then—

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): In one day?

Mr. Grisé: If we conclude second reading tonight, as the Deputy Prime Minister said, we will deal with Bill C-144 followed by Bill C-130. I think it is very clear that the Deputy Prime Minister said that we will deal with Bill C-144 followed by Bill C-130.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, on the same point, I am just seeking clarification. I appreciate what the Parliamentary Secretary has informed us, but the question is: if Bill C-144 is not completed at second reading stage before 10 o'clock tonight, what will be the business of the day tomorrow?

Mr. Grisé: Mr. Speaker, once again, the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) is putting a hypothetical question. He is asking what will happen if Bill C-144 has not concluded second reading stage tonight. That will depend upon how many speakers rise and how Members of the House will react to that. We will act accordingly.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, this is totally preposterous. I would like to ask a question of the Parliamentary Secretary in simple, clear language. There are 50 amendments dealing with Bill C-130 before the House. We have until six o'clock tonight to table further amendments if members of the Opposition, or government members for that matter, so choose. It will be impossible for us to organize the day tomorrow if the Parliamentary Secretary does not come clean with us. For tomorrow, August 12, at ten o'clock, what does the Government intend to call as the order of business in the House of Commons? Will it be Bill C-144 or Bill C-130?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grisé: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat it in French, although I thought I made myself pretty clear. The Deputy Prime Minister said in the House a few moments ago, in his reply to the Liberal House Leader, that today we were considering Bill C-144, and that if we managed to finish second reading this evening, we would then proceed with Bill C-130. I have now said the same thing three times over, and this is the same information the Deputy Prime Minister gave the House a few moments ago.

• (1530)

[*English*]

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary is playing a game with us. That might indicate to people following these debates why the Government has difficulty getting its business through the House. At the end of the day there are two possibilities. We might be continuing on Bill C-144, not having concluded second reading, or we might have concluded second reading. The difference is very important for this House.

We in our Party, like the NDP, have Members who want to participate in tomorrow's business if it is Bill C-144, and different Members if it is Bill C-130. The purpose of the Thursday question is to settle for the advantage of all Members what the score is, where we will be, who ought to be prepared to speak, and what the government order of business will be. Nothing can be clearer than the position which the

Parliamentary Secretary put to us if we conclude second reading of Bill C-144 tonight. He has given a very clear answer to that. However, what if we do not? That is a possibility for which we want to be prepared.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Deputy Prime Minister is in the House and he can answer that.

Mr. Kaplan: We can have an orderly day in the House tomorrow—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Chair is naturally the servant of the House, but I would hope that on a Thursday this type of discussion would take place with House Leaders in House Leaders negotiations.

Mr. Gauthier: They do not. They are playing games.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Deputy Prime Minister is here, and I am sure he will be able to clear it up.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I regret the confusion. I just walked into my office and watched the exchange going on. I can only assume from the comments made that it is the intention of the Opposition to filibuster Bill C-144, the child care Bill. That being the case we will call Bill C-130 tomorrow.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Does the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap have any further remarks?

Mr. Riis: For clarification, Mr. Speaker, I believe we have heard that if the debate on Bill C-144 is not completed at second reading stage tonight then we will definitely be going to Bill C-130 tomorrow. All we were seeking was clarification so that we can plan. I take some offence at a lot of government Members yelling that we have to wait until tomorrow. We try to operate this place as effectively and efficiently as possible and to do that—

Mr. Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Oh, yes, of course! What did you do yesterday, you turkey?

Mr. Riis: —we have to have some indication of what is coming up.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Orders of the Day. A point of order?

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The NDP House Leader has straightened that out. I will listen to the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to put this on the record. The Deputy Prime Minister suggested that the amendments put forward to Bill C-273 were what he called a caucus initiative, indicating that that was somehow different from a government initiative. I was trying to point out that on several occasions the Hon. Member for Ottawa West has raised this issue with his caucus, and while I was not present, I understand his colleagues were quite happy to see that Bill go forward. What has changed—

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Cassidy: —is that the Government has decided to intervene. The letter to my Leader, if I can continue—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): When Bill C-273 comes up for debate I hope the Hon. Member will bring that to my attention.

Mr. Cassidy: This is a matter of government business.

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Cassidy: Without being announced as such, particularly when the Deputy Prime Minister writes to my Leader about it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADA CHILD CARE ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Epp (Provencher) that Bill C-144, an Act to authorize payments by Canada toward the provision of child care services, and to amend the Canada Assistance Plan in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Before I recognize the Hon. Minister, earlier today during the course of debate on second reading of Bill C-144, the Hon. Member for Outremont proposed to move the following reasoned amendment on which the Chair reserved:

> That the motion be amended by deleting all of the words after the word "That" and by substituting the following:
>
> "This House objects to the principle of Bill C-144, an Act to authorize payments by Canada toward the provision of child care services, and to amend the Canada Assistance Plan in consequence thereof, which is to establish a program that does not provide access and services in all provinces and equal access to low and middle income families."

After consideration, the Chair finds a major procedural difficulty with the wording of the proposed amendment. As stated in Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 744(1), a reasoned amendment "must be declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions of the Bill". In her amendment the Hon. Member simply indicates her objection to the principle of the Bill and, as indicated in Beauchesne's Citation 745(4), "an amendment which amounts to no more than a direct negation of the principle of the Bill is open to objection".

I must therefore rule the amendment out of order as it does not constitute a reasoned amendment and as it amounts, in its form, to an expanded negative.

May I point out to the Hon. Member and the House that the results sought by the amendment can be achieved by simply voting against the principle of the Bill, that is, by voting against the second reading motion. Furthermore, the Chair would like to remind the House that the text of a reasoned amendment should include words indicating that the House does not wish to give a Bill second reading. For that purpose, I refer Hon. Members to page 531 of Erskine May's Twentieth Edition.

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism) and Minister of State (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to address Bill C-144, the Canada Child Care Act. As my colleague, the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp), indicated, this Bill provides for implementation of the most important component of the national strategy on child care. It responds to the child care needs of Canadians with an innovative, flexible policy that is both generous and equitable. It represents a major move forward for children, parents, and families throughout the country.

Child care is probably one of the most pressing social issues facing legislators today. This Bill reflects this Government's strong commitment to improve the quality and quantity of care in all regions of the country. The Government will spend $6.4 billion on child care over the next seven years, and another $1 billion annually after that. This is a significant response to the realities of our society today and lays the foundation for an improved quality of life for the Canadian family in the future.

As Minister of State for Indian Affairs and Northern Development, I am especially pleased that the national strategy on child care has been expanded to recognize the special needs and concerns of Indian people. Indians must be full and productive participants in society if Canada is to go into the 21st century a more mature and stronger nation. Today a wide range of federal programs and services is provided to Indians. For example, CMHC has a rural and native housing program, DRIE's native economic development program, and CEIC's native internship program.

• (1540)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, Indians must also have access to child care, child care that is both flexible and affordable, so that they can concentrate on their jobs and improve their quality of life. As Hon. Members are aware, despite progress made in recent years, economic conditions in Indian communities lag behind the national average. This means that the ability of an Indian family to find good child care for its children while one or both parents work can be essential to that family's well being.

I am very glad to say that as a result of this Government's initiative, some 2,000 child care spaces for Indian children will be created over six years, that is, for children living on reserves.

However, creating child care spaces according to the provincial model will not resolve a specifically Indian problem. Like all Canadians, Indians are very concerned about their children's well being, and anyone who visits Indian families living on reserves will see how important children are to those families. Child care must therefore meet safety and other standards while also respecting the social and cultural traditions of the group in question, in this case the Indians.

Mr. Speaker, Indian child care in Canada is underdeveloped. Most provincial governments have been reluctant to extend their programs to Indian reserves since they are, admittedly, a federal responsibility.

Only the Province of Ontario finances Indian child care through a contribution agreement with the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. On some reserves, bands have set up their own daycare, but such cases are few and far between.

[*English*]

The Government of Canada has a special relationship with Indian people living on reserves. It was in recognition of this relationship that Health and Welfare Canada, in consultation with the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, developed the special Indian component of the national strategy on child care. This component provides for an expenditure of $60 million over six years to develop and stimulate the growth of accredited child care services on reserves. This is the first time in Canada's history that such funds have been made available specifically to serve the needs of Indian children.

Although the administrative details of this initiative are yet to be worked out, the funding schedule has been set and some basic goals and principles have been established for the program. Beginning April 1, 1989, the Government of Canada will invest $5 million in each of the first two years of the program, $10 million in each of the third and fourth years, and $15 million in each of the final two years of the program. The funds will be administered by Health and Welfare Canada with assistance from Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

This money will be used to fund a number of significant pilot projects designed to determine exactly what is needed in terms of Indian child care and how to deliver that. It is anticipated that the program will create about 2,000 child care spaces over six years. Equally as important, it will help us establish how the Indian child care system should work.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, obviously Indians will be fully consulted on the implementation of this program in their communities, as will the provinces. Since this Government came to power, we have always taken this approach, and we intend to start consultations in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, we have reason to expect that the program will develop in such a way that Indians will be able to exercise direct control over a child care system that is also in line with our approach to the provision of services to Indians.

Our primary objective will be to create services, with and for Indians, which respect Indians values, traditions and culture. Indian child care should not merely reflect the kind of system established by the provinces. It will be thoroughly Indian, while meeting current standards for health, safety, child-staff ratios, staff accreditation and licensing.

[*English*]

I want to emphasize that Indians will continue to have access to the $100 million child care initiative fund, another important element of the Government's national strategy on child care. Among other things, the child care initiative fund supports applied research and demonstration projects which address the needs of certain groups in society. Indians have been designated as one of the target groups for this research and plans are already under way for a major study of child care on Indian reserves.

The fund will help child care training institutions develop course materials which are sensitive to Indian culture and Indians will be encouraged to participate in this special training.

The national strategy on child care is more wide ranging and flexible than any such program ever offered by a federal Government. Today's generation of Indian children must become full and productive partners in the Canada of tomorrow. I am sure that Hon. Members of this House can contribute meaningfully to that future by giving this legislation unqualified support and speedy passage.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, for us in the Official Opposition the idea of child care is obviously important. It is an idea whose time has certainly come. How can the Minister possibly consider that his Government has responded to the promise it made in the last election campaign with this program which was not introduced in the four years of its normal mandate and will only create 200,000 additional day care spaces in the coming four-year period when the need, which is recognized by the Government I believe, is for one million additional child care spaces? With the good times which Canada has known in the last four years and the problem which the Government has recognized, how can it say that 200,000 additional spaces to be created over the next four years is an adequate response?

Mr. Valcourt: Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised by the statement made by the spokesman for the Liberal Party. Canadians must find that strange. Kids were not born in this country on September 4, 1984, for the first time. We have had children in Canada for a long, long time. As far as I can recollect no Liberal Government ever even attempted to create such a program as we have for the parents of Canada.

We know where the Liberal Party stands on many issues. On the issue of child care it says that this is not enough. Of course anyone can make that argument. The issue today is whether this Bill provides a good program for Canadian parents and their children.

Liberals and socialists do not consult. They tell people what they need. Our Government has listened to the people. A task force has studied this and spoken to people. There are, of course, certain vocal groups who say that this is not enough. They would rather spend $14 billion and tell Canadians that that is what they will receive. That is not the Conservative way. The Conservative Government respects people and respects what they want.

• (1550)

People want a choice and that is what this Bill does. Canadians will not be forced into anything specific for which they do not have a choice. That is what this program is all about.

Our Government wants to implement this Bill. It is on our agenda. Yesterday, the Hon. Member's leader was in the House telling Canadians and the Prime Minister that we should call an election. We have not even had four years in government. Today they complain that we have not yet adopted child care.

If the Liberals were in government we would not even be discussing child care for Canadians because they would be on vacation or campaigning for an election. I find it very strange that he accuses us of bringing in this measure in the fourth year of our mandate. We have accomplished many things in those four years. We could have done it the Liberal way and ran measures down the throats of Canadians. Instead, we have consulted with Canadians. We have used an approach in which we are sure that Canadians support us.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me an opportunity to come back to the thin soup served by the Minister in answer to that question.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), three times during Question Period, was content to put forward what he considered to be comparisons between his Government and the former Government. The Minister has done the same thing. I do not think they should hope to be able to continue living in the past. That will not be good enough for Canadians, to hear them criticizing the former Government as a way of seeking applause for their Government's record.

The times have changed and the Official Opposition has changed. An example is the policies we have developed on South Africa in light of events over the last few years. It is ridiculous for the Government to continue living in the past and acting as if Canadians will be satisfied to have comparisons between this terrible Government and the former Government.

There was no answer to my question. Does he really believe the Government has fulfilled its campaign promise by providing in the fourth year of its mandate a program that will only deliver 200,000 additional child care spaces spread out over the next four years when the need today is for a million spaces?

Mr. Valcourt: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member talks about living in the past. He wants Canadians to believe that the Liberal Party is living in the present and the future. Canadians will see for themselves.

I am a Member from the Province of New Brunswick and I remember the past with the Liberal Government almost bankrupting the country. Today we hear that 200,000 spaces is not enough. It means that we would need more money to put into this program. It could require some $10 billion or $14 billion, but the Liberals do not care about the future. They did not mind almost bankrupting the country. We had terrible unemployment rates across Canada. They had a deficit of $38 billion. The Hon. Member believes that Canadians will trust the Liberal Party with the finances of Canada.

The Hon. Member asks whether this measure fulfills our promise to Canadians. Yes, it does.

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, under the current day care policy we would have produced more day care spaces in six years than this proposal before us will produce in seven years. Will the Minister tell us why the House and Canadians should approve such a retrogressive step? Why should we be pleased with this legislation that will produce less day care spaces than the existing program?

Mr. Valcourt: Mr. Speaker, they would impose on Canadians something they do not want. Socialists do not care what people think; they have all the answers. They have the corner on principles, on virtue, and on truth. We know what they are suggesting with their universal system. It would be to ram through a system on Canadians, without giving them a choice. Canadians have told us otherwise, and we have answered accordingly.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pépin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Fisheries Minister that he is spouting fine words, instead of answering and stating the facts correctly. I would like to tell him that twenty years ago, it was difficult to set up day care centres because women had four children on average and worked at home. In the last twenty years, the model of the traditional family has changed.

When the need became apparent, studies were done by Rosie Abella and Katie Cook, but the Conservative Government, when it took power, shelved them and set up another committee, which I was on. However, the Conservative Government has not even answered some of the recommendations made in the report of this all-party committee.

So he says, "What do Canadians want?" Well, I am telling you: they want accessibility for all children from low- and middle-income families and they want quality services.

I would like the Minister to tell us what his Government will do with the new Bill to provide access for all children from low- and middle-income families, when this is not mentioned at all and no priority is given to this kind of family. So what will his Government do for these families in 1988?

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Minister's time has expired, but I will allow him to answer the question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Valcourt: I will be brief, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Member asks me what the Government has done for families in 1988. It introduced Bill C-144 and contributed more than $6 billion for a child care system to be set up in cooperation with the provincial governments throughout Canada. That is what the Government . . .

Look, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Liberal Party is sorry that it cannot claim authorship for this major social program, but that is what Canadians decided in 1984 when they gave us a mandate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments are concluded. Debate. The Hon. Member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan).

[*English*]

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed being able to participate briefly in the question and comment session with the Hon. Minister about this child care program. When he was pressed on the question of whether he considered the program the Government is delivering today to be adequate fulfilment of the Government's promise to Canadians during the last election, he said "yes". This program will create 200,000 additional day care spaces in the Canadian stock of all day care spaces, including private and public, over a seven-year period.

During the last election campaign, Canadians, particularly the millions of women in the Canadian population, were promised an adequate, comprehensive day care program.

• (1600)

In my riding alone, the day care shortfall today is 20,000 spaces. That means that one-tenth of this magnificent program delivered by the Government to the millions of women to whom it promised adequate child care is needed in one small corner of Metropolitan Toronto. This is not an adequate program.

It is very significant that the program is being delivered today. It is very significant that at the beginning of this debate the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) of Canada stood outside in the hall telling the media that the Government had fulfilled its promise to the women of Canada in delivering this child care program. I think the Government saying that our

determination to debate this Bill until the end of today constituted a filibuster is also significant. Why is it a filibuster? This is the first day the subject has been debated in this House of Commons. It is a one-day debate about a $6 billion program that the Government claims delivers on one of its major promises. We have been brought back in the middle of the summer with an election call, we hope, coming very soon. This Bill has been put on the menu and we are told we have to finish the debate on second reading by the end of the day or we will be accused of filibustering.

Ms. Mitchell: Filibustering after two hours.

Mr. Kaplan: We will be accused of filibustering after only two hours as my friend from Vancouver observes. I think that is easy to understand. The Government does not want this matter to be fully debated. It does not want the Canadian people to see what I call the thin suit of its day care program in the light of parliamentary debate and examination. The Government wants a one-liner. It wants to be able to say it delivered on a promise to establish a comprehensive day care program in Canada, and the less said about it, the better, because when we look at this program we find it is a pathetic farce and fraud. It is a particular fraud on the women of Canada. They are the ones for whom this program is the most meaningful.

Members opposite like to blame all their shortcomings on the former Government. I was a Minister in the former government and I was proud of it. However, we were not a government that was in a position to deliver the programs required by this country for all time. The need for day care is something that snuck up on the people of Canada and on successive governments. We were not as sensitive as we should have been in the past, and I mean all of us, to the situation of women. We did not recognize until very recently that what we thought was the typical family was very far from the typical family. A typical family, we thought, was one where one of the spouses, the wife, in most cases, was at home looking after the children. If she was not, she was out working to provide fulfilling activity for herself, to enrich her life and to provide some extra spending money to supplement the earnings of the main bread-winner, the husband. But anyone who thinks that is the typical family today has a lot to learn and one can learn it in my riding and in any other riding in our country.

The fact is that there are very few families where there is a spouse living at home and keeping the home fires going as the main occupation. Women are working and in a lot of cases they are the only wage earner in the family. They are the bread-winner. They are working to support their families and we are tying a hand behind their backs by not having an adequate day care program.

Until medicare was established, we caused suffering in Canada by not having such a program. Medicare is now a program equally meaningful to men and women. Day care is not. I think we should be blunt about recognizing that part of the reason for the delay in bringing in day care was the fact that this place was mainly peopled by men with the perspective that did not recognize the actual facts of family life and the terrible burden carried by women in our society. I see this, if not during the rest of the year, in election campaigns, when I make a point of being at bus-stops and subway stations at six-thirty in the morning when people in my riding are going to work on a typical day. I see the women, not the men, leading young children to whatever kind of day care arrangements they have been able to make so they can go out and make a living in order to keep their families going.

The Minister has the nerve to say that Canada cannot afford a better day care program than a measly 200,000 additional spaces to be created over the next five years. That man should be ashamed of himself when he makes such a statement like that about the economic and social needs of our society and about the simple question of social justice in the field of day care. To wait until a hot summer day, probably hours before an election will be called, to try to twist our arms so that we do not have time to tell the Canadian people the truth about this fraudulent effort to validate a campaign promise is too much. I do not think we should let the Bill go through today even though it is an important measure and even though I would rather have 200,000 additional day care spaces than none.

We cannot let this Bill go through without letting the Canadian people hear what is wrong with it. In the last election campaign, three big beautiful promises were made to the Canadian people about day care by each of the national Parties. The Liberals made their promise as well as the New Democratic Party and the Conservatives. Each was different. I was interested in the subject, and I am glad to be able to speak today, because it is the most important issue in my riding, in my opinion.

The issue of day care can bring out on a day's notice a large crowd of people, mainly women, with babies in their arms, with problems they are looking at the legislators of this country to solve. We have seen this in the front pages of the newspapers in Toronto over the last few days as a municipal government tries to cope with the delivery of a social service without adequate help, without comprehensive help, from the federal Government. Yet the municipal government, which mainly draws its revenue from property taxes is continuing to provide the level of service it did in the past, although a low level, at great difficulty to its own tax base.

I am not saying it is easy to finance a day care program for Canada, but it is important. It is essential and the sensible economic development of our country requires that we do it.

The promises of each of the political Parties were different and only one of those Parties won the last election. The Conservatives won with 211 Members of Parliament. That promise was what meant the most in my riding. I think people were expecting that when the Conservatives were elected they would deliver a universal, comprehensive day care program that would solve the problem the way the old age pension has solved the problem of our senior citizens being the poorest Canadians in our society—they were before but they are no longer—and the way in which medicare solved the problem of poor people and people in poor regions not being able to afford proper medical care. Medicare solved that problem. People expected that a strong Conservative Government with a sacred trust to keep would have delivered that program.

• (1610)

Our program, which I hope I will have time to talk about in a moment, was not brought forward because we were not the government. The NDP program, which I do not agree with, but which would have done a lot more than the program delivered by the Government, is on the shelf because the NDP did not form the Government either. The Government frittered away its majority and its claim on five years or four years of control of the House to deliver a comprehensive day care program. In the dying hours of Parliament we have a pathetic attempt by the Government to make the women and the people of the country think that it is fulfilling a campaign promise that we expected would be fulfilled five years since.

[*Translation*]

I wish to pay tribute to my colleague, the Hon. Member for Outremont (Mrs. Pépin), our child care critic who has worked very hard for the past four years, on all the reviews requested by the Government, all the committees that drafted their reports and were directed by the Government to proceed with a review of the work they had already done. The Hon. Member finally produced a report which we in the Official Opposition have adopted as our own.

[*English*]

I am proud to have circulated the Official Opposition's proposals on child care. They are comprehensive and they cost a lot more than the ones before us today, but they will work and give us a day care program; not the type of program that the NDP have talked about which is delivered in state-owned institutions to children across the country, and not a program which forces the closure of day care programs run by women in their homes in my riding. As far as we are concerned, for profit types of day care centres are perfectly acceptable. In the Liberal Party we have no objection ideologically to entrepreneurs who believe that they can deliver a good day care program and make money at it. In our view there is absolutely nothing objectionable to that. In fact, we propose to stimulate their activities by providing government funds to them under circumstances that I have described.

Ms. Mitchell: Misuse of tax dollars.

Mr. Kaplan: The NDP consider that a misuse of funds. I hope that we will be talking about that in the next election campaign. Certainly day care will still be an issue in the next election campaign. Perhaps the Conservatives will have nothing more to say about it except to claim that they did what they promised. In my riding, in Toronto, and in places where people have turned their backs on the Conservatives, they will be wanting to know what type of real, serious, effective day care programs will be introduced after the next election when hopefully a Party other than that presently on your right, Mr. Speaker, will have the opportunity to keep some of its promises on the subject of day care.

I have talked about the inadequacy of the day care program delivered by the Government. One other fundamental difficulty with that program is that it does not establish national standards. The Government revels in the concept of consultation and how wonderful it is to consult with the provinces and to consult with the groups in society that are interested in an issue. That is motherhood, and it is easy to agree with. Even the former Government recognized that consultation was desirable. It is not a contradiction of the concept of consultation to also advance the concept of leadership.

Canadians expect the Government to provide leadership, and expect Parliament to provide leadership. They particularly expect it when we are talking about money being spent through the Government that has been raised from the Canadian people. We have taken their money through taxes and we have established a priority. The basic principle of democratic accountability requires us to provide some leadership in the area in which we are turning over that money to be spent, whether by provincial governments, day care agencies, or whatever it is. We must establish some standards. After all, we are using the money received from the voters. We have to be accountable for some type of standard.

This Government does not understand or agree with that fundamental principle. It feels it is enough to say how it feels and then to write cheques across the country and let those who get the money deliver the program or a substitute for the program at whatever level they consider proper. I do not think that Canadians want that type of federal government. In a country with such a diversity as ours in economic standards the Canadian people want Parliament to set objectives or to set standards for the child care program. We want to support a national level in as many areas of Canadian life as possible, and certainly in those areas where we are turning over federal taxpayers' money to keep programs going.

I deplore the feature of this day care program which does not establish any standards. It says to the provinces: "It's your jurisdiction. You may establish programs. Here is some money, we hope that you will spend it wisely". We ought to do better than that, and Canadians expect us to do better than that. Failure to show leadership in this area and in many other areas is a reason why Canadians are turning their backs on the Conservatives and why their standing is as low as it is with the Canadian people.

I want to share with people in the House the dilemma that one has on how to vote on second reading of a measure as bad as this. We support child care. We want to see federal tax dollars and federal standards and objectives established in this area of child care. The Government has brought forward a measure which we feel is a political fraud because it does not deliver an effective universal child care program. Yet the Government will characterize it as such. Therefore, it is a dilemma. We want to indicate to the Canadian people that we support child care. We want to see this $6.4 billion spent in the area of child care. With our recent amendment put forward by the Hon. Member for Outremont (Mrs. Pépin), which was not found to be in order, we wanted to demonstrate that this program is terribly lacking. I hope that in the speeches that will be delivered by members of the Official Opposition we will be able to indicate that we want the $6.4 billion to be spent over the next seven years. We want more to be spent. We do not approve of a program that is so woefully inadequate and so fraudulent in political terms.

• (1620)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments. the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell).

Ms. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I have a number of questions. I obviously do not have enough time for them, but I would like to, first of all, clarify a couple of points that the Member made. I must say that I am surprised to see this Member, whom I have a great deal of respect for, repeating some of the misinformation that the Minister himself is promoting regarding the NDP policy. First of all, does he not realize that non-profit day care, which is what we advocate, is not the same as government institutions? There could be public day care as well. We have no objection to that. I wish that he would check into that and clarify that non-profit societies are quite a different thing than government institutions. We are saying that we believe that federal money should go to child care that is not for profit. On the other hand, we are not opposed to commercial day care, providing it is self-sustaining. If parents want to use it and pay fees for it, fine. We are not saying that it should not be commercial. We are saying that it should not be supported by tax dollars. I wish he would be more clear about that.

We are also very much in favour of in-home day care. We want women in the home or people in the home to be licensed as family day care homes, so that they will have decent pay in order to have the chance for all the resources and support that they need. They will have money to get fences and everything will be prepared the way it should be. There would be good quality family day care homes, not just baby-sitting with kids plunked in front of a TV set. If parents still want to use casual informal care, that is their right. We should not be paying federal money. I wanted to clarify those points first.

I will now get to my question. The former Minister, who is well informed on matters of justice, mentioned the question of national objectives. I do not agree with what he was saying and what the Liberals keep saying about national standards. It is not the role of the federal Government to establish standards in areas that are provincial jurisdiction. This was analysed over and over again in our committee, with considerable expertise on this.

In both medicare and health and welfare, the question of standards are a provincial jurisdiction, but certainly those standards should be based on principles. I would ask him to clarify a little bit more the significance of not having national objectives. Also, does he feel, as I do, that the Government seems to be trying to push this particular social program—the only new social program that we have had for many, many years—through before Meech Lake is applied, and has deliberately not put in "the national objectives", which would be required under the Meech Lake Accord?

There is no statement of principles on which provinces would be required to base their standards. There is also no enforcement mechanism as we have in medicare. I wonder if he would comment further on that and if he has any suggestions as to how this should be developed in a way that is closer to the medicare model.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Hon. Member got up and stated the NDP policy in her own way, because she can certainly state it better than I can, and I accept her statement of her own policy. I am glad also that I can emphasize a very important difference that emerges between the NDP and the Liberals on this subject. That is, we do not think that for-profit operations are bad. We think that they may be entitled to receive support from the taxpayers if they are prepared to meet the standard of the programs—

Ms. Mitchell: You better read the studies.

Mr. Kaplan: The Member is indicating that the studies may show that there is something wrong with some of the profit day care centres, but that may be all the more reason why the federal Government ought to turn to them, or to turn to them through the provinces, and encourage them, with tax dollars, to do something. For the life of me, I do not accept as a principle—and I know that the NDP do—that when something is run for profit it is not going to be run as well as something that is non-profit.

Ms. Mitchell: Where does the profit come from?

Mr. Kaplan: I think that profit and the opportunity to make profit assures an efficient operation. Now, efficiency—

Ms. Mitchell: Read the studies. That is not true.

Mr. Kaplan: I did not interrupt the Hon. Member while she was speaking. Efficiency can be a very desirable component of any operation. There is nothing wrong with having an operation more efficient, providing that it is delivering the goods. If day care can be delivered efficiently by entrepreneurs and profit produced at the bottom line, I do not think that we should turn our backs on it. I think in fact it has a lot to commend it. That is the difference between the way that the Liberals look at things and the way that the NDP look at them.

The Hon. Member made a comment about standards. She does not feel—and I am shocked to hear it—that it is the place of the federal Government to set standards. Well, maybe the difference between us is semantic. I do not mean by standard precise definitions, ceiling heights of rooms where day care centres are to be established, or fire regulations or things like that. I recognize that these are matters which are very regionalized across our country. To try to specify construction materials and size and shape, and even hours, can be totally out of whack with local standards in a particular community.

But I insist that it should be the part of the federal Government, wanting to provide leadership, and hopefully a government does want to provide leadership, to set as much of a national standard as it can. We have done this to a degree in medicare, a degree that I think we can be quite proud of. We have not only made sure that high quality medicare is available right across our country, in poor parts of our country and in well-off parts of our country, but that it is accessible, wherever it is found, to poor people and to people who are well off. That is the kind of national standard or national objective that I would like to see.

Finally, the Hon. Member wanted me to comment on the Meech Lake idea about opting out, I suppose, of a shared-cost program. I hope that this would be a program where all the provinces would want to participate. The question of opting out and sharing costs and having different programs and getting compensation for them would not arise. That, after all, is a matter for the federal Government to negotiate. If the federal Government goes about it in a sensible way and has the support of the Canadian people, I do not see why provinces would want to opt out and to provide programs of their own that might be different and lead to the test of whether they meet national objectives or not.

In other words, I would like to see programs rather than references to the Supreme Court of Canada about the interpretation of Meech Lake.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Member whether, in his assessment of the situation in his own community, the excessive demand in the City of Toronto, for example, where they have more than 1,000 children on a waiting list, trying to get into available spaces, this program will in any way alleviate that incredible demand.

Mr. Kaplan: I am glad that the Hon. Member asked me about Toronto, because she is an expert not only in Toronto but in Hamilton as well. I did my own research on the subject and found that the demand in my riding of York Centre, unfilled, is for 20,000 additional day care spaces. That is just for one riding, one corner, of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. Those 20,000 spaces are needed now, not spread out over the next four years.

We have a program that delivers to our whole country 200,000 spaces, and over the next seven years you will see the total inadequacy of it. I do not think that the Government deserves our co-operation in rubber stamping this Bill by ten o'clock tonight so that they can go out to the country and claim that they fulfilled a promise.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments are now terminated. Debate. The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works (Mrs. Martin).

Mrs. Shirley Martin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise and to take part in this debate about something that is very close to me, having chaired the parliamentary committee on child care, along with the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell) and the Hon. Member for Outremont (Mrs. Pépin), who have already spoken on this subject. As the Hon. Member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan) said, we cannot let this go through without the facts being heard, and without hearing what is wrong with the Bill. I think it is time that some of facts are put on the record to correct what has been said by Members opposite.

• (1630)

The Hon. Member for Vancouver East commented in her speech this morning that I was not present in the House to listen to what she had to say. I can assure her that I was listening to what she had to say through the medium of television which we happen to have in this place. I would like to correct some of the things that she said.

The Hon. Member mentioned that two million children under the age of 14 have parents who are working. She also said this included parents who work not only full time but 20 hours a week or are studying for 20 hours a week. Two million children under the age of 14 do not all need licensed day care spaces. Parents who work 20 hours a week may be working three or four hours a day. One spouse can be working while the other is at home looking after their child. People can also be working when their child is in school. Let us not mislead people by saying two million children under the age of 14 need licensed day care spaces.

Ms. Mitchell: I did not say that.

Mr. Keeper: Do not mislead the people.

Mrs. Martin: I am not misleading people. I am commenting on what was said this morning.

Mr. Orlikow: That is not what the Member for Vancouver East said.

Mrs. Martin: Perhaps when the "blues" come in we can check that—

Mr. Orlikow: You need new glasses.

Mrs. Martin: I am not using glasses—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order. The Hon. Member will have plenty of time to ask questions or make comments. I hope he will show some courtesy to the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary.

Mrs. Martin: Mr. Speaker, it is apparent the New Democrats do not like to hear the truth.

I would like to go on with something else that was mentioned. Only 11.5 per cent of these children can be assured of quality licensed care. I take a little bit of exception to that because the Member said that other children are in the care of relatives, neighbours, nannies, or baby-sitters and are in unreliable care. I do not believe the care of a grandmother, a neighbour or a nanny is necessarily unreliable care.

Ms. Mitchell: I did not say that either.

Mrs. Martin: I come from a single parent family. When I was seven years old my father died and I was raised by a single parent mother. Fortunately, I had a very loving mother who gave me good care. I know what it is like to be a child of a single parent. I also worked when my two children were born. I had to work throughout their upbringing and used care outside of the home as well as within the home. I was fortunate in that my husband shared that care with me. He looked after the children while I was at work and I looked after them when he was at work. I had the help of family and I also had to use outside care. It was licensed care and it was not non-profit care but it was care given by a very loving woman because she cared for children. Yes, she made a profit but that did not mean the care was any less. So I have been involved in some of what we are talking about today.

I really find it difficult when so much is being said that care cannot be good care unless it is non-profit licensed care. Care, and good care, comes from the people giving that care. It does not matter whether people are getting paid for it through a non-profit system or a profit system, they are doing it out of the love of caring for children. They are doing it as a neighbour for maybe minimal dollars. Nobody looks after children because they want an easy job. Nobody looks after children just to make money. You cannot look after children unless you really care about them. If you care about children you care about the quality of the care given to them.

The Hon. Member for Vancouver East went on to say that Tory Members on the child care committee favoured the traditional family. I do not make any apologies for saying that we favoured the traditional family. We recognize that we have traditional families still in this country. Traditional families also have needs as far as raising children are concerned and have to be included in any policy that we set.

Most single parents in this country are in that position by circumstance, not necessarily by choice. They need help in raising children. The legislation before us will continue to give them the help with the care they need. The legislation also recognizes that parents who are at home require help. It also recognizes that where two parents work and are paying for their child care they deserve some recognition for the dollars they pay out. This legislation recognizes the cost of child care and allows parents to make the choice of and how they will care for their children. It also recognizes that when those children are under school age that cost of care is more expensive. They should, therefore, have a higher tax allowance. We have done that.

The Member went on to say that the Tories on the committee said that quality was not needed. That is not true. We all agreed, unanimously, on the committee that quality was very important. Where we disagreed is how that quality could be delivered. I mentioned earlier that quality is delivered by caring people in the child care field whether or not it is for profit. The Hon. Member for Vancouver East and the Hon. Member for Outremont would have to agree that as we crossed this country and visited 31 cities in every province and the territories, in the small towns and large towns, we listened to what the people of Canada wanted as far as the care of their children was concerned. Quality was definitely one of the items they were looking for. Quality came in many different ways and certainly was not synonymous with non-profit licensed care.

The Member also mentioned that we took $2.3 billion away from services. We did not take $2.3 billion away from services. We took $2.3 billion and have directed it to parents to allow them to care for their children and meet their responsibilities in raising them. They can decide how they want to raise their children. While we directed to parents $2.3 billion through the tax system, we also invested some $4 billion to provide additional day care spaces. All I have heard so far in this debate is that we are limiting growth to 200,000 spaces. It needs to be said that we are directing subsidized funding to create 200,000 spaces that we will share with the provinces, spaces to help those who cannot pay for their own child care. That is only growth in the subsidized spaces, not in total child care spaces in this country. For those people who can afford child care and can pay for it out of their own pocket, that space is not one of the 200,000.

As the Hon. Member for York Centre (Mr. Kilgour) said, he sees nothing wrong with the profit side of the picture coming into child care. If the need is there, entrepreneurs will create the spaces for children and supply those spaces. We heard from some excellent people who had turned their homes into child care centres. Some had 10 or 12 children in them and some had as few as 5. They provided good care. The entrepreneurs are not large chain systems which do not care about children. Entrepreneurs are neighbours, friends and relatives who care about children and are willing to go into the market to provide spaces for children.

Then the Member mentioned that there was no provision for latchkey children. The Hon. Member knows better than that. There is nothing in the legislation that restricts the beginning or the continuance of after-school and pre-school programs. It is part of the over-all child care provisions in the provinces.

• (1640)

The Province of Quebec has a system in which the school boards themselves are involved. For other provinces provide the space is provided for child care within the school system but the programs are run by the parents, by non-profit organizations and in some cases by for-profit organizations.

The spaces are there to look after children pre and post-school and they will continue to grow. Under the $100 million initiative fund, which no one on the opposition side has bothered to mention, the total federal dollars that have gone into the care of children, can be used to improve methods for caring for so-called latchkey children. Again, the numbers are inflated in that in many cases, parents may work during school hours but are at home when their children come home from school. We are not dealing with the total number of figures that are being played with in this debate.

The Hon. Member for Vancouver East and the Hon. Member for Outremont would also agree that the committee listened to Canadians, not necessarily to people within the House but to Canadians from coast to coast, people who had a very definite interest in coming to the committee to tell us what they felt. Those people said that they do not want the school system to look after latchkey children, they want space within the school. They did not want a curriculum that continues on after three or three-thirty when the children get out of school. They said they wanted space within the schools so that they could run child care programs that meet the needs of the children when they are finished a day in school.

The last thing a child wants when the bell rings at three o'clock is to go into another regimented curriculum after school. They need to let off steam. If they are anything like my boys, they need to let off an awful lot of steam. It is this type of flexibility, recognizing the differences across the country and the need to meet them, that this Bill addresses.

The strategy provides funding for the provinces to deliver child care services under their jurisdictions. We have not intruded upon their jurisdictions whatsoever. As far as standards are concerned, the Hon. Member for Outremont mentioned that there are no standards in place. The Bill provides that the provinces must have standards in place and that they must publicize these standards as well as the methods for their enforcement. There are arrangements to ensure that standards are put into place by the provinces.

The Hon. Member for Vancouver East also mentioned that the provinces would be encouraged to use the dollars for poor quality care. I do not believe that the governments of the provinces, no matter what Parties they represent, care so little about children that they would bring in services of poor quality. They too have to answer to the electorate. They have to answer to the parents. More than that, they have to answer to their own consciences. I cannot believe that the Government of any province would be encouraged to use dollars for poor quality service.

We are working together with the provinces in providing care for the children of Canada. We know from our many tours across Canada and from the people to whom we have listened that people want flexibility. This legislation has addressed the service side of it by putting $4 billion into additional subsidized care spaces for those parents who cannot provide full payment for child care services.

The strategy provides tax measures that allow parents who can pay for child care to realize some return on those dollars that they are putting into the system, providing wages and dollars toward supplies that are required. We have increased the present $2,000 deduction for child care services to $4,000 for pre-schoolers. After that, the tax deduction continues but it remains at $2,000 unless a child is disabled, in which case it remains at $4,000. We have addressed the concerns of parents who are paying for child care services.

Then we come to the parent at home. We could not do as much for the parent at home as we may have liked to do. The parent at home stays at home out of a desire to be in the home with the child. A woman who has a career may come to the point in her life where she must ask what is more important to her as an individual, can she stay home with her child or must she continue to work? That is a very difficult decision for a parent to make, whether it be a father's, a mother's or a joint family decision that is made.

We have tried to recognize the choice these parents make by offering an additional $200 per child that is at home with his or her parent. It may not be enough in some people's eyes. It is certainly not intended as a replacement for wages that might have been earned, but it is a recognition that parents make a conscious decision to stay home and raise children.

In looking back on my life, I worked when my children were young and I only wish that I had been in a position to spend more time with them. I can honestly say that if I had the chance to do it over again, that is probably what I would do. I admire the women who have to make the decision about being in the workforce or staying at home. It is not an easy decision to make, but with this legislation we are attempting to make that decision a little easier to make.

We cannot help all people in all situations, but we can certainly help by working with parents, with care givers and with provincial Governments to ensure that the children of Canada who are our greatest resource receive the care that they truly deserve. I feel that this legislation will do that. It would be nice to be able to do more. There is still more to be done with parental leave which, as the Hon. Member for Vancouver East mentioned, was something that we were unanimous on during the committee hearings. We need to have changes there.

I think we have made headway. We have shown leadership by forming the committee, the first all-parliamentary committee. We listened to 2,000 people across Canada. Because we listened to the people, we have come up with legislation that we feel meets the majority of the needs. Therefore, I move:

That this question now be put.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Debate, with the Hon. Member for Brant (Mr. Blackburn).

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to trust people around this place sometimes in terms of the length of debate. I have to assume that if a Member is allowed 20 minutes to speak, the Member would want to use the 20 minutes.

Ms. Mitchell: Point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): There is no necessity for putting the question. We are carrying on with the debate.

Ms. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I wondered if you had omitted the 10-minute question period of the last speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): There are questions and comments. I will recognize the Hon. Member for Edmonton—Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour) for questions and comments and I then I will recognize the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for her thoughtful speech. Would she explain how she sees the essential differences between our proposals and those of the two opposition Parties? Perhaps she could explain for my benefit how we will be helping single parents. She understands the matter far better than I do.

Mrs. Martin: Mr. Speaker, under the current child care legislation, the Canada Assistance Plan, single parents who are not able to pay for child care are eligible for assistance on a dollar basis and in some cases 100 per cent care. Sometimes it is on a percentage of income basis. To give you an example, we visited a child care centre here in Ottawa which had 44 children in its care. The care of only four of those children was paid for by the parents. The other 40 were subsidized by the Government.

• (1650)

I might mention that as we crossed the country one of the things we heard from parents, advocates, and specialists in the field, was that they wanted to see child care taken out of the Canada Assistance Plan and governed by its own Act. That is exactly what this Government has done. Child care is covered by its own Act so we can be sure the money goes toward child care.

Under this legislation subsidies will still exist. If you have a single parent who cannot afford to pay for the care of her child and she wants to get back into the workforce to improve herself and provide an income to support her children, the Government can still assist her with the cost of child care through local social service agencies in her community. That has not changed. In fact, it is improved by the fact that not only can the dollars be provided, the federal Government is willing to pay 75 per cent of the cost of creating new child care spaces. That does not exist under CAP. I might explain that a bit further. This does not involve simply creating a brand new child care centre in a building. It means that if you have a child care centre which can perhaps accommodate only 12 children, and it wants to expand, then 75 per cent of the cost of improving that centre and creating additional spaces can be paid.

It also means that if a parent wants to spend her time with her child and has decided that she can help other mothers by taking children in, in other words an unlicensed facility, which the Hon. Member for Vancouver East has some concern about, that parent could apply to become a licensed centre and receive capital funding to add whatever is necessary to her home to turn it into a licensed child care facility. That is going one step further in that as a licensed facility she can provide receipts to the parent who will then be entitled to a tax deduction. It may mean putting a fence around the facility. It may mean adding an extra washroom in order to meet standards. Standards do exist. There has been discussion about whether standards exist. They do. In short, 75 per cent of the capital cost for expanding or creating facilities is available to the small entrepreneur, not necessarily just for the large child care centre.

By the same token, if someone comes forward and says they want to put in a 35 space child care centre they can draw up a business plan and under this legislation we could provide 75 per cent of the capital cost. I think that is very important to creating additional spaces.

Single parents are being looked after in a different way, too. A lot of parents, primarily single parents need assistance with parenting skills. In many cases they need someone to talk to. Under the $100 million initiative fund there are plans to help groups that can offer help in parenting skills.

Another thing that the capital dollars can be used for is toys. Many of these children come from single parent homes which do not have the funding and the children do not have toys. They need toys, including educational toys, to help develop their learning skills. The money can be spent to make sure there is a proper kind of educational toys not only in the larger centres but in the smaller family centres as well.

There is a lot there for the single parent and I am glad the Hon. Member asked me that question because I think it is important that it be clarified.

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, I am in a bit of a dilemma and I seek your guidance. I have a specific question I want to ask but I know that my colleague, our day care critic, also has a

question for the Hon. Member and she would like to go first. Is it possible to accommodate us?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would be more than delighted to let her ask her question. We have only a couple of minutes left so you can split it up the way you want. Is the Hon. Member giving up his time?

Ms. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I will be as quick as I can.

I would ask my hon. friend, who I shared many hours with on the day care trail, to read the "blues" because she did misunderstand some of the things I was saying. For example, I said it was baby-sitters who may be unreliable. I certainly was not referring to the other categories, although it maybe came through that way.

As to the question of profit and non-profit, I would ask if she has had a chance to read a study completed recently in Toronto with reference to compliance with the Day Nursery Act. Its findings were very similar to a research study done for our committee. She will recall that that study's conclusion was that generally speaking, and there are exceptions, the for-profit day care centres tend to have minimum standards with lower salaries and other criteria which are not as high quality. The Toronto study found that for-profit commercial centres are less likely to meet the requirements of the Day Nursery Act. They are likely to be bigger. They are more likely to have spaces which they are not licensed for. There are more complaints launched with regard to this sector. They are likely to have a higher staff-child ratio violation and differences in the numbers of supervisors. Non-profit tend to have less supervisor turnover and hence more stability in care given.

There are many other criteria but those are the conclusions of that study and they are similar to the study we did. I am glad the Hon. Member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan) is here because this concerns his riding and he should read the information from Toronto.

Mrs. Martin: Mr. Speaker, I agree with my hon. colleague that we spent many hours crossing the country on this particular subject and I am sure that is why she is as anxious as I am to see this Bill get speedy passage so that we can start to create an additional 200,000 spaces.

Some of the problems she raises were well handled by the Hon. Member for York Centre when he said he sees nothing wrong with funds going to help those centres improve the quality of their service and the wages of care givers. However, I will also bring to the Hon. Member's attention that, if she is honest, she will remember that we heard as many complaints from parents about the quality of non-profit day care as we did about for profit day care.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): Point of order, Mr. Speaker. You recognized me but then I sat down very quickly and I want to know if I will be recognized for the floor at 6 p.m.?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Yes, I will recognize the Hon. Member at six o'clock for debate.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's order paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—BILLS

[*English*]

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES POLITICAL RIGHTS ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-273, an Act respecting political rights of public servants, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

Mr. Daubney: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. As the sponsor of this Bill, I rise on a point of order. I have reviewed the amendments which have appeared in the *Order Paper* today. Many of them are sensible modifications which clarify parts of the draft Bill and in fact improve it. However, I have grave reservations about a number of others which will fundamentally alter the Bill. I also have some concerns about the process which has led to the motion before us today. In light of that, and in light of the recent decision in the Federal Court of Appeal on the Osborne case which recently struck down Section 32 of the Public Service Employment Act for all but Deputy Ministers, I cannot acquiesce in a process which would allow this Bill, standing in my name, to become a vehicle for the imposition of more, what I would consider to be, unreasonable restrictions on my constituents and on public servants in Canada. I, therefore, withdraw Bill C-273 standing in my name.

• (1700)

Mr. Speaker: I have to advise the Hon. Member for Ottawa West (Mr. Daubney) that under the rules of the House it will be necessary to have the unanimous consent of the House. The House has heard the proposal of the Hon. Member for Ottawa West that he withdraw his Bill. Is there unanimous consent for it?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Accordingly, the order is discharged and the Bill withdrawn.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: Under the circumstances, there being no business before the House, the sitting is suspended until 6 o'clock p.m.

Before leaving, out of courtesy I wish to remark that the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) sent the Chair

a thorough and helpful note with respect to certain amendments. I want to assure the Hon. Member that I read it with very great interest and I thank the Hon. Member for taking the trouble to do that.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I want to express sympathy to the Member for Ottawa West (Mr. Daubney) and also want to express on the record, on behalf of some of my constituents, gratitude to him. His Bill happened to have the luck of the draw and was brought forward whereas a similar Bill standing in my name was not brought forward. The Member persisted in bringing it forward and I regret with him the fact that the Government chose to bring forward amendments which would have so weakened or undermined the principle of the Bill that they could honestly be called killer amendments. They have led to the situation in which the Member had no choice but to feel that the Bill should be withdrawn.

As it stands, in the forthcoming election public employees will have the right to participate fully because of the Federal Court of Appeal decision in which I was involved. I am glad of that but am sorry that this House has proved incapable of legislating, as we were responsible to try to do, because of the intervention of the Deputy Minister and the Government.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a very short statement. I join with my friend from Ottawa West (Mr. Daubney) and tell him how disappointed I am that the Government intervened at this time. The Government had an entire process before it at report stage. We brought forward a Bill which we thought was a result of serious study by the committee.

The Government never even made an appearance before that committee to help with the drafting of this Bill. At the last minute, today, it came forward with a series of amendments which, as the Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) said, are killer amendments which would have the effect of neutralizing this Bill or making it absolutely impossible.

I thank all those who worked with us and gave a lot of their time, energy, and good advice toward the drafting of this Bill. I regret exceedingly that the Government intervened and am very saddened by the fact that after four years the Government did not have the courage to come forward with a Bill of its own.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, killer or no killer, I, too, would have found some of the amendments to be very unreasonable restrictions applying to many of my constituents in Ottawa—Carleton. At this point in the process I would not have supported some of the amendments which were brought in last night. I want to congratulate my colleague, the Member for Ottawa West (Mr. Daubney), and everyone else who worked so long and hard to bring us this far in the process to enhance full legal rights for public servants. We were awfully close.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claudy Mailly (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has my sympathy. I think it is really too bad this had to happen, because the Bill tabled by the Hon. Member was a very praiseworthy initiative, and the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) was right when he said we had worked very hard and were happy with the results of our work. I realize some Members expressed certain reservations because they thought the Bill gave public servants too much freedom. There were even public servants who made some very serious representations which some of my colleagues also took very seriously. However, I am sorry to see it all end this way, because I believe this Bill should have been allowed to pass and that it reflected most honourably on the Hon. Member for Ottawa West (Mr. Daubney).

Mr. Richard Grisé (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I simply want to provide some clarification, especially with respect to the comments made by the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) and the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier). I would of course like to start by congratulating all Members who took part in this debate, especially the Hon. Member for Ottawa West (Mr. Daubney). I agree with my colleague, the Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Mailly), the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, who said that some Members of this House made certain comments on the substance of the Bill and suggested a number of amendments.

I would like to make it quite clear there was no Government interference. There was no meddling by the Government in a Bill . . .

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Grisé: I listened to you and you can listen to me. A number of amendments were made.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Grisé: Go ahead and laugh.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to clarify the situation, and the fact is that, today, the Hon. Member for Ottawa West decided to withdraw his bill. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this was in no way the result of any direct intervention by the Government.

[*English*]

SITTING SUSPENDED

Mr. Speaker: There being no business before the House, the sitting is suspended until six o'clock p.m.

At 5.08 p.m. the sitting of the House was suspended.

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 6 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADA CHILD CARE ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Epp (Provencher) that Bill C-144, an Act to authorize payments by Canada toward the provision of child care services, and to amend the Canada Assistance Plan in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee; and the motion of Mrs. Martin (p. 18222).

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate at second reading of Bill C-144, principally because it is the most important piece of social legislation to come from the Government since it came to power in 1984. I am sorry that there is so much disagreement in this debate over a national child care program. All joking aside, this really should be a motherhood issue.

We all agree on the need for such a program. Using Health and Welfare Canada's own figures, there are over 850,000 children in this country under the age of six who have parents working more than 20 hours a week or who are studying full time. That enormous number of children are being served by just over 220,000 child care spaces at the present time. That is clearly inadequate.

Anyone just taking a cursory look at these figures can see that there is a crying need for child care right across the country. This problem is national in scope. Our children need care and their parents need our assistance. It is up to the federal Government to provide national leadership in dealing with this problem.

What has been the Government's response? It has come up with a program designed to create about 200,000 new spaces over a period of seven years. Clearly this will never meet the needs of over 850,000 children and their families. In fact, doubling the number of child care spaces over a period of seven years is a lower rate of growth than has been achieved without a national program. Child care spaces have doubled in just two years, from 1984 to 1986.

This raises a very relevant question. Why is the Government creating a program which is designed to fall far short of demand? Why start a program doomed to fail? If we are going to spend over $5 billion on child care, let us get it right the first time.

Let me touch me briefly on a few of the problems I see with the Government's proposal. In the first place, almost half the money for this proposal will not create new child care spaces. It is earmarked for tax expenditures. I thought we had realized in this country that tax expenditures are, in most cases, less efficient than direct capital spending. It is hard to target a tax expenditure specifically.

Most of this $2.4 billion in tax expenditures will be used to double the child care tax deduction. This is clearly a regressive move. It does nothing to help the poor single parent. If one does not have enough income, one cannot take advantage of a tax deduction.

This measure flies in the face of tax reform as well. We are supposed to be moving from tax deductions to tax credits. Credits are also part of this patchwork quilt that the Government is calling a national program. Less well off families will get an increase of $100 in the child tax credit in each of the first two years. This is hopelessly inadequate. First, one cannot use this money to get child care if no spaces are available. One cannot break the cycle of poverty and dependence with a mere $200.

Conservatives are always saying that they want people to be self-reliant. But how can you get a single parent off welfare and into the workforce if the solution is to hand out $100 per year to hire a babysitter?

The real weakness of this measure can be seen when we compare it to the de indexing of things like family allowance that the Government has pushed through. It turns out that this measure will give back to Canadian families less than the $1.5 billion they will lose through de indexation. Inflation will eat up more than the Government is handing out.

What is most troubling about the Government's proposal is the lack of a set of national objectives and standards. There are no minimum standards of care established anywhere in this program.

We are discussing the needs of our children. They deserve adequate care. However, even this is not guaranteed by the Government's program.

We do not have to dictate terms to parents. We just simply must assure families that they can expect certain minimum standards of care for their children.

We just went through the debate on the Meech Lake Accord. It clearly says that national objectives can be set in such programs. Here is the perfect opportunity to demonstrate how our system of Confederation can work. We can establish a truly national program in an area of provincial jurisdiction.

Here is the perfect opportunity, moreover, for a federal Government to show some leadership. I see no leadership in this proposal. Instead, I am struck by the Government's curious lack of vision. Everyone can see the crying need for a national program. I have already outlined the figures. Where is the program that will meet the needs of our society?

It has been estimated that if all of the money used for things like tax expenditures had been used to create new child care spaces, we could create about 170,000 more spaces. That would at least be an add-on start.

We have the opportunity to show that we understand the needs of average Canadian families. The Government could have shown that it understood their desire for quality affordable child care. Instead, we are fighting the same kind of battle we fought over deindexation. We have to show the Government that we have as much concern for the care of our children as we have for the security of our seniors.

This should also be a time to show our commitment to equality for women. We know that there are a lot of single parent families. Many of those families are headed by women. We know that single parents need affordable child care in order to work. We should be encouraging women to increase their participation in the labour force. We should show them that we want them to reach their full potential in society, but we should also realize that they will never achieve that potential if they are deprived of the opportunity to work because there are not enough child care spaces in Canada.

This proposal will not give them any choice, and the Government is simply not being open and honest about that. This program will not meet their needs.

Just as it fails in quantity, it also fails in quality. Instead of an affordable national program of quality child care with minimum standards, the Government is offering this patchwork, piecemeal approach. Instead of demonstrating a commitment to fairness for Canadian families, the Government is offering a program which is not even designed to meet their needs.

Instead of showing a vision of Canada where all its citizens can reach their full potential, the Government is content to throw money at the problem in a pre-election period. Incidentally, the fact that the Government wants to move with what I would call indecent haste, in trying to get this Bill through second reading after we have been debating it for just three hours at most, is totally unacceptable. As I said at the outset, this is the most important single piece of social legislation to come forward from the Government after it has been in power for almost exactly four years. Yet, in four hours, it wants to get this through second reading, out of the House, and into committee. There is absolutely no justification for this kind of haste at this time, election or no election on the horizon.

• (1810)

Canadians are not going to be fooled. They know this program is inadequate and should be rejected in its present form. It is a dilemma for all Members of Parliament who are opposed in principle to the mechanics of this Bill, or to its technical aspects, in view of the fact that child care and money for child care is very important. Nevertheless, there is no point in starting out on a national program unless we have the very best program we can put into place at the outset. If we do not have a good program with national standards and objectives, we may very well be wasting a lot of that $6.4 billion.

What should be put in its place? Canadian families should have access to a comprehensive, flexible and affordable system of child care. They need to know their children are safe and secure while they are out earning a living. Children should not have to stay at home watching television all day with some well-intentioned teenager who is simply not qualified to assist, train, educate or care for those children. That means we have to put money into creating spaces in non-profit community organizations, not tax expenditures. This would give parents a voice in the kind of care their children receive. It would also allow us to guarantee quality. We should make funding to the provinces conditional on compliance with a set of minimum national standards and objectives.

I realize that such a system cannot be set up overnight, but in the meantime we should provide a series of good faith grants to the provinces. That way we can get started on the road to meeting the needs of Canadian families while we negotiate cost sharing with the provincial Governments. We must also be flexible. We have to realize that not everyone will have access to this type of child care. This is of particular concern to our remote or rural communities.

Parents should have the choice of going to licensed home care. That is why the Government should also fund home services which meet national standards. In that way it can ensure that facilities in these homes are adequate. This would give Canadian families real choices. They would no longer have to worry about the level of care their children receive. Canadian families need a comprehensive system of child care. They want a system that is fair for all families regardless of where they live or how much money they earn. They need to know their children will be safe and secure in the child care system. We should, therefore, reject the Government's proposal and get on with the job of meeting the real needs of Canadian families.

Let us show Canadian families that we understand their needs and have the vision to meet them. We are not opposed to the private sector being involved in child care. However, we argue that public funding should not be used to assist the private sector. If it wants to be in the business community and its job is child care, then let the market determine, through profit and loss, the quality of care for the children of its clients. We are not opposed to that. But we are opposed to, on the one hand, a lack of national standards and, on the other hand, giving money to private sector child care homes or institutions, which we feel is not fair to the taxpaying public of Canada. If the private sector wants to run a private operation, this is a free country, let it do so.

Also, based on the evidence that came before the committee, I would argue that non-profit child care is much more efficient and is of a higher quality of child care, generally speaking—and there are exceptions—across Canada.

In closing, I want to cast my mind back to some of the other great battles that have been fought in this Chamber in terms of bringing forward progressive social legislation. I can recall the critics, and most of them were either large C Conservative or small c conservative, when Tommy Douglas and Woodrow Lloyd brought in OHIP and medicare in the Province of

Saskatchewan. They said it could not be done. They said it would be wasteful. They said the Government had no business being in the medical care delivery system. They said it would be a great encroachment upon the private sector in what, in those days, was a market-driven medical care system. I do not think there is a Conservative or Liberal left in this country today who would want to go back to the pre-medicare system.

We are the envy of many progressive-thinking U.S. Senators and Members of the House of Representatives. I do not think I am quoting Michael Dukakis out of context when I repeat what I heard him say a couple of weeks ago in Atlanta. They would dearly love to have our medicare system in the United States, and one thing he said that night with respect to medicare was that 38 million Americans have no medical coverage at all and that he would initiate and bring in a medical care system similar to ours to cover those 38 million.

Those of us who fought the medicare battle some 25 years ago were considered radicals, unacceptable to the so-called market-driven medical care delivery system we had in those days, but today, I would argue, there are very few Canadians, rich, middle-income or low-income, who would want to get rid of that system.

I can recall a time, towards the end of the Diefenbaker period, when a professor of my university was called upon to head a commission of Mr. Diefenbaker's Conservative Government to find out whether or not it was financially viable to bring in a Canada pension system. After several months of hearings here in Ottawa and across the country, the conclusion was, no, this country could not afford a Canada Pension Plan as was being put forward at that time by the New Democratic Party and the Liberals. They said the country could not afford it and it would infringe upon the Great West Lifes of this country, the insurance companies that had it all wrapped up in their tidy little hands. We all know that when it comes to life insurance companies, if one reads the fine print one will find that the exclusionary language in almost every life insurance policy is appalling, to say nothing of the fact it is downright misleading. We fought that battle and finally got the Canada Pension Plan. Now we come to a national child care program.

I am arguing this evening that perhaps for some old fashioned thinkers in this House we are being a little too progressive or aggressive. I want Members in the House to think back to the medicare fight and the Canada pension fight, just those two issues, before we proceed much further with this Bill. Members will find that what we are arguing for and promoting is not perfect by any means, but we are moving in the right direction. There is no more precious commodity—if I can put it in those crass words—than our young people. Regardless of background, education or family income, unless they are all give an equal start in life, an equal opportunity to develop, the waste that will continue in this country will be inestimable. All one has to do is to look at those countries where child care and day care are virtually tied up in the private sector, where there are very few, if any, public programs. You will find that if one is born in a black ghetto, or a hispanic ghetto in the United States, or a poor white ghetto, one does not have nearly the opportunity to develop as a young human being that one would have if one were born into a middle-income family or upper-income family.

• (1820)

We do not want that type of society in this country. We want to give all our kids an equal start in life and an equal opportunity. They may not all have equal qualities or capabilities, but the very least we can do is to provide them with an equal chance to get started.

Ms. Mitchell: I would like to congratulate my colleague on his remarks. He mentioned early in his remarks that, in his view, rather than having tax measures that were regressive and would take money that was very much needed for child care services, having regressive tax measures, and also having a tax credit of $100 for the first year and $200 thereafter for families not using licensed care, it would have been better for the Government to have reindexed the family allowance. Would the Hon. Member elaborate on that a little? Does the Hon. Member consider that the Government should have reindexed the child tax credit which would have targeted lower income families and, as the years went on, would also have increased upward the income range eligible for the child tax credit? These are two things that have been detrimental to families that have put particular economic pressure on low and average income families and contradict any family policy goals that the Government espouses.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): In response to my colleague, the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell), this is an extremely important aspect of this Bill. A tax deduction favours a few, or favours those who are earning higher incomes. To a considerable extent those on lower incomes are excluded, and those not paying any income tax at all because their incomes are so low are entirely neglected.

In order to make a policy or program like this fair and equitable, in my view there is only one way to do it, and that is by direct funding and making whatever the program is directly accessible to those individuals and their children. The minute tax policy is used in order to pay in part for any social program, literally hundreds of thousands of Canadians are excluded, or those with higher incomes are favoured.

In terms of raising the income cap, it is a well known fact that the heaviest portion of the tax burden in our country falls not on the rich, not on the poor, but on those in the middle-income area from $25,000 up to $40,000 a year. Those people in our society are becoming terribly fed up with having to bear a substantial burden, more than their fair share of taxation. These are very important aspects of this Bill. We feel that we have to reject those aspects of the funding as being unfair, inequitable, and not working in the best interests of all Canadians.

Mr. Skelly: Could the Hon. Member for Brant (Mr. Blackburn) outline how the Conservative Government has completely misled the people of Canada on this particular legislation, and how it has limited the number of day care spaces that will be created? I appreciate the speech made by the Hon. Member for Brant, and I know he can outline how the people of Canada have been misled on the number of spaces that have been created for young people in this country.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): I appreciate that question very much. I am very happy that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) has come in to listen to my speech this evening. It is the first opportunity I have had to stand across from him and deliver a speech, although I have heard his speeches on many occasions.

Referring to what is misleading, when people take a look at the total sum that the Government is talking about they think that that is a total cash outlay of some $6.4 billion almost overnight as it were. Second, somehow this will automatically jump up the number of child care places to accommodate the total need. We all know that that is not the case.

I am not prepared to say that the Government is deliberately misleading the people in this regard. I leave it to the people to read the legislation, to read what is in the Bill, and to come to their own conclusion. I am quite sure that they will come to the same conclusion as my hon. friend from Comox—Powell River has come to.

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my friend the Hon. Member for Brant (Mr. Blackburn) expressed gratitude that I would be down to listen to his speech. When I heard the Member for Brant was speaking on child care I immediately rushed to the House. I was up in my office working and I rushed to the House, because when I saw the astounding miracle that he had worked on the NDP defence policy, I could hardly wait to see what was going to happen on child care.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): Both make a lot of sense too.

Mr. Mulroney: I thank my distinguished friend for his welcome. I am always delighted to listen to his contributions to an important matter.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, with great pride to join in this historic debate on the Canada Child Care Act. In government we all have two general goals: to try to build a productive economy, and to try to build a caring society. These objectives are by no means mutually exclusive. Indeed, in many ways they are complementary and result in a nation hopefully that is more civilized and more prosperous.

First, I know that all Members of the House, irrespective of political Party, will join with me in saluting the tremendous leadership role of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) for bringing forward child care and fostering a national consensus on a very important matter.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: I gather the NDP is holding its applause for a little later.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): A lot later.

Mr. Mulroney: I think that the national consensus engendered by the Minister of National Health and Welfare, and by the Minister responsible for the Status of Women on the four principal objectives of availability, accessibility, affordability, and above all, quality, has been a commendable achievement, and on behalf of all Members of the House I want to underline his tremendous contribution to our national well-being.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: As a result of this initiative we will be allocating $6.4 billion over seven years, creating 200,000 new quality spaces and virtually doubling the number of spaces available today. That strikes me, irrespective of Party, of being a major contribution to the national well-being of Canada, and I would think that all parliamentarians would want to celebrate that fact.

In so doing we are honouring an important commitment that I made on behalf of my Party during the last election campaign. At the First Ministers' Conference in Vancouver in 1986 I said that one of the most important factors contributing to the persistent and persisting inequality of women in this country is the lack of affordable, flexible, quality child care. We have been determined from the beginning of our mandate to seek to create and implement a national child care program worthy of the name. With this Bill I believe that we are in the process of doing just that.

[*Translation*]

And in the process, Mr. Speaker, we are preparing Canada for the social and economic challenges of a new decade and a new century. Consider the following: Today, more than half of Canadian mothers with young children are in the work force. The Canada child Care Act, with its emphasis on flexibility, will help facilitate choices in child care. We want parents, and this is something you tend to forget, we want parents to be able to choose the kind of child care best suited to their values and their requirements. We recognize that there are different needs in each family just as there are different needs in various regions, from British Columbia to Newfoundland and Labrador.

• (1830)

[*English*]

The demands of adequate child care, say in Williams Lake, British Columbia, clearly differ from those required in Burlington, Ontario, or in Rimouski, Québec. But the fundamental objective, we believe, is the same everywhere, to give all Canadian mothers the possibility of going to work, secure in the knowledge that their children are in clean, safe and supportive surroundings. The Canada Child Care Act is about protecting children, about helping parents, about strengthening the Canadian family. Most of all, we want the best of care for our future generations.

We are living in an era of remarkable economic and social change. These are challenging times, but they can be rewarding for Canadians individually and for our society as a whole. Some 56 per cent of Canadian women are in the workforce today, as compared with 45 per cent in 1976, and 35 per cent a decade earlier, in 1966.

It is a matter of particular pride for me that of the nearly 1,300,000 new jobs created since I had the honour of being sworn in as Prime Minister, fully 728,000, or 56 per cent of all of those jobs, have gone to women in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: That is a spectacular growth rate of 15.5 per cent in women's employment in less than four years, as compared, for example, to 8.8 per cent for men. That means that the number of women's jobs has been growing almost twice as fast as the number of new jobs for men. That is catch-up. There has been a growing demand and an historic injustice, and the policies of the Government are important economically. I am proud to be associated with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) in this. The economic policies of the Government have made an important social statement, and these figures indicate that Canadian women, having been left behind for so many years, are now playing catch-up and getting their fair share of economic jobs and equality of opportunity in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: Of that growth in women's jobs, 78 per cent, more than three-quarters, have been full-time jobs, reversing almost completely the trend under the previous Government, where employment for women was essentially part-time. The unemployment rate for women has declined from 12 per cent to 8.4 per cent, a decline of nearly one-third in less than four years. I think that all Members of the House would agree that this is a happy development for all Canadians.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: The number of women employed in managerial and administrative positions has grown by 36 per cent between 1984 and 1987.

These are strong indicators, not perfect, but strong and vigorous indicators, that we are moving in the right direction as a country, that we are moving towards fairness and equity for women. We are guided by these principles of fairness and equity as we prepare for the societal changes of the next decade.

If you look anywhere across Canada, at our universities, you can see the dimensions of the winds of change that are about to sweep across this country. Women account for nearly half, and in some areas more than half, of the enrolment in our faculties of medicine and law and business.

[*Translation*]

In Quebec, especially in business administration and international trade, more and more women are outdistancing men in so-called traditional jobs or careers.

[*English*]

This is a major development. Women have moved as well into small business in a very big way. Women accounted for 95 per cent of the net increase in unincorporated small businesses between 1980 and 1985. The number of self-employed women grew by 118 per cent between 1975 and 1986.

[*Translation*]

With these changes to the face of our economy, there has been a strong and positive evolution in attitudes during the present decade. What used to be known primarily as women's issues are now called, quite properly—and I think the Hon. Member for Outremont (Mrs. Pépin) will agree—society's issues.

Child care is such an issue. It is about social justice, but it is equally about economic justice. In terms of social justice, we want Canadian mothers to be able to participate in the work force if they choose, to the degree they wish to do so, to expand their own horizons, to develop their own capacities, to enhance their own prosperity and to pursue their own dreams. At the same time, we also want to respect the decision of those mothers who choose to remain at home to raise their children.

That is why this important and historic initiative is based on the fundamental principle of choice.

[*English*]

Freedom of choice, this is what this is all about. This is not a unitary, uniform, homogenized society. There are different people with different dreams and different options, and this gives Canadian women freedom of choice.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: This initiative recognizes the needs of both women with children who work outside the house and women with children who choose to work at home with their children.

Canada has long been a world leader in promoting social justice for its citizens. From the time of the baby bonus in the 1940s and Old Age Security in the fifties, down to the Canada-Quebec Pension Plans and medicare in the sixties, Canada has been well regarded in the international community for its by and large generous and civilized approach to social programs across the country.

I believe and I hope that Members of the House from all sides will agree with me. I hope that perhaps a decade from now, a generation hence, the Canada Child Care Act will be

regarded as perhaps the most important social innovation in the 1980s.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: Our critics—and there are a few here in the House—say that the child care program is—

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): Very few.

Mr. Mulroney: Well, the Member from Brant is saying very few. He is very right.

An Hon. Member: Sixty-six per cent of Canadians.

Mr. Mulroney: I think, measured by any standard, all Members would agree that $6.4 billion is a substantial sum of money. By contrast, and to put it into some perspective, consider the debate, for example, on child care in the United States of America, in the general election that will soon take place. Vice-President George Bush, the Republican nominee for President, has proposed a $2.2 billion package of tax credits for low-income families. Governor Michael Dukakis, the Democratic nominee, has proposed a $2.5 billion program for the children of working parents.

An Hon. Member: Jesse Jackson.

Mr. Mulroney: That is in a country with 10 times our population.

An Hon. Member: Don't use them as an example. They have the worst child care program in the world.

Mr. Mulroney: We are proposing for Canadians a $6.4 billion program over seven years, and I think that that is a great tribute to Canada and its notion of justice for working women.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: How about comparing it to Sweden, Holland, Norway, Denmark, France, Italy, Germany?

Mr. Mulroney: I believe that those figures tend to put the debate in a different and, I think, quite interesting perspective. We are doing this, which is very important, within the fiscal framework of responsibility that the Minister of Finance introduced in November, 1984, and which—may I say to his great credit and because of his very, very significant leadership—this Government has respected ever since and will in the future.

• (1840)

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: There is a very important economic and social reason for this, Mr. Speaker. It is not being hung on a given concept of deficit reduction. There is a very important reason of social justice associated with this. The notions of deficit reduction and social programs are not at variance one with the other.

[*Translation*]

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, our program of financial restraint and our economic policies have encouraged sufficient growth in the economy that we are able to afford this important, most historic initiative. It must not be forgotten that when we assumed office, the deficit was at $38 billion and ticking like a time bomb. We have defused that. Less than four years later, the deficit has been reduced by nearly $10 billion a year, and we are right on target for reducing our borrowing requirements by half over five years. I think this is a most significant achievement for any Government of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mulroney: We began, Mr. Speaker, from the premise that Canadians needed more work. We began from the principle that governments don't create wealth, people do.

[*English*]

Governments do not create wealth. Governments can, however, create conditions within which new wealth can be generated by Canadian citizens, by the genius of the entrepreneurial spirit, by the risk-takers who create jobs, by those who have vision and believe in job creation. Governments cannot create those themselves but they can create conditions conducive to that kind of economic growth if they get their spending down, as we have, if they get their deficits down, as we have done, if they encourage, not discourage, investment if they attract investment and in the process attract jobs, and if they reduce regulatory constraint to economic growth, as we have tried to do from the very beginning of our mandate. The result of this, Mr. Speaker, has been lower interest rates, which has produced sustained growth in a climate-controlled inflation.

The 1.3 million new participants in our economy today resulting from new jobs created are paying into our envelope of social programs rather than drawing from it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: Canadians are now themselves with their own hard earned money, rather than with borrowed money that does not last and is shoved on to the backs of our young and new generation, creating a broader and a deeper national pool of new wealth. It is based on that new wealth that the Government and the people of Canada provide the kinds of programs and social justice, such as the national child care program that is before the House of Commons today.

I think that by creating an additional 200,000 quality child care spaces many more mothers will have an opportunity to participate in the labour force.

While this is very much about social justice, it is equally about economic justice.

[*Translation*]

And in the strictest economic terms, we cannot hope to achieve our economic potential in the 1990s wihtout the full and fully engaged participation of as many Canadians as possible who wish to enter the job market.

In the coming decade, we will have to make some real economic and social choices for this country. We will need, for example, more qualified immigrants, not fewer, if we are to sustain our economic growth. We will need a more literate labour force. It is, in both human and economic terms, a terribly sad fact that one Canadian adult in four is functionally illiterate. In the coming era of technological change, in a time when research and development must be a national hallmark of excellence, we must have a work force whose skills are fully developed and whose potential is fully realized. I think those are some of the dimensions of the economic and social challenges that we will face in the coming decade.

[*English*]

And so, Mr. Speaker, in a very special way the constant challenge for a civilized and tolerant Government is to be, as best it can, formed, as any Government is, of human beings with their own imperfections, both competent and caring. For without the prudent management of our nation's fiscal resources we cannot free up new resources on the social side to meet the increasing demands of an increasingly complex society. We all know that it requires that kind of growth and new wealth to meet the constant demand of society. So it is a matter of some pride to the members of this Government that we have been able to expand our social framework within a fiscal framework of some considerable restraint.

Many of these issues are of special concern to women and to working mothers, but not exclusively. They affect all of us. In a very special way, they have a particular effect on women and working mothers. We have sought to respond to a number of them in constructive ways, for example, the spousal allowances. One of our first acts in government was to extend spousal allowances to all low-income widows and widowers aged 60 to 64. This increased income protection to about 50,000 widows and provided some $200 million in additional benefits. We introduced improvements to the Canada Pension Plan with an improved benefits package, including an early retirement option, increased disability benefits and improved pension benefits for women, which benefited about 230,000 Canadian women. We have increased fourfold our assistance to disabled persons' organizations. The tax changes from the first Budget changing the definition of disability have resulted in increased benefits for another 85,000 Canadians.

On drug abuse, which affects us all but in a special way affects mothers who are charged with the responsibility and the heartache that comes from the impact of this situation, the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) has brought in a $200 million five-year strategy to curb this tragic situation which afflicts not only our youth but all professional and income levels of our society.

In a major CBC news report a few weeks ago Dr. Ivan Porosko, director of a cocaine treatment program in Toronto, described cocaine abuse in Canada as an epidemic, a most interesting choice of words, with which most mothers in Canada would agree. They are asking the Government of Canada to get rid of this savage problem which weakens our family and debilitates our country.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: In the very sad and tragic area of battered women, we are creating 500 new shelter units which can accommodate an additional 25,000 women and children per year.

On child abuse, the Government has enacted Bill C-115 which addresses in a substantive manner the sexual abuse and exploitation of children.

With regard to native women, about which demands have been made in this House of Commons year after year, and many members of the NDP raised this with Conservatives when we were together in the Opposition, I am honoured to say and to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that we introduced amendments to the Indian Act which replaced discriminatory elements and gave back aboriginal women both status and band membership, thereby benefiting 10,000 native women in Canada.

An Hon. Member: No money to house them.

Ms. Mitchell: No resources.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mulroney: We have introduced amendments to the Criminal Code to ensure that victims of crime are given increased attention in the criminal courts, and we have secured agreement from the provinces and territories on a statement of principles for victims.

Regarding the proceeds of crime, we have instituted procedures to seize, freeze and forfeit the proceeds of crime. At the request of all Members of this House, we have imposed stiffer penalties for impaired driving and established new provisions for mandatory blood testing.

• (1850)

[*English*]

In a very important social problem area, the question of AIDS research, we have introduced a $129-million initiative for research, public awareness and education and community services. Perhaps we cannot reduce the pain and suffering of AIDS victims, but we can remove the social stigma which is attached to it and we can concentrate and ensure that more and more resources go to the research so that we can find a cure for this debilitating and unfair disease which affects so many people in Canada.

This, I think, is a solid record of achievement of which all Members of this Parliament can be proud. It indicates that this Government has provided strong and improved social programs that go hand in hand with economic renewal, and the child care program is but the most recent illustration of that.

There are those who argue that this can be done in a vacuum, that this can be done with borrowed money, that this can be done overnight while raising the deficit and driving up interest rates. There are even those who argue that Canada's social, cultural and environmental programs will, for example, be adversely affected by a free trade agreement with the United States of America. However, in the final analysis, action speaks louder than unfounded fears.

In the last nine months, our Government has, among other things, passed a tough new Environmental Protection Act, the most comprehensive environmental legislation among the leading industrialized nations—

Some Hon. Members: Order, order!

Mr. Mulroney: We have renewed the Official Languages Act for the first time in 17 years. We have acted to provide copyright protection to Canadian artists and musicians. We have established the first ever legislative recognition of Canada's multicultural heritage—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mulroney: And if you don't like to hear it, we're going to repeat it again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rossi: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Bourassa (Mr. Rossi), on a point of order.

Mr. Rossi: Mr. Speaker, instead of talking about day care, the Prime Minister gave an overview of the four years of this Parliament. He talked about crime, he talked about everything but day care. So it might be . . . This is a point of order. I think that he should talk about something to do with day care, not crime, drinking, pensions, etc. He is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: I accept the Hon. Member's intervention.

[*English*]

Perhaps I can just say that I know that the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) would know that during some parts of his speech, there seemed to be some agitation on the other side, I think aimed at the question of relevance. I would ask the Right Hon. Prime Minister to keep that in mind.

Mr. Mulroney: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to my hon. friend who takes offence at some of the important questions that we are discussing. I have always thought that the Canadian family and the needs of the Canadian family involved day care, but also all of the other important matters that were unaddressed for 20 years and that this Government has now dealt with.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: Mr. Speaker, among other things, we have introduced the $6.4-billion child care program that we are debating today. These are the actions of a Government determined to strengthen Canada's social, environmental and cultural programs, and in our judgment they are all linked together. They cannot be cut off one from the other. They go to the well-being of families, they go to the well-being of working mothers, they go to the well-being of Canadian who need jobs, and all of them must be considered together. Only a Liberal would believe that you could cut off one from the other. There must be a program but there must be a way to pay for it, and that is why we believe in a strong economy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: They are the actions of a Government determined to lead in implementing coherent national programs.

[*Translation*]

These actions clearly illustrate that this Government is committed to social justice for all Canadians. Child care is the centrepiece of that commitment. We embark on this initiative with pride and with confidence. We have every reason to believe that this program will work well and respond to the needs and aspirations of a vibrant, modern Canada. Years from now, when historians are assessing our stewardship of the country, I hope that they will say that this initiative in particular provided substantial benefits for Canadian women.

[*English*]

I hope it will be said that we in this Parliament developed the right social and economic initiatives for the times. I hope it will be recorded that we strengthened the social future of Canada and that our years were marked by a certain generosity of spirit, that all of us worked together on the fundamental issues to build a more tolerant society.

I have been somewhat taken with the fact that members of the Opposition seem to believe that Canada, Canadian women and Canadian families do operate in a vacuum, that child care can be segregated from drug abuse, from drunken driving, from the absence of jobs. I am being asked whether this fits together and whether we have done something.

I stand today before a Party that for 20 years had the pleasure and the privilege of sitting here talking about child care but which never once fulfilled its responsibilities to the family. I stand before you, Mr. Speaker, and say that the women of Canada understand that with the creation of 1.3 million new jobs, 56 per cent of those jobs have gone to working women, and that is a tremendous contribution to social justice for all the women of Canada.

Most of all, I think it will be recorded that the child care initiative that has been brought forward today, representing billions of dollars, recognizes and understands a commitment

to justice, fairness and equality for Canadian women. This is what the Parliament of Canada is all about.

There are cheers from the children in the gallery.

Mr. Rossi: You're making the kids cry.

Mr. Mulroney: A seven-month-old baby understands, but the Liberals don't. I could say that that was a loud and ringing endorsement from one of the principal beneficiaries of the child care program.

I think all of us can take pride in the fact that for the first time a national child care program has been brought forward which will double in a period of years the number of spaces available to women and their children, thereby strengthening the most important element of our society, which is the Canadian family.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1900)

Mr. Speaker: I should advise Hon. Members that under the rules there are no questions or comments after the Right Hon. Prime Minister's speech.

Mr. Gauthier: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In the spirit of reform, and given that this is the Prime Minister's first speech on any Bill in this House—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gauthier: —in four years—

Some Hon. Members: Sit down!

Mr. Gauthier: It is the first time he has participated in anything and we cannot ask him questions.

Some Hon. Members: Sit down!

Mr. Grisé: That is not true, and you know it!

Mr. de Jong: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. While I recognize that under the Standing Orders the Prime Minister need not necessarily answer questions after an address to the House, surely, with his consent and that of the House—

Some Hon. Members: No!

Mr. de Jong: —he might want to take some questions. Surely he should have the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: The House can of course do anything by consent. But I do not see that there is consent to depart from the rules. The Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) has the floor in debate.

Some Hon. Members: Stick around, Brian.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would ask the co-operation of Hon. Members. The Hon. Member for Davenport has the floor in debate.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, with fewer than 40 Members on the Tory side, the Prime Minister has delivered tonight what is obviously—

Mr. Keeper: How many Liberal Members?

Mrs. Mailly: There are only four of you!

Mr. Caccia: —going to be described by historians as his swan swong, his last speech in this Chamber as Prime Minister of Canada. It is very revealing to notice that his own back-benchers do not have enough confidence in him to subject him to a question period, which would have been the natural thing according to the rules that apply to everybody.

Mr. Redway: When was the last time Turner answered questions in this House?

Mr. Caccia: Evidently our belief in democracy is so weak that we believe the Prime Minister as an elected Member should not be subjected, as everyone else is, to a question period. Why should the rules be different? Why should the back-benchers of the Tory Party be afraid and lack enough confidence in their own Leader to see him subjected to a few questions? This is a real indication of weakness and fear on the part of the supporters of the Prime Minister.

Mr. Malone: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe the Hon. Member is out of order. The rules of this House are well known. They are written. The rule that the Hon. Member objects to was a rule of this House—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would hope there would be a little more decorum this evening. I am listening to a point of order by the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) and I hope he can complete it so we can carry on with debate.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, thank you for helping me admonish the Liberals. The rules of this House on the point that the Hon. Member for Davenport is raising were the rules which applied when his Party was in government. The practice of this House is the same as it was when his former Leader was Prime Minister of Canada. For the Hon. Member to come here today and use the media and the medium to try to impress upon Canadians that there is somehow something inappropriate or wrong or unusual or different from past practices is inappropriate and wrong.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That is not a point of order, but I appreciate what the Hon. Member is saying. I hope other Hon. Members will not raise points of order if they are not a point of order. I would love to listen to them in debate, but otherwise I will recognize the Hon. Member for Davenport. Does the Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Mailly) have a point of order?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Mailly: Mr. Speaker, this is really a point of order. A few minutes ago, during the Prime Minister's speech, the Speaker of the House rose to comment because a Member of the Liberal Party objected to the content of the speech, saying that it was not relevant.

So I rise on the same point of order. I believe that the speech by the Member who just spoke is not relevant either. He is talking about . . .

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That is not a point of order either. I would like the debate to begin with the Hon. Member for Davenport.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rossi: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Davenport started his speech at 7.02 or 7.03. It is 7.09 p.m.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I know what time he began. The Hon. Member for Davenport has the floor.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that unanimous consent was sought and denied. That is a rule that everyone understands.

Mrs. Mailly: It happens all the time.

An Hon. Member: When was the last time Turner answered a question?

Mr. Caccia: The fact is that the Prime Minister did not respect the rules of relevance and the Speaker got up to remind him of that fact. For a good half of his speech he did not speak on the Bill before us.

As I said, he had his swan song and I hope historians will record it as such, as his last speech in this House, and that he will be remembered, unfortunately, by Canadian historians as the Prime Minister who weakened Canadian federalism and virtually sold Canada to the Americans. That will be the sad legacy he leaves behind.

He also raised a number of rhetorical balloons, so to say, and they must be punctured one by one, because this is a place for debate and a rebuttal is perfectly in order.

The fact is that the Prime Minister got carried away in his rhetoric. He seemed to imply that only as of 1984 have women entered the labour force in increasing numbers. That is not true. That trend was set in place long before the election of 1984. Certainly no one will take that theology as a fact.

After four years in power women are still earning 65 cents for every dollar men earn. The Government has done nothing to correct that imbalance. The Prime Minister implied that enrolment of women in universities has been increasing under the present regime. We know very well that the enrolment of our female population in universities has been increasing for a number of years. It has nothing to do with who is in power.

• (1910)

The Prime Minister would like the public to believe that the number of self-employed women and women owners of unincorporated businesses is on the increase as a result of the Tory Government. That is sheer nonsense. This trend has taken place for a number of reasons and certainly not because a particular Party is in power in Ottawa. That development has nothing to do with what happened in September of 1984.

The Prime Minister made a big item of freedom of choice, which is a codified manner of excusing to the public the fact that the Bill which we are debating tonight will not set national standards for child care. That is what he means when he speaks about freedom of choice, and the public ought to know that. The Prime Minister referred several times to the fact that over the next seven years $6.4 billion will be made available for child care. In reality it is $4 billion, and I will return to that later.

The Prime Minister compared the Canadian measure to what Vice-President Bush is proposing in the United States, which is $2.2 billion, and to what democratic presidential candidate Dukakis has proposed, which is $2.5 billion. Well, so what? Since when does Canada take its lead from the Americans on social policy? Is that now becoming the bench-mark for the quality and standard that we want for Canadians? Is that where the Prime Minister takes his inspiration for what Canadians should be given?

The Prime Minister referred to the time bomb of the deficit. Those are his own words. Well, the time bomb imposed by the deficit was conveniently forgotten in the weeks and days preceding the last by-election. At that time the deficit did not exist. Why is it that when we approach a by-election and a general election, as we now are, the Government spends like a drunken sailor? It has been estimated that in the time leading up to the by-election and in subsequent weeks the Government spent $14 billion in commitments and promises leading to the fall of 1988.

The Prime Minister made reference to the prudent management of our nation's resources. He is very proud that he is capable, therefore, to offer this measure. I would like the Prime Minister and each Tory Member to address themselves to the estimated expenses of projects proposed in the White Paper on defence as compared to what the Government is proposing for child care. The Prime Minister should do that before he has the nerve to talk about the prudent management of our national resources. I will return to that in a moment.

The fact is that in the four years of the Government's mandate, low-income families earning up to $25,000 a year have seen their taxes increased by 22 per cent. That is what the Tory Government has done in the last four years. The fact is that the Government attempted to deindex senior citizens' pensions. It was stopped but it tried in 1985, didn't it? The fact

is that the Government was successful, unfortunately, in deindexing family allowances. It was successful in deindexing the child tax credit. Is that the prudent management to which the Prime Minister referred? Does the Parliamentary Secretary agree with that?

Mr. McDermid: Yes.

Mr. Caccia: The fact is that, as a result of Bill C-22, there has been an increase in the cost of drugs which will mainly affect senior citizens. Is that prudent management by the Tory Government? The fact is that, with regard to the production of social and co-operative housing, the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation has virtually been put on ice. Those are the facts in reply to the rhetoric of the Prime Minister.

Contrary to the impression the Prime Minister has attempted to create in this House, we have had fine legislation by the name of the Canada Assistance Plan since 1966. That was introduced in the Pearson years. The Prime Minister seems never to have heard of that. Under the Canada Assistance Plan we laid the foundation for all the fine social measures which exist today, including the measure which makes it possible today to have the basic minimum in child care.

That brings me to the substance of this Bill which is, in a way, a deathbed repentance by the Government in its fourth year in government. I intend to make eight points which will make the life of the Parliamentary Secretary rather unpleasant.

First, the measure before us provides for only one-seventh of the child care spaces which are being requested by the provinces over the next seven years. It is estimated that 1.4 million child care spaces are required in our society. This Bill provides for 200,000 only. That fact is established by the projections of the provinces.

Mr. McDermid: What nonsense. You are totally wrong.

Mr. Caccia: The Parliamentary Secretary's ignorance is so visible. He need only do his homework. Having offered one-seventh of the requirement for the next seven years as proposed by the provinces and the two Territories, the Government has imposed a ceiling on each province. I will use as an example the Province of Ontario from which both the Parliamentary Secretary and I come. The imposition of the ceiling under this Bill in Ontario will mean a reduction in Ontario's plan for child care by some 12,000 spaces. That is my second point.

Third, this measure would build fewer child care spaces in Canada over the next seven years than would be possible under the existing legislation because of the ceiling to which I made reference a moment ago.

Fourth, it was very revealing that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp), in his speech this morning, avoided committing the Government to the establishment of national standards in child care. This measure would allow for the balkanization of this important social program and will prove right those who oppose the Meech Lake agreement and said that there would never be another national social program. Bill C-144 proves that. We will have different standards in each province. That is the net effect of the wording of the legislation.

The Minister carefully avoided the words "national standards" in his speech because he knows very well that that is the fact. Each province will go its own way and there will be no national standards on child care. The Government has no guts and no political will to set national standards. We saw the same situation with Bill C-74, the Environmental Protection Act. This is the same pattern and it is what I call the Meech Lake virus.

Fifth, this Bill does not set priorities. The net effect will be that the needs of the most disadvantaged parents will not be taken into account as a result of lack of priority. As my colleague, the Member for Outrement (Mrs. Pépin), pointed out in her excellent speech earlier today, this Bill will make things more difficult for needy parents.

Sixth, this Bill completely ignores the existence of latchkey kids. I hope the Parliamentary Secretary knows what latchkey kids are. He has a limited knowledge of social affairs. I will explain to him what latchkey kids are. They are the kids who go to school with a key around their neck. He has probably never seen them. They do exist in large numbers in west Toronto where I come from. This Bill ignores completely the fact that after a certain hour kids come home to an empty house. A measure like that in this Bill would have been the ideal vehicle to address that particular social need.

• (1920)

Mr. McDermid: Day care kids do not go to school yet.

Mr. Caccia: If the Parliamentary Secretary has something interesting to say, he can speak tonight, tomorrow or next week. We will hold our breath and listen to his wisdom with great interest.

Mr. McDermid: Three-year olds do not go to school.

Mr. Caccia: The Parliamentary Secretary's lack of sense of humour is becoming a bit too strident.

Mr. McDermid: Your lack of knowledge is becoming evident in your debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. I would hope Hon. Members would give the Member the courtesy of completing his speech. There will be questions and comments.

Mr. Caccia: My next point deals with the situation in Davenport where we have consulted a number of day care centres this morning. I was given some interesting statistical background. For instance, we were informed that the average waiting list at the Dovercourt Boys and Girls Club is some 15 people. This is one of many day care centres in Toronto. There is a great potential for expansion, which this Bill will hardly be able to meet.

The waiting list is one and a half years at the Dovercourt International Day Care Service. The average waiting list at the Harmony Day Nursery is 100 to 120 children. The waiting list for special needs children at the MacAulay child development centre is 30 names. The average waiting list is 20 children in the case of the Old Davenport Child Centre. At the Sister Regina Mass Day Nursery, the average waiting list is 35 to 36 children. The waiting period can be fairly long. In the case of St. Chad's Day Nursery, the average waiting list is at least 20 names. Time does not permit me to cover them all.

Let me conclude with the comparison of the Government's priorities. This measure offers $4 billion over the next seven years plus a total of $2.3 billion in tax credits.

Let us compare the priority the Government gives to kids with its priority on defence equipment projects over the next 10 years.

Mr. McDermid: It is 27 years.

Mr. Caccia: I will make it 10 years to make it easier for the Parliamentary Secretary to understand. On the one hand, the Government is offering our kids in direct funds, $4 billion over the next seven years, while on the other hand, there is the following breakdown in Tory defence equipment projects over the next 10 years: $8 billion for nuclear powered submarines; $12 billion for ship borne helicopters over five years; $2.7 billion for a second set of patrol frigates over nine years; $750 million for minesweepers over 10 years; $420 million over 10 years for all terrain troop carriers; $250 million for heavy trucks over approximately four years. The funding for tripling of reserve forces is $9.2 billion over 15 years. The battletanks yet to be announced will cost some $1.8 billion to $2.8 billion over the next five years.

The comparison is $4 billion toward a social program on child care versus that $25 billion. That is the priority and the prudent management, to which the Prime Minister referred a few minutes ago, of this so-called Progressive Conservative Government. What a sham.

What a disgrace that the Government would see less value in preparing the young generation under 14 years of age to grow up in our urban centres and in rural Canada by allocating $4 billion in the next seven years compared to $25 billion to be allocated to defence equipment projects. The Government believes that defence projects must have greater importance, because of our NATO commitment, than the value of our next generation. I find that a form of pornography of power and reverse priority that one could ever see in the history of our country. It is disgraceful and shameful.

If the Minister of National Health and Welfare said today that his measure takes into account all of the requirements of the provinces and the 1.4 million kids for the next seven years, my comparison would have lost its meaning and its impact. I would be the first to admit it. Such a measure would have taken into account the requirements of the provinces and the Territories. Instead, the Minister came in with a measure that meets the needs of only one-seventh of our youth and their respective families. The conclusion is that this measure shows the bankruptcy in terms of social values and priorities of the Government, whose days are numbered. The sooner an election is called, the better.

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, we know quite clearly that the Member who spoke is very much against the Bill that has been proposed. However, his Party is opposed to everything the Government has proposed, except Meech Lake. I think the Member himself opposes Meech Lake and therefore opposes everything the Government introduces. Perhaps that is a fault in our system.

We know what his Party opposes. We know that it supports the Senate and the unfettered rule of the Senate. Will he, without any personal attack, tell us what he would like to see in a day care plan and how much it would cost?

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the Hon. Member, for whom I have great respect, was not in the House when the Member for Outremont (Mrs. Pepin) made the position of our Party quite clear. She established our Party's position point by point. She analysed for every aspect, and in much greater depth than I, what are the shortcomings and the alternatives that the Liberal Party of Canada would produce. That would take me much longer than the few minutes available to me.

However, they are on the record for everyone to see tomorrow in *Hansard*. They are also outlined in great detail in a document entitled *Choices for Child Care: Now and the Future*. I would be glad to supply the Hon. Member with a copy of this document which sets out a very positive Liberal approach to this matter. I know of his sincere interest in these matters.

Our basic position in principle is that we want to focus on the needy first. We would want to take into account the requirements of the low income and middle-income Canadians first as a major priority, to ensure that there is fairness built into the system. That has been the Liberal position on every social measure that has been adopted over the decades. That has been our guiding principle. This is what probably differs from the approach of the Progressive Conservative Government.

• (1930)

As I mentioned in my speech, this measure fails to take into account those youngsters who go home after school to an empty house because their parent or parents work. That is a very serious vacuum which we addressed in our interventions here today.

We also indicated that the requirements of Canadian society in 1988, because of the evolution in the family structure, particularly with respect to single parent families, are such

that a much larger number of families must be addressed. I think we have been pretty positive in our criticisms and in defining alternatives. In addition, I took the liberty of comparing the priorities of this Government in the over-all picture by addressing the amount of money that is being made available for this badly needed social measure compared to the Tory defence equipment projects over a parallel period of time.

Mr. McDermid: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) about his new-found interest in day care. He has been a Member of this House for a number of years. He was in a previous Cabinet but I have never heard him talk about day care before. This is a revelation. Here is an individual who was in the Liberal Cabinet of Pierre Elliott Trudeau. He was, I must say, a less than effective Minister of the Environment. I never heard him talk about day care. I never heard him advocate day care. I did not see any day care programs whatsoever come out of that administration. I am glad the Hon. Member for Outremont (Mrs. Pépin) is sitting beside him, dropping, I am sure, some hints in his ear, because she understands the problem. I will give her full marks for that.

Great hypocrisy has been shown in the House tonight by the Hon. Member who talks about day care as if he has been an advocate in Davenport for years and years. He has never discussed it before. He has never debated it before. This is the first time he has ever stood up in the House of Commons and talked about day care. What a show of hypocrisy!

I might also point out that the statistics the Hon. Member talked about, comparing day care help and defence expenditures, was playing loose with the truth, and he knows it. The statistics he was giving were all selected figures, some spread over 20 years and some spread over 10 years. He knows full well that the submarine program this Government is talking about will cost the taxpayers of this country one-half of 1 per cent of the social spending in this country. For him to stand up and try to compare the day care figures with defence spending is a total fallacy, and he knows it. He is playing very loose with the truth.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I am so glad I have touched a raw nerve. I am delighted to see the Parliamentary Secretary angry at being put into a corner to such an extent that all he can say about my intervention is to use the word "hypocrisy". He has run out of steam. He has no other argument. Out of sheer desperation he has to refer to my record as the Minister of the Environment. This is one of the most pathetic arguments I have heard because the record can be seen by anyone. It is just another example of Tory bankruptcy. When one has good ideas, one does not refer to hyprocrisy or former performances, but to the subject matter at hand. We are debating day care tonight.

I am sorry the Parliamentary Secretary did not like former Prime Minister Trudeau. He was a great Prime Minister. I am sorry the Parliamentary Secretary has no positive words to say about him. I served under him and I am proud of that fact. I know there are millions of Canadians who would love to see Mr. Trudeau as Prime Minister of this country any time, any day, to replace the present, weak leader—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret to interrupt. I have given a little more time than necessary, but I would like to cut it off right now. Questions and comments are now terminated. Debate.

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, it was, of course, time to cut things off. When the spokesperson for the Liberal Party is hearkening back to the Trudeau era and is making it quite clear that he has no confidence in his present Leader, I think it is time to move on. I did have a question for him but I will ask it another day.

I want to zero in on this whole question of day care, I must say, quite in contrast to what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) did in this House. He covered the waterfront. He talked about things that affect families, but he did not say a great deal about the legislation before us. His speech sounded very much like an election speech. I am surprised that at the end of his speech he did not announce he was going to see the Governor General. Perhaps he is on his way there now.

Day care has been in and out of the headlines of the newspapers for the last couple of years. When the Prime Minister was campaigning before the last election, he made big promises with respect to day care. We then had a couple of commissions and studies which took a look at day care, but the Government's program on day care kept being put off and put off. Finally the program was unveiled and made public. What stands out in my mind, and I am sure it stands out in the minds of most Canadians who observe what is going on in politics, is the headline which stated that the Government was going to spend $6.4 billion on day care. Coming from a Conservative Government this was a surprise because at first glance we had the impression that here was a Government doing something substantial, that here was a Government taking a step forward in the day care field, because $6.4 billion is a lot of money. It sounds like a lot of money and when it is spread across the headlines, one has to be impressed. The time for day care has arrived.

So I am not surprised if many Canadians, at least at this moment, think that the Government is doing something substantial in the area of day care. But if we step back a little from those headlines, from those billion dollar figures, and examine what the Government is doing, perhaps we will get a little perspective on the situation.

The first thing I want to point out is that, of course, it is necessary to make real advances in the area of day care in order to meet the kinds of needs which have emerged over the last couple of decades. We must first begin by comparing the Government's program for day care with the need in the community. If we accept at face value the Government's indication that its program over seven years will produce some

200,000 new day care spaces, clearly that will be an improvement. However, my understanding is that there will still be a couple of million children who will require day care spaces. In other words, the amount of day care spaces being provided is nowhere near what is needed. We can debate the amount of need that exists in the community. We can debate whether all children should be in day care centres. We can debate whether most mothers would prefer to stay home and take care of their children rather than working and having to send their children to day care.

• (1940)

When we use statistics to point out the size of the need in the country some government Members accuse us of being social engineers, or of wanting to regiment society and shove every child into day care. However, in spite of those political points that are being made, and even though those political points may be effective in some quarters, or perhaps are persuasive to some people, it does not erase the reality that the amount of spaces that will be created by the day care program of the Government in no way matches the need.

Over the last two decades increasing numbers of women and increasing numbers of mothers have entered the labour force. Therefore, there is a social revolution. Rather than things being as they once were where the father would be in the workforce and the mother would be at home with the children, this situation has changed radically. If one looks at the statistics, it can be seen that the number of families in which the mother stays home rather than works as well as takes care of the children is in the minority today. For the majority of families the social reality is that both parents are working.

When both parents work we as a society must ask the fundamental questions: "How do we take care of our children? How do we take care of young Canadians? How do we assure ourselves that young children receive the loving, adequate, and competent care that they require in order that they will grow up to be good people, competent, mature individuals, and good citizens?" That is what the day care question is about. It is about the making of mature and responsible human beings.

It is important to note that there are many families in which both parents are working and there is a need for quality care for those children. Those children should not be cared for as a happenstance. The Government has stated that it is spending $6.4 billion on day care. While that makes a big splash and a big impression, the impact on the social reality is a fraction of what is needed. First, that is over seven years, therefore, there is less than $1 billion a year. This is a fast emerging social need that demands a radical restructuring of our spending priorities so that we can find the resources necessary in order to provide the services.

If we put the day care program of the Government in the light of what is required and needed then it falls short of the mark. Some people might say that that is okay because we are making some progress and while some people would like to go faster, we are going as fast as we can.

If we compare what the Government is doing with what is needed, we might accept that as a perspective and as a way of looking at and evaluating the day care program of the Government. If a much more thorough analysis is conducted of the Government's day care program, for example, a budgetary analysis, and we compared the program against what is needed and what was in place already, if we compared the budget for day care that exists today under the Canada Assistance Plan, which has present legislation, budgets, and a track record, with the program the Government is bringing forward now, the Epp program, and if we looked behind the headlines, we would find out something that is quite shocking because it radically changes our perspective on this program. If the present program for day care were left in place, the Canada Assistance Plan, there would be more day care spaces created over the next seven years than there will be under the initiative of the Government.

When I first heard that stated I was short of breath and knocked back. I could not believe it, because I had been reading the headlines and they gave me the impression that the Government was taking a bold initiative. However, when someone took the time to study the details of the program and its budget, they found out that the Government is replacing an existing day care program with a new program that will produce fewer day care spaces than the old program would have. We have a retreat on day care and a cut-back. There is a diminished commitment on day care. In fact, it begins to make a lot of sense. While it would be surprising to see a Conservative Government take bold action on day care, it makes a lot more sense when we understand that it is replacing a program that is in place with a new program that will cost less and produce fewer spaces. That fits much more with our experience of the Government.

When the Government has changed social policies over the last four years it has always meant a lower priority on the scale of social programs, and it has meant fewer dollars for social programs. For example, when the Government decided to do something about old age pensions, what did it do? When government Members spoke in the House they spoke of improvements, but what they attempted to foist on people was a deindexation of the old age pensions and removing the annual cost of living raises that go up with inflation. Over a period of years that would have destroyed the pensions. That is much more typical of the actions of the Government. The point that we must realize is that the Government is introducing a program that will have a less positive impact when it comes to day care than the program that is presently in place.

I wish to return to the question of day care from a different angle. What are the elements that make up a good day care program? I want to take some advice from people who have studied this very closely, particularly the women's organization, the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women. It was established in 1973 as an independent organization funded by the federal Government. The Council's mandate is to advise the Government and inform the public on matters of concern to women.

• (1950)

This is what the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, who is there to advise Government on day care, says about child care. It ends up with a question, but it says this, that almost two million pre-school children across Canada need child care services because their parents work or study more than 20 hours a week. But there are only 244,000 licensed child care spaces to meet their needs. The federal Government's national child care strategy for the next seven years will do little to address the child care crisis. By 1995, at the end of the seven-year period, only 25 per cent of current need for licence spaces will be met. More than half of the funds allocated by the federal Government to child care during that time will give tax breaks to higher-income parents.

The proposed program will do little to make quality child care services available to all children and families who need it. It does not adequately recognize the contributions of parents who care for children at home.

That is the comment of the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women on the Government's child care strategy. It ends up with a question that it would like to ask Members of Parliament and candidates in the next election, and that is: What steps will your Party take to ensure that publicly-funded, non-profit quality child care services are universally available to all families who need them in the same way that health and education now are?

That is the question that we have to ask the Government. What is it prepared to do to see that there are publicly-funded non-profit quality child care services, universally accessible, in the same manner as health and education? In other words, we would not tolerate a situation in which the vast majority of Canadian children did not have access to health care or did not have access to education, to schools. So why do we tolerate it when it comes to child care? Each of these elements is necessary in order for a child to get a fair chance in our society, to grow up to be a healthy, mature, responsible citizen.

So this Government has failed the challenge of child care. It has failed to bring in a program that is adequate to the need. Not only that, but it has brought in a program that will be producing fewer day care spaces than the existing program. So what it has produced is a fraud, a deception, a sleight of hand. It gives the impression through the headlines that it is taking bold action because you could read figures like $6.4 billion. But if you do a budgetary analysis, you will find it is in fact going to be spending less and creating fewer spaces than if it left things as they were.

The status quo is better than the Tory initiative. That is the sad reality of this day care package that is before this House. That is a tragedy for the children of this society. We would not tolerate a situation in which children did not have a school to go to. We would not tolerate a situation in which children did not have the health care that they needed. Why does this Government ask Canadians to tolerate a situation in which children that need care do not have a child care program available for them? That is the question that this Government has to answer.

I want to sum up by saying that the Government has been shrewd and clever in its management of the news, in its management of the headlines. But when it comes down to the substance, when it comes down to meeting the human needs, it has failed. It has failed to meet the need. In fact, it has done less than what would have been done if it had left things alone. That is a sad commentary but an understandable one.

We know that it is the objective of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) to cut back on social spending. He has indicated that in so many ways in so many areas of social policy. So this day care initiative fits with the objectives of the Minister of Finance, but it does not fit with the children of Canada, with the families of Canada. It fails abysmally, because it does not provide for what is needed. Not only that, but it reduces the commitment of the federal Government in the area of child care.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions or comments.

Mr. Charest: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some very brief comments and put a question to my colleague. First of all, I would just like to comment slightly by saying that I think people listening tonight will find it a bit incredible that the Hon. Member would even indicate that what the Government is proposing today in terms of a day care policy is worse than the status quo when in fact it is investing $6.7 billion.

It does not require me to yell or to use great rhetoric to put that point across. Canadians listening to us tonight must know that any Government who spends $6.7 billion over a seven-year period, whether it is day care or anything else, is spending a lot of money—taxpayers' money.

An Hon. Member: It could be less.

Mr. Charest: To just discard the policy, whether it is on day care or anything else, on such an issue is a challenge to the mind. How anybody could get up in the House of Commons and so blatantly push away such a policy is just incredible, it is a challenge to the mind. But then again, I guess if you are from the NDP, such challenges once in a while creep up and occur.

The question I want to put to the Hon. Member is of great interest to provincial governments, and to the provincial Government of the Province of Quebec. I know it is of some concern and I know also that the Members and their Party as well as the official critic have been saying that this legislation lacks in specifics on national norms, and it is their position that the legislation should include something very precise on that very issue. I want to know from the New Democratic Party of

Canada how far they are ready to go in implementing what they thing should be national norms. The provincial Governments would certainly like to know.

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, I must say I welcome my colleague's question. He makes the point that I made when I opened my speech. He said it is incredible that a Government that spends $6.4 billion is worse than the status quo. Well, on first blush, he makes sense in what he is saying. That is where the challenge comes in. The thing is, you just do not take a look at $6.4 billion in a vacuum. You have to compare it to what present government expenditures are and what are present government plans and programs for spending in the future. When you compare it on that level, what is revealed, once you pull away this curtain, is that in fact the new program will produce fewer day care spaces than the existing federal government programs. That is the interesting reality. People should get a chance to understand those facts.

I think that the Government's play for the headlines is not going to work as a political gambit. This is the first thing. The second thing was how far we would go with regard to national mores, which is what I think the Member said. Well, what we believe in this Party is that, when you establish a national social program such as day care, you must have national objectives. A responsible Government will say that this is the kind of program that we want, this is the kind of program that will provide for the day care needs and the child care needs of the nation. Then, of course, provinces can buy into the program and become involved.

First of all, you have to have the political leadership out of this Chamber and you have to have some accountability for those funds, accountability in terms of a national objective. The sad part of this program is that it is a program that gives no national direction. It turns over a pot of money to the provinces. It gives a global funding arrangement by which provinces can do whatever they want with the money, obviously in the day care field, but they can still do whatever they want. It is a hands-off approach, Mr. Speaker. It is the nightmare of Meech Lake. Rather than use the opportunity for political leadership and the opportunity to provide some direction, it takes a hands-off approach and says that the provinces can do whatever they want.

• (2000)

I disagree with our Liberal colleague who spoke earlier and who blamed this on the Meech Lake Accord. I would not blame it on the Meech Lake Accord. Given the Meech Lake Accord, you must have political leadership at the national level in order to provide direction so that you can have good national programs. If the federal Government had taken this approach when it came to the establishment of medicare, we would not have medicare in this country. I say to my colleague that we need to have national objectives. Then we will have set standards whereby the provincial Governments and the federal administration can be held accountable for the expenditures of those moneys according to the national objectives.

Mr. Charest: I have a very short supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I think Canadians from the Province of Quebec will find it of particular interest that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Keeper) from the New Democratic Party would describe this piece of legislation—if I heard him correctly—as the nightmare of Meech Lake. I want to know from him whether he intends, along with the Leader of his Party, because we are approaching a federal election in the next few months to a year, to enter the Province of Quebec and campaign specifically on that issue with regard to this legislation.

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, all I would say is that you can have a Meech Lake nightmare and you can also have a Meech Lake dream. This Government has chosen the nightmare. It has chosen not to provide political leadership. If you want to have a dream, you have to provide leadership and direction. That is possible under our Constitution. The nightmare in this situation is that the Government has abdicated its responsibility to provide political leadership. The Government is abusing the Meech Lake Accord in that way. It is saying: "Okay, we will leave direction for day care to the provinces and we will provide no national leadership".

Mr. Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to comment. The Minister of State for Youth and for Fitness and Amateur Sport (Mr. Charest) works within the ambit of the Department of National Health and Welfare. We understand why he is putting in a good word for his boss, the Minister. I must say that my colleague labelled this the "Epp plan" and then later on called it a fraud and deception. Members will appreciate that I might have felt those observations rather keenly.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): If you allow me a moment or two, Mr. Speaker, to get precisely to the point, I would like to remind Canadians that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) in early 1985 published a paper on child benefits in which he promised that there would not be a reduction in child benefits and if there were in any part of that, the money would stay within the envelope, in the jargon of the federal Government, so it would not be lost to families. The same Minister was forced by September, 1985, to concede that there would be through deindexation of the family allowance, a reduction in child benefits which would be a loss to families because he would not, in fact, keep the money in his area of spending. He made no particular apology for having taken up the imperatives of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) and, in the process, broke his word to Canadian families.

Though I might at first be inclined to feeling a little piqued at this harsh description of the "Epp plan" on child care, those Canadians who are watching and wondering whether my friend is telling the truth about a plan that can represent over the next seven years less spending if it is put into effect than

would occur if the existing arrangements under the Canada Assistance Plan, dating from the mid-1960s remain in effect, and if provinces take up the opportunity to provide child care under that joint funding arrangement between Ottawa and the provincial Governments of this country, it is possible.

My colleague says that this could be less spending, even if the Minister who has been commenting cannot believe that and finds it too much for his mind, but I must say that in working with youth he should be capable of understanding almost anything. The possibility that a Minister in the Conservative Government, as my friend has said very rightly, might be involved in just this kind of fraudulent game on the Canadian public seems to me quite possible, given the record of the Minister of National Health and Welfare. He has yielded to Tuxedo and River Heights before against the interest of Steinbach and Ste. Anne, and he has done it one more time.

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, when I spoke about the "Epp plan", obviously I was thinking more of Jake than of Ernie. When I said that it was a deception, I really was not trying to say that it was a "dis-Epp-tion". I was trying to say that it seemed to me to be misleading. I hope that I have not insulted my colleague. I certainly stand by my critique of the day care program of the Government.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Charest (Minister of State (Youth) and Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your customary generosity. The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) wants me to go easy on the compliments, Mr. Speaker, but I warn you I will ignore his advice. I intend to express my appreciation of your excellent work in the Chair and your immense patience as well. We all know it is not an easy job, Mr. Speaker, because every single day, and even at night, because we are working overtime . . . This is not just the usual extended hours. We are working on extended hours during the summer, Mr. Speaker, and during all that time you have to listen to speeches by the New Democratic Party.

An Hon. Member: It is not easy.

Mr. Charest: I think we may have to review your income supplement because the job is worth more. It is worth . . . I do not know if we could ever pay you enough . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Charest: . . . in return for what you have to endure in the course of a single evening.

An Hon. Member: The father of multiculturalism.

Mr. Charest: Mr. Speaker, earlier I said to my colleague from the New Democratic Party that we had trouble sitting here listening to one of their speeches that contained, substantially, the following statement. The New Democratic Party tells us that this program worth $6 . . .

Mr. Della Noce: . . . $6.4 billion . . .

Mr. Charest: . . . $6.4 billion which will be spent over a period of about seven years is peanuts. They would prefer to keep the *status quo*. They would rather turn back the clock. They would rather not spend $6.4 billion in taxpayer's money.

If that is any indication of what we can expect during the next election campaign, there will not be much to fear. This is what is referred to in Quebec as the "Capitaine Bonhomme" technique. "Capitaine Bonhomme" used to say, and we even heard it said by the Hon. Member for Terrebonne (Mr. Toupin) when he was sitting with the NPD, when he shouted from the other side of the House that "les sceptiques seraient confondus"... Well, "Capitaine Bonhomme" seems to be in charge of the New Democratic Party's campaign committee.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of reasons why the Government decided to introduce this Bill and this policy. Today, we are specifically considering the Bill, but there is also a general strategy of which this Bill is a part. In recent years, there were a number of developments in our society that made our Government decide to react. These are developments that in fact all political parties are able to recongnize. We agree on that. There is for instance the fact, and this has already been mentioned, that women are entering the labour market in increasing numbers. It is not for us to judge whether it is a good or a bad thing. It is a fact of life. I think it is a good thing. I think women have the right to do so just as men did before. People no longer question their right to enter the labour market, and if they make that choice, just as men make the same choice, they should be allowed to do so.

• (2010)

So this is one factor making child care services increasingly important. There are other factors besides, Mr. Speaker. Family structure in our society has changed, for all sorts of reasons, good or bad; again, we are not to judge that today, but, for example, there are more and more single-parent families. So there are more and more women who are single mothers with children and who have to take care of them and at the same time earn their living; they must work. The children must still be cared for. These women, like so many others, do not make much money and child care services are important—that is another important factor.

Mr. Champagne (Champlain): The NDP does not understand that.

Mr. Charest: My colleague from Champlain (Mr. Champagne) says that the New Democratic Party does not understand that. I would not have said that, Mr. Speaker, but I tend to agree with him. I did not say it.

So, Mr. Speaker, added to that, and I think that we have not talked much about the changes within the labour market itself . . . We tend to think these days that in this modern era, investment, modernization and all that will bring jobs. Whenever we announce subsidies, for example, we try to help companies in the regions through regional economic development. From time to time, we automatically think that this means jobs. That is not always true, Mr. Speaker. You know, investing and modernizing sometimes mean loss of employment and it is difficult to put that in context. But we modernize to be more competitive.

Canada is an exporting country, and it is probably one of the few countries in the world that depends to such a great extent on exports as a percentage of its gross domestic product. There is also West Germany, and in fact we are both very close. Since Canada is an exporting country, we have to invest and we have to be competitive as a country, and sometimes that means losing jobs. All that to reach a simple conclusion! This means that changes in the labour market are important. For instance, the number of jobs in the service sector in Canada is increasing. In the forties, about 40 per cent of jobs were in the service industry in this country, while by 1986, it was 75 per cent. What this means? Well traditionally, women are more highly represented in the service sector than they are in any other industry. Ironically, and I say ironically in referring to the last two years, women have performed well on the labour market because of shifts in the kind of jobs available. Such shifts are not unique to Canada. They are a worldwide phenomenon. It means more and more part-time work, sometimes temporary work, which is another facet of the situation of women on the labour market and in fact of whole families.

Mr. Speaker, one aspect that has not been discussed today is the role played by men, because in recent years, the emphasis has been on discussing what the role of women should be in the family, on the labour market and so forth, but men are also changing the way they live. Men enter the labour market, their jobs change, they are displaced by new technology, and they are asked to play an increasingly important role in terms of society's values with respect to men. I noticed in the course of this debate that there have been very few references to the changing roles of men, and I know something about the subject. The Hon. Member for Champlain (Mr. Champagne) knows about this and the Hon. Member for Chambly (Mr. Grisé) as well. We have young families, we have young children and all that, and our roles are changing as well. There is another person who is knowledgeable on the subject, Mr. Speaker, and I am proud to refer to our Prime Minister.

An Hon. Member: He changes diapers.

Mr. Charest: He is very close to his family, and Members on both sides of the House have seen for themselves that he is very much attached to his family and his wife. It is a marvelous sight. People think he is promoting certain values, but he is also keenly aware, and I have discussed the matter with him, of the fact that men have to change their attitudes within the family unit. It's all very well to put all the mechanisms in place, but men will have to do more. They will have to redefine and share to a greater extent the responsibilities within the family unit.

That being said, it is clear, Mr. Speaker, that we need more day care. We need more day care so that these people can live, can develop and participate fully in the labour market and in Canadian society, because that is what we mean by participation in our society.

I see the Hon. Member for Outremont (Mrs. Pépin) who is joining us. Please sit down and join us! It's nice to see you again. So the Hon. Member for Outremont is with us again, and I am delighted to see her, because I have some comments and questions. However, we all agree that these needs exist and that these changes are taking place. We are probably more sensitive to the changing roles of men in our Party, since the other parties never even mentioned the subject. We decided to talk about it this evening. There is a problem, however, when we talk about the means for bringing about these changes.

Members of the New Democratic Party have already told us what they thought of our approach. We intend to spend $6.7 billion, and their answer was that it was peanuts, did not mean a thing and was regressive. I would like to know how many people are sitting in Sherbrooke this evening in that beautiful riding of mine who are going to believe that. These are people who already pay taxes every Thursday. Just imagine, their paycheck arrives, part of it is taken away, and the New Democratic Party tells them that $6.7 billion is peanuts! They want to take the rest of your paycheck as well! What really worries me is that they are going to deduct so much income tax from my constituents' paychecks in the riding of Sherbrooke that they will not be able to afford the day care the Government wants to give them. In any case, that is another problem.

As far as the practical side is concerned, the Government wanted to establish a policy that would respect the jurisdiction of the provinces, because after all we are in Canada and not in the United States or Great Britain. Policies are not developed in a vacuum. They evolve within the constitutional reality of this country which provides that the provinces have certain jurisdictions. And the Province of Quebec, and this should be of interest to the Hon. Member for Outremont, also has its own jurisdiction. If we discuss the matter with our counterparts in Quebec, I am sure they would be interested to talk to you about their jurisdiction.

In the Bill before the House today, Mr. Speaker, we appreciate that reality and we want to make certain adjustments. The New Democratic Party and the federal Liberal Party of Canada do not recognize that reality. I know that. I have already heard what they had to say in the House. They claim, for instance, that we are not setting national standards and are not showing any leadership.

Mr. Speaker, let's be honest. What they are saying is totally false.

An Hon. Member: They did nothing for twenty years!

Mr. Charest: We have to call a spade a spade. It's just not true.

The Bill contains some very clear indications in that respect. The standards that we ask the provinces to develop and implement include (1) the child:care-giver ratio; (2) the qualifications of the day care staff; (3) the size of the groups by age and type of care; (4) health and safety measures; and the nature of parental participation, Mr. Speaker. What we plan to enforce those standards, Mr. Speaker, is specific agreements with the provinces recognizing, for example, that Quebec may be more advanced than the other provinces. Are you going to deny that? You see, they almost agree with us. I am sure that the Hon. Member for Outremont will vote for the Bill at this rate.

Are Quebec and Ontario, for example, as advanced as other provinces like New Brunswick, for example? Are they as advanced in New Brunswick as in Ontario, Mr. Speaker? To ask the question is to answer it. Basically, what is wrong with a Bill that recognizes these realities? Do we always have to act as if that were not the case or must we, the federal Government, always impose our will on everything? It is not necessary, Mr. Speaker, when you want to do things that work, practical things out in the field. When the time comes to act, when choices have to be made, when you have to implement what was discussed, be it in 15 or 20 years when they were in power or in our case, in the space of one mandate, the reasonable time we took to put this together, when that time comes, these realities must be recognized. Something must be done for those people. That is exactly what this Bill does.

There are three main objectives. Our national policy can also be divided into three parts, more or less. First, what we are trying to do, looking at the objectives as a whole, is to develop a flexible strategy, one that respects the parents' right to choose. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, we as a party—this may surprise you because I know . . . Not you, excuse me, it will not surprise you. We have great respect for your intelligence, Mr. Speaker, but it surprises the people on the other side, both in the federal Liberal Party and in the New Democratic Party. Imagine that—we want to let parents choose. What a sin! What a scandal to presume that Canadians can have the intelligence to choose what to do with their own tax money! We will have a choice soon, Mr. Speaker, you see, because another Government would take their money and tell them that is the way it is. Not only will they take your money, they will take twice as much. We will take twice as much, as the New Democratic Party would say, and we will give you no choice because we know what is good for you.

Mr. Speaker, we believe we are past that stage. Because people are intelligent. Earlier they referred to the fact I am Minister of State (Youth). True, I am the Minister of State (Youth), but I do not claim I know our young people very well, in the sense that I do not know each choice of each individual. But I know them well enough to know that they want to have a choice, they want to make their own choice. They want to be treated as full partners in our Canadian society.

The legislation recognizes that reality.

We also want to ensure that child care is accessible, affordable, and of better quality. This is what we are aiming at.

So this Government uses three major approaches. There is increased tax assistance to families, Mr. Speaker—this is the first approach, an important approach that will put some money into their pockets through the tax system. The second approach is the new fund for child care project implementation, and there you will see a certain diversity in the approaches taken, recognizing the fact there is no magic solution, no uniform solution for everyone, and what we aim to do through that new fund, Mr. Speaker, is for instance to give an opportunity to those who want to offer specialized services, to submit project proposals.

As I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, this Government is accepting projects, examining them through National Health and Welfare, in order that a group wanting to have a project for handicapped children in a child care centre can do so. It is important to be able to recognize those differences. This is what we mean when we refer to the right of choice. Because not all people are alike. We cannot have a ready-made system that will fit everyone because there are for instance ethnic groups, and they can chose to submit a special project.

Groups with handicapped children for instance can make that choice. There are all kinds of reasons, all kinds of differences that make our society richer in all kinds of ways, and this we would like to recognize through that program.

Through the legislation indeed. Of course, the legislation now before us.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me offer a remark that goes a little beyond the subject at hand this evening, but that is directly linked to the legislation and the result expected from this legislation. The question we must ask now as we sit in this House, after the decision taken by the Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada (Mr. Turner) is this: Will he or will he not instruct the Senate to block this legislation?

Because as you see, Mr. Speaker, the votes of Canadian men and women is not good enough any more. Because if today you are a federal Liberal, Mr. Speaker, you can decide what is good or what is bad, no matter how the people voted. The vote of each Canadian man and woman has been reduced, diminished that very day the Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada (Mr. Turner) stooped himself to block Government legislation in the Senate, on free trade of course. That is what I am talking about. Even though he promised to tear up the deal as soon as he would be elected leader of this country, he changes his mind, he turns around, and claims that no, a non-elected Senate does have the right and will be asked to show its expertise in filibustering.

In other words, in order to protect, and it is a real challenge to understand the reasoning behind this whole thing, Mr. Speaker, in order to protect democracy, John Turner decides to deny democracy. That is the new philosophy of the federal Liberal Party. You've got to see it to believe it! A few months ago, this same man, Mr. Speaker, while being stabbed in the

back by half the members of his own caucus, was referring to the democratic process by which he was elected. In 1986, more than half the members of his caucus told him to quit and leave his Party and stabbed him in the back. And where was he during all this time? We know! He was going through a very difficult time, a very painful family ordeal, while half of his caucus, more than half of his caucus were democratically stabbing him in the back and telling him to quit. And what did John Turner say? Democracy, my friends! In November 1986, 76 per cent of our delegates elected me leader of the Party. I have the right to retain my position, based on the democratic fundamental principle of our country. Now, a few months later, he changes his mind and says: Let us forget about democracy! The non-elected Liberal Senate can now start filibustering.

Mr. Speaker, I only mention this because in a few months Canadians will have the opportunity to vote, and, in fact, to make a big decision. They will have to determine the value of their vote for all subsequent elections. If the strategy used by the Canadian Senate, and by the federal Liberal Party of Canada, ever succeeds, from that time on, the value of the voting right of each and every Canadian will be diminished, and a Bill like this one would be jeopardized by a leader as weak as John Turner, and a party as weak and as undemocratic as the federal Liberal Party of Canada.

• (2020)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments. The Hon. Member for Outremont (Mrs. Pépin).

Mrs. Pépin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of State for Youth who seems to know everything about day care centres . . . in fact, he seems to know a lot of things. He made a case for day care centres by referring to the Senate and the Liberal Party.

I wish he would give me more details because the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) has had a lot to say about the war his Governement is waging against drugs and cocaine. As it happens, one preventive program against juvenile delinquency would involve extracurricular day care centres for children aged 6 to 14. We also know that 57 per cent of these children are alone after school hours.

Since he mentioned the Province of Quebec I am telling him that it is one of the crucial problems facing Quebec—I mean extracurricular centres—because it is the only province which makes grants to support this kind of day care centres.

So what does his Government intend to do to promote day care centres, because there is no reference to them in the legislation? Clause 2 even excludes services relating to education.

Mr. Charest: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Hon. Member for Outremont (Mrs. Pepin) should ask me that question, particularly as it relates to Quebec and fields of jurisdiction.

We on this side are somewhat taken aback by the statements made by the federal Liberal Party of Canada, especially by her colleague the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) and by herself, the Hon. Member for Outremont, to the effect that the legislation fails to give a clear definition of the standards, that the standards are not clear enough.

What I would like to know is just how far the federal Liberal Party of Canada is prepared to go to impose these standards and how far it is prepared to go to impose them within the Province of Quebec.

Can the Hon. Member for Outremont tell us whether she knows the answer to that question, because I would like to know. I would like to know what they will tell Quebecers about the standards.

Mr. Speaker, in response to her question, she knows full well that the legislation provides for agreements. I can tell you that our objective is to be as flexible as possible so that we will be able to acknowledge the legitimate options of the provinces while taking into consideration their needs and, if you will, how far they have progressed in the day care sector.

Still the Hon. Member for Outremont ought to be able to tell us whether or not the Liberal Party of Quebec is at one with the federal Liberal Party of Canada when it comes to the question of standards. Do they agree with them, yes or no?

[*English*]

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I have a comment and I want to direct a question to the Minister. My comment is that his speech was excellent in its rhetoric but a failure in its substance. He seemed afraid to answer questions. He was afraid to answer the question of the Hon. Member for Outremont (Mrs. Pépin). Therefore, I want to ask him a question.

As I understand it, the Meech Lake Accord permits establishment of national objectives for new social programs which the federal Government funds. Child care is a new social program which the federal Government is funding. Why did the Government not put in place standards for the provinces? The provinces are getting all this money and are essentially going to set up child care.

I have a further question for the Minister and I would ask him to answer it. Does he believe that the federal Government should set up standards when it gives money like this to the provinces?

• (2030)

Mr. Charest: Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing at this time the old school of thought of the NDP, the New Democratic Party of the late 1980s versus the early 1980s New Democratic Party of Canada, the one that voted with the federal Liberal Party to repatriate the Constitution even though the Quebec National Assembly had voted unanimously against that. There are two schools of thought in the New Democratic Party. We heard one of them tonight and at this point in time are witnessing the other school of thought.

The Hon. Member for Vancouver—Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) has expressed his opposition to the Meech Lake Accord with some conviction and has paid a price for that. He is asking us, in the context of his personal opposition, which is not consistent with the position of his own Party, for our answer on the question of national norms.

The first answer is obvious although it may not be obvious to the Hon. Member. I say that respectfully because the Hon. Member operates on a centralized premise. He sees Canada as having a centralized government. The fact is that there are different jurisdictions in Canada. This legislation recognizes those different jurisdictions. There should be nothing surprising about the fact that the provinces have jurisdiction in this.

Through this legislation we recognize the specific areas in which the federal Government, with the provinces, wants to establish some norms including the ratio between children and those who keep them; the qualifications of the personnel; the sizes of the groups, their ages and types; regulations on health and security; and the nature of parental participation. These are all things provided for in the legislation and they should be consistent with the way in which Canada operates.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Hamelin: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to my colleague, of course. The Opposition speaks a lot about national standards... Here is my question: Would my colleague consider, as the Opposition no doubt does, that the government of Alberta and the parents in that province have lower standards concerning the security and safety of buildings? In Newfoundland or British Columbia, for example, are people less concerned about employee qualifications? Are we to consider, and this is the question I ask my colleague, that some Canadian parents and some provincial governments are less responsible than others towards the children of this country?

Mr. Charest: Mr. Speaker, that is a very good question from my colleague from Charlevoix (Mr. Hamelin), whom I recognize...

An Hon. Member: You have to make it easy for him!

Mr. Charest: ... as a great advocate of the people and whom I commend for the excellent work he has done on Bill C-72, for example. He will no doubt go down in the history of our Party as someone who has made a substantial contribution.

Actually, what he is telling me a little ironically, I must say, is that the Opposition thinks that everybody should be the same, that everybody should be in the same boat. Their vision of the country is that everybody should be put on the same conveyor belt, should be stamped and approved from above...

Do you know to what extent, Mr. Speaker, this is true? Just yesterday, as Wayne Gretzky was being traded because he had decided to join his wife... That's the way it is, Mr. Speaker, where the wife goes, the husband must follow! He decided to join his wife in Los Angeles. The New Democratic Party suggested that the transaction be stopped, that the marriage of Mrs. Wilson and Mr. Gretzky be cancelled immediately and that a warrant for the arrest of Wayne Gretzky be issued so that he can be put in jail when he returns to Canada. How scandalous! They will soon have the choice. Theirs would be kind of government where everybody and everything would be the same. One need only go out a bit in the world to realize that things are not the same everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, we must not be afraid to live in a world where people are different. It is not because they are different that we must be afraid. Differences make us richer. They make for a varied world. We must not be afraid to recognize differences among people.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments are now over. On debate, the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) has the floor.

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the Minister is delighted to see that the question and comment period is over. He has nearly lost his voice from so much shouting. It is to be feared that if he should continue like this, he could choke again, Mr. Speaker.

I do not think there is a single Member in this House who is now fully aware of just how important this debate on Bill C-144 is. I am one of those who would like to emphasize the impact this Bill is likely to have on their ridings and, if I may, I should like to refer to a survey which was carried out not so long ago on this issue in my own riding and share with my colleagues its findings.

But before coming to the heart of the matter, I should like first of all to state unequivocally that the needs do exist. It is a well established fact. Several commissions of inquiry have already made a number of recommendations, the issue has been thorougly examined, so that the time now is for action and not for further studies.

[*English*]

I do not think there is any argument on the need for an increase in adequate child care spaces in Canada. That has been fully explained and documented over the years, as far back as the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in 1970.

I want to put on the record a statement made by my leader on October 26, 1986. At that time he stated on *The Nation's Business*:

> "We in the Liberal Party believe that any child care system must be based on two principles: 1) sharing the burden and 2) providing choices.
>
> Our proposal is that parents, the private sector, and provincial and federal governments will share the costs. It will be a mixed program, with more facilities and help for those who do not have access to the facilities—particularly in rural areas."

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, several Members of this House have clearly demonstrated today that child care has become a social issue. Canadian families have experienced dramatic changes over the

past twenty years as a result of an increasing shift in population towards urban areas in an effort to adapt to a more modern way of life. Things have changed gradually so that now traditional families with only one bread winner are now a minority and we see more and more the advent of new families structures. Take, for instance, the case of single parent families. They represent 20 per cent of all the families in my riding; in other words, one in every five families is a single parent family and 90 per cent of them with children. Nowadays, there are childless couples, families with two bread winners, families which are entirely different from those which existed 25 or 30 years ago, and we must create the social structures to meet the important challenge we are faced with in 1988, namely, how to deal with the children, and especially those who need day care because both their parents are part of the labour force.

Thanks to a questionnaire which I circulated in my riding a few months ago, I came to the realization that a great many of my constituents are very much interested in this issue.

• (2040)

According to Statistics Canada's most recent report, there are 19,265 families in my constituency. Of that number, 8,180 do not have children at home and 3,635 are single-parent families, including 3,075 headed by women. There is a total of 18,520 children at home, including 4,325 aged six years or less. They are the ones needing day care services.

Besides the changes I was talking about earlier, there is a large increase in the number of women in the workforce, particularly those with children under six. In 1967, 16 per cent of those women were in the workforce whereas now, 20 years later, that number is 56 per cent among women with children aged three years or less and 63 per cent among those with children between three and five. It is a radical change.

Therefore, we see right away that something must be done to help those women and families take care of their children because it is the next generation of Canadians that is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, it is essentially the economic conditions which caused the changes I was talking about. Since 1960, the purchasing power of single-income families has not stopped decreasing. That has put more and more pressure on those families and forced many of their members to work outside the home. The reality is that 44 per cent of Canadian families now rely on both spouses to bring home the money required to support the household. It is a reality that we, as responsible lawmakers, must take into account.

For millions of children currently needing day care services because both their parents are in the workforce, there are only 250,000 spaces in public child care centres, which barely meet 15 per cent of the demand. It is not enough, we know it, something must be done.

Because there are not enough spaces in day care centres children must put up with day care services of lesser quality, constantly change sitters or, worse, be kept under the care of persons whose qualifications are doubtful if not inexistent. That, Mr. Speaker, is not what we consider as adequate in many cases.

Parents who have been able to find acceptable day care services still have a problem: professional services cost a great deal. One must be ready to pay between $4,000 and $6,000 a year per child.

As an example, I was discussing this problem some time ago with my parliamentary assistant whose wife works outside the home. They have two children. They are among those in my riding who have been able to find a quality day care centre. They are satisfied with the quality of service provided at the centres their two children go to.

However, that couple must pay $500 a month for the four-year old child and more than $800 a month for the one-year-old. That amounts to more than $1,300 a month for the two children, or $15,600 a year for the assistant of a Member of Parliament who is not paid a high salary. Unfortunately, we cannot pay our assistants as much as we would like to, we are on a tight budget, but I know that in order to pay $15,600 a year of family income for day care this individual is making sacrifices. Mr. Speaker, those parents tried for a while to answer their need for day care but economic conditions are getting too much for them. Considering the amounts I have just cited, we can see how much more difficult to solve my assistant's problem can be for other low or middle income Canadian families.

Day care services will therefore be restricted more and more to an elite who can afford to pay what they cost. That is not what we mean when we talk about reforming the system, giving Canadians the day care services they need.

We can see it is urgent to solve the problem. But the need to act does not mean forsaking the opportunity to review the problems to be solved and the ways to solve them.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there are two ways that the Government tries to help families with children and we know that for many years, billions of dollars have been spent to help Canadian families meet their needs.

Mr. Speaker, we now spend $5 billion a year through the tax system to help Canadian families with children. First, there are government benefits for families with children. These families enjoy several programs collectively known as the Child Benefits Plan. They are family allowances, the child tax credit and the tax exemption for dependent children.

In 1984-85, net expenditures for the Child Benefits Plan were $4.09 billion and it is estimated that in 1986, $4.82 billion was spent on this budget item.

The other aspect is child care services. In addition to government financial support for child care, this service takes four forms: (1) the income tax deduction for child care expenses; (2) sharing the cost of subsidized child care services for low-income families with the provinces under the Canada Assistance Plan, which has existed for many years, as we know.

When I hear my colleagues from the Government side say that the previous Government never did anything... They cannot be serious, because for many years, there have been both tax programs and direct assistance programs to help Canadian families meet their needs to raise children.

Third are the training allowances for parents taking courses sponsored by Employment and Immigration Canada.

It is well known today that training programs are available to Canadian men and women and that if they need child care services, the federal Government provides financial contributions to that end.

Fourth, there are contributions by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for child care services and Day care services in Indian reserves. Those four measures have cost about 224 millions dollars in 1984, according to the last figures available.

Those amounts seem high at first, but one must not forget that the deduction for child care expenses benefits primarily high revenue families and only if they can provide receipts. That as is very important!

As we have seen earlier, those who can afford to pay more than 1,000 $ a month in child care expenses are entitled to a tax break, but not those who have inadequate or almost non-existent revenues.

Assistance is provided to low revenue families through the Cost Sharing Program of the Public Assistance Program of Canada, but less than 20 per cent of eligible children six years old or less have benefited from this program up to now.

Furthermore, some measures allow families to raise their children. There are the family allowances which have been in existence for many years, as well as the child tax credit, the tax deduction for children. Unfortunately, all those have been reduced, Mr. Speaker. They have been reduced by the Mulroney Government through desindexation.

This has had a serious impact on poor and low income families. According to figures available to us, every family will lose ground in 1990 with the deindexation of those tax measures.

The situation is therefore urgent. It has to be dealt with. We, in the Liberal party, believe in the major principles which must underlie this reform of assistance to child care services. So, before dealing with the Government Bill, that is C-144, I want to recall the principles stated in several reports, but more recently in the minority report presented to the committee by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Outremont (Mrs. Pépin), entitled *Choices for Child Care: Now and in the Future*, dated March 1987. Mr. Speaker, this document has to be read, for it represents a serious approach and gives an alternative which could in my opinion provide us with a good solution.

First of all, we believe in the value of the parents' role. In order for them to be able to care for their children, we have to create programs of parental leave, flexible working hours, work sharing, etc. It is difficult, I grant you that, but it is not impossible. We will have to use our imagination, innovate a little, but that is the challenge we are facing in the workplace today. As we know, more and more businesses and industries provide and must continue to provide day care services, because that may be the solution to some of the problems.

Second, we need quality services which will guarantee the full development of the children. Child care is not a mere physical surveillance. These children are the next generation of citizens and the services we provide must prepare them to achieve their full development. In that respect, the school system is the most elaborate and valued child care system we have. The youngest should not, because of their age, be neglected. Young children are young human beings and they have the right to be treated as such. To that end, we will have to set and enforce basic standards dealing with accommodation, programs and staff training to ensure a good emotional, intellectual and social development of our children.

The third main principle is the development of institutions to implement over the years a comprehensive child care system of good quality, everywhere in Canada.

Fourth, there is the important principle of justice and equity. What does it mean? It means that assistance must go to the families most in need and that all families in the same situation must share the same opportunities.

The fifth objective is social justice, which means that the cost of child care must be shared equally among beneficiaries, namely governments, parents and employers.

The sixth objective is the harmonization of programs between provinces. I touched on a similar aspect a few minutes ago when I talked about the principle of equity between families. We think that all Canadians must have access to the same or a comparable level of service throughout the country, regardless of their province of residence. We will always object to a double or triple standard within Canada. There must be national standards for child care services as there are for health services. It is absolutely essential.

Lastly, there is the question of fiscal accountability. We saw that the amounts involved are very substantial. We are talking several billion dollars. Therefore, it is essential that there be some kind of accountability to ensure that the funds provided to provinces are used according to the objectives set by the federal government. I believe in the sharing of powers between the various jurisdictions. However, since child care services is a federal initiative funded by the federal Government, it seems to me that it is just common sense that there be some kind of accountability for those programs.

Mr. Speaker, those were the objectives that we, Liberals, want to have included in any legislation on child care. And not only the Liberals favour them, Mr. Speaker, but Canadian people do too. As I said earlier, I polled the constituents in my riding of Ottawa—Vanier on this issue. The responses I got confirm what I just said. Out of 1,404 people who answered, 1,192 or 85 per cent think that the parents should pay all or part of the child care expenses, which brings forward the matter of social responsibility that I mentioned earlier.

As well, 33 per cent believe that the system should be universal and 56 per cent stated that such a program should only be offered to families in need. Moreover 59 per cent of the people in my riding of Ottawa—Vanier favor a system of funding based on revenues supplemented by some form of government assistance. This is what I was talking about when speaking of new trends in the workplace. Fifty per cent of the respondents favour child care services at the workplace.

In my riding, people agree with the establishment of child care services, but they remain realistic and believe in family responsibility, in a fair funding of child care and in helping families in need. As for us, we endorse those objectives and believe furthermore that any family in need should have access to the best child care services which should be offered according to the paying capacity of theses families.

Mr. Speaker, when looking at the Government proposal to solve this problem, we realize that the Tories have once again missed the boat. As I have said, the main problem is the lack of spaces since only 15 per cent of the needs are presently fulfilled. Some two millions additionnal places ought to be created. However, the government wishes to respond to the problem mainly with tax credits.

With a $6.4 billion budget over seven years, they intend to allocate a little less than $4 billion in cost-sharing programs with the provinces towards the creation of additional spaces.

Mr. Speaker, a refundable tax credit is contrary to the principle of a fair family treatment since every family will be getting $200 more over two years, going from $500 to $700, no matter what their needs are and whether they in fact spend that sum on child care. Tax credit will in no way contribute to the creation of new spaces, while funds targetted for the creation of new spaces will be too scarce to allow for a universal access to child care services.

The number of profitable child care services will increase as a result of Bill C-144 which will provide families with more money for day care while not contributing the necessary funds to create additional spaces in public or non profit organizations.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of approach the Governement has chosen to take. I doubt it is the right one, but it is its choice having been elected to govern. The Government has failed to show leadership in that area. I blame it for that. But is not the first time it surrenders its national responsibilities.

The issue of national standards which was mentionned earlier and discussed on many occasions before, is a fondamental issue since the federal Government must maintain some kind of parity between various programs under different jurisdictions as a result of its constitutionnal or financial involvment.

Canadians are entitled to the same services wherever they live in Canada. That is a fundamental point, a matter of justice and fairness, and the Government is to be blamed for not having established national standards in this legislation. He is introducing a bill on child care . . .

• (2050)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Are there questions or comments for the Hon. Member? The Hon. Member for York South—Weston on a question or comment.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in my colleague's speech, and I noted you cut him off in mid-sentence. I would like to ask my colleague what he was about to say before his time expired.

Mr. Gauthier: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was just about to terminate my speech by saying that we of the Liberal Party would like to see Bill C-144 contain some substantive and national standards so that Canadians could have pure, unobstructed access to quality day care on a universal basis. I would like to tell Hon. Members in closing that in my view, the Government, once again, has missed the boat. It has not taken up the challenge before us, that is, to cope with the demand for spaces in day care centres, and I regret that very much.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a couple of questions, if I may, to the Hon. Member for Ottawa Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) who has just spoken. I have been a Member of this House since 1979 and I recall that it was his Party which was in Government from 1980 to 1984. I recall there were many groups from my constituency of Burnaby and, indeed, from British Columbia and across Canada, who urged the then Liberal Government to move forward and deal with the very serious concerns in the area of child care. There was a desperate need for more spaces, a desperate need for quality child care.

I also remember that those pleas for assistance in the area of child care fell on deaf ears because for that four year period the Liberals were in power, they did nothing whatsoever to expand the quality of child care in this country. Why is it and how is it that the Liberal Member can now stand in his place and suggest that this is an inadequate program—which, of course, it is—when in fact his Party was in Government from 1980 to 1984 and did absolutely nothing to expand the quality of child care in Canada?

• (2100)

I would like to ask a broader question about credibility. Why should we believe Liberals when they speak about the types of programs that they would implement. I remember hearing from the Leader of the Official Opposition, the Hon. Member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Turner), talking about democratizing the Liberal Party. Credibility! Is this the same Party that said to a potential Liberal candidate in the riding of St. Laurent in Montreal, who had signed up 1,400 members, that he could not run. "We will not let you run", Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): On a point of order the Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata).

Mr. Nunziata: I would simply request, Mr. Speaker, that you enforce the rule of relevance with respect to the Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my 20 years here I have never seen anything that was relevant. The Hon. Minister of State on a point of order.

Mr. Charest: I was just going to point out that if we were to listen to the Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata) apply the rule of relevancy, neither he nor the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) could ever talk.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I believe the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) has finished. I will give him another 30 seconds.

Mr. Gauthier: I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I hope that it is not taken off my time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would not dare.

Mr. Robinson: I will conclude my remarks, but I would ask the Hon. Member to explain how it is that there are certain ridings in Quebec that are reserved for the special stars. Why is it that we should believe for one minute this Party when it talks about child care, but when it talks about democracy it is obviously misleading the people of Canada?

Mr. Rossi: Quebecers don't want the NDP.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) has a point of order.

Ms. Copps: I could be totally irrelevant and point out how the NDP Members must be licking their wounds after the provincial leader in Quebec garnered a total of 2 per cent of the popular vote in a recent by-election, but I will not. First, I would only like to point out that the NDP Members do not even have nominating conventions in Quebec; they appoint their so-called representatives. Second, we are supposed to be discussing child care.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will defer the Hon. Member's question and comment and let the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) answer, and then I will come back.

Mr. Gauthier: I can well understand members of the NDP not wanting to talk about child care and talking about everything else. When it comes to credibility, they are the experts in non-credibility. They have lost absolutely any confidence that any Canadian may have had in them, and I could go back to NATO, to the banks and the nationalizing of banks, or I could talk about serious problems that they have. However, since the debate is on Bill C-144 and day care, I would like to take the occasion to tell the Member, who has been here since 1979, that he has certainly heard of the CAP program which was brought in by a good Liberal Government. It gave 50 per cent contributions to Canadians in helping them to have day care. I remember the then Minister of Health bringing in a tax credit for children, which was a Liberal initiative. There were many good fiscal measures put forward which probably the Member missed because, being an NDP Member, he never sees the realities. He lives somewhere in the beyond, in the dream world of the arm chair socialists, as we call them in my riding.

To answer the question of the Hon. Member, I would recommend that he read the report on child care, that he read the minority report of the Liberal Member of that committee, the Hon. Member for Outremont (Mrs. Pépin). It is entitled: *Choices for Children Now and in the Future.* It is a very good minority report. If the Hon. Member reads the report he will have the answers to all of his questions.

Mr. Jepson: I have a point of clarification. Did I hear the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) state that he and his Party were for universal day care? If he said that, I would like to know what he anticipates the cost per annum would be for universal day care, and what that would relate to on an individual taxpayer basis.

Mr. Gauthier: I would like to point out to the Member that it is a good question. What I am talking about is universal accessibility. That means that Canadians wherever they live in this country should have universal access to day care. I did not talk about a universal program, I said universality of access.

Ms. Mitchell: First, I think I should point out to my Liberal friend that my understanding is that the Canada Assistance Plan was in force since 1966.

Ms. Copps: Who brought it in?

Ms. Mitchell: The Hon. Member should learn about the inadequacy of some of the child care programs, at least in my experience, under that program. However, this Bill is worse than what we would have under the Canada Assistance Plan. The growth rate for new spaces would be higher under the Canada Assistance Plan than under this new Bill.

In his remarks the Hon. Member referred to standards. We preferred the term "objectives" from a national point of view. I

would like the Hon. Member to outline what a Liberal Government would see as national standards in its terminology. Would it include commercial day care as one of the goals that it would seek and, if so, why?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member has one minute to complete his questions or comments.

Mr. Gauthier: I did say that the CAP program was available and accessible to all Canadians, but it did have its faults.

Ms. Mitchell: Only low-income Canadians.

Mr. Gauthier: It was a program basically directed to those of low income and those who were in need. What we are talking about here is a two earner family which is in need of child care. In my speech I made it clear that, in my riding, I was talking about those people who, because of a changing society, have to cope with a two-earner family but with children who are in need of child care. That is indeed a problem we will have to answer. I did not say that CAP was the solution and the end-all to all of the problems. I know it was a solution at the time, but now we have to go beyond the CAP program. As a general response at that time I think that it was a good response.

As far as the other question is concerned as to where I stand, the Hon. Member can read my speech tomorrow. I am sure that she will have in there all the answers to her questions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments are now terminated. On debate the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary for Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. Bourgault).

• (2110)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Lise Bourgault (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I also am pleased to take part in this debate this evening and to speak on child care on behalf of my constituents of Argenteuil—Papineau. I would like to remind certain Hon. Members that the national child care strategy must meet the needs both of urban and rural families, and of course native ones. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I represent a constituency that meets those three criteria because, as you know, my constituency includes the municipality of Oka, Kenesatake. There is a crying child care problem in Kenesatake.

Mr. Speaker, when I listen to the New Democratic Party and certain Liberals, including their critics, I am inclined to wonder if they understand the nature of rural Canada? I wonder, because if we were to rely on what we heard since the legislation was tabled, the need would be almost exclusively in urban centres. Do not worry about public, non-profit child care centres 100 per cent funded by the state, governments, without any financial accountability towards parents or users because the Government has money, we will pay for everything!

Mr. Speaker, in Argenteuil—Papineau this evening, I am sure that when we tell them: We will inject $6,4 billion, I am certain that to people in Argenteuil—Papineau this is a substantial, an exceptional amount. People in a rural constituency do not refer every day to billions of dollars. This is not a frequent occurance.

But on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I hear some dreamers opposite speak of nationalizing child care services. Not to worry about money, Canadians have a lot of it, even if we are only a small number to pay for that—not to worry. We will find the money somewhere, and anyway we will get more taxes from Canadians. I wonder where they would get that money, but at any rate they are referring to nationalizing child care just as they are referring to nationalizing health care. As if those two were comparable!

I will speak in practical terms about what happened in Argenteuil—Papineau since we referred to the national strategy, since my citizens feel that from now on they will get increased help, of course with a contribution from Quebec. One example: There is a citizen in Morin Heights, Mrs. Berverley Mehlamed, an extraordinary woman who created a private child care service in an area that is not exactly a fringe area because it is near Saint-Sauveur, in our beautiful Laurentians, but anyway she developed an exceptional child care centre that draws on the parents as well as brothers and sisters of the children who finish school at 4 p.m., as mentioned earlier by the Hon. Member for Outremont (Mrs. Pépin). This woman wishes to expand. She has already told me of a very remarkable project, and we were eagerly awaiting the introduction of this Bill as well as the accord signed with Quebec to see how she would be able to get the financial aid she needs to double the spaces in her day care centre. So, you see, in my riding, we already have projects in place.

Let me tell you about another project dear to me. Since we, the Conservative Government, have been in office, it is a well-known fact, recognized by all, that the economy is doing so well that the population of the Saint-Janvier area in Mirabel, a municipality known for its dramatic development, has become aware of the serious problem of day care. So, nowadays, Mr. Speaker, companies such as, to name a few, Bell Hélicoptère, Nationair, Transat, Canpak, the Mirabel town council, and so on, have been meeting with concerned citizens and day care directors to discuss the issue of day care centres in the workplace, an issue which concerns companies, parents, and governments alike, and not exclusively governments.

From now on, private firms will have to get involved financially in the creation of day care centres.

For the time being, we are waiting for the result of an application we have made to the Department of National Health and Welfare concerning a new Project Assistance Fund which is part of the national day care strategy to create in Saint-Janvier a unique day care centre in a working area which, I hope, will become a reality, in view of the interest shown so far by my constituents and the women working in these plans.

Mr. Speaker, I dare say that this is the result of the national day care strategy because we are aware again of the fact that the federal Government is determined to get involved in it.

Like a great many of my colleagues both on the Government and the Opposition sides, Mr. Speaker, I have met many mothers in my riding and most of them are definitely in favour of family type day care centres.

It is quite a chore for the mother of one, two or several children to dress them in the morning and take them to one of the public day care centres which have set such strict conditions as to the time of arrival, time of departure, etc. I can tell you that people in increasing number prefer family type day care centres because families are smaller.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has met the needs of these parents who wanted to choose their own type of care through the national strategy, and it has done so within the framework of the tax reform.

Let me remind you for instance that the maximum day care deduction for children six years of age or under will double from $2,000 to $4,000. Parents with children six years of age or under who have no child care receipts—and Heaven knows that there are many in our ridings who don't—will be entitled to a refundable child tax credit supplement of $100 for 1988 and $200 for every year there-after. That is a need we have met, Mr. Speaker!

When we hear NPD Members, Mr. Speaker, we get the impression that we are in Russia or some other socialist dictatorship, because they want to nationalize child care services.

Opposition critics say that the federal Government has to make sure that the provinces will indeed use the money we will give them under the national strategy.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest it is an expression of lack of confidence in the legitimately elected provincial governments. I am convinced that, with respect to the Government of Quebec and the governments of the other provinces, day care centres are a basic need and I fail to see how a provincial administration would dare expend these funds for purposes other than those specified in the legislation.

As well, Mr. Speaker, it seems unrealistic to me to claim that the federal Government ought to know what Nova Scotia, the Northwest Territories—the reserves, for instance—require in terms of day care centres.

I think that the social services of the provinces are much better suited and much better structured to define just what kind of day care services each province needs. It seems to me that the federal Government is showing leadership today. It has been said on many occasions but still not often enough, Mr. Speaker, if anyone is showing leadership when it comes to day care it has to be our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney). There is a reason why we are here today, August 11, when we should be on holidays: the Prime Minister has been insisting that day care legislation being so important it must be passed before we can go! It goes to show that we have a Prime Minister who knows where he is going, Mr. Speaker.

Let us be realistic about day care. I read the report of the committee so ably chaired by our colleague from Lincoln (Mr. Martin) and during the proceedings I saw for myself to what extent opinions differed in the positions expressed by women from rural or urban environment and by the various groups which appeared before the committee. I suggest that the committee was realistic in its approach when it tabled its report, an approach which should represent a consensus concerning day care services.

• (2120)

Mr. Speaker, it was very difficult for me to hear all day long, both in my office and here in the House, the comments of my opposition colleagues. I suggest that to oppose for the sake of it is wrong. Come on. Although the Government is spending $6.4 billion on this program, they are against it because they feel it is regressive and do not meet the needs of Canadians. Mr. Speaker, I suggest it would be commendable on the part of the opposition to recognize for once that the Government has made a great step in the right direction and to work with us and the provinces in the future to improve this program.

We should emphasize the fact that the purpose of Bill C-144 is to improve the quantity, quality and accessibility of day care services as well as to make them more affordable.

I understood the Hon. Member for Outremont (Mrs. Pépin), as official critic of the opposition, when she mentioned all these children who do not know where to go when they leave school with keys around their necks. I want to tell her this: In several areas of my Argenteuil—Papineau riding, parent committees in various school addressed this problem and, with the national strategy and the Novative Project Assistant Fund, it is possible to get money which was not available before to help schools set up day care centres to meet the needs of young teenagers after school. We are very fortunate indeed in our ridings to have block parent committees to look after these children. It is our responsibility and also the responsibility of the provinces to look into it.

I met recently my Quebec counterpart, Mr. Claude Ryan, a man whom I hold in high estime and who is well known to the House; as Minister of Education, he is quite willing to work with his colleague, Mrs. Lavoie-Roux, the Quebec Minister Responsible for Women's Issues, to find within the framework of the national strategy which will be signed—I do not know if it has been signed already . . . He will do everything in his power to keep schools open after hours to offer these children shelter between the time classes ends and the time their parents get home.

What a great day it will be, Mr. Speaker, when every school in Canada will be able to help children and their parents who face these special problems.

As well, our Government recognizes that child care is the key to women's economic equality and represents a need and an essential welfare program. Nevertheless, we are once again committing substantial amounts in order to offer and contribute to the creation of new and good quality spaces. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that a unique child care centre will soon be opened in Saint-Janvier de Mirabel, since a few businesses have already confirmed their readiness to make the move and partly fund it for the enjoyment of their employees. I met the previous Bell Helicopter human ressources manager who told me a number of times about this serious problem. As you know, more and more businesses have these work shifts where men unfortunately come to realize that their fellow women workers have to leave work at a quarter to five because they must pick up their children at the day care centre before it closes at six o'clock.

There is thus a growing need to establish child care services at the workplace and I think that it is towards that objective that we should direct our initiatives and energies.

Mr. Speaker, day care services are no longer the exclusive concern of women. More and more men are responsible for looking after their children and since they have this added responsibility it seems that all of a sudden the issue has become more urgent. For years now women have been asking for better day care services but now the issue seems to have a higher priority, and I am very pleased to acknowledge this new development.

Of course I am glad for women and I think that in the future, when families take part in the collective effort concerning the equality of women, why would the father not drive his two children to the day care centre and take them out to lunch and promote better family understanding, better family unity! I think day care services at work are the answer to the problem.

Mr. Speaker, need I remind you that over the last 20 years the Canadian traditional family—the wage-earning father, the mother at home with one or more children—has become the exception rather than the rule. It has become obvious. Nowadays 54 per cent of all Canadian women are on the labour market, and the figure is higher still in the case of women in the 24-to-64 age bracket. Sixty-five per cent of them work outside the home. Sixty-two per cent of Canadian mothers with children under 16 belong to the labour force.

Mr. Speaker, speaking personally as Member for Argenteuil—Papineau, I think there is another measure which the Government is interested in looking into, and I am referring the need to extend maternity leave in a significant manner. Women want to keep their children longer, Mr. Speaker, and I really think that three months is not enough for a very young baby.

Again I suggest that if we want to promote the family status and urge families and women to have more children, one way to achieve this is to give them more assistance and extend maternity leave.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we must say there is an increasing number of Canadian mothers who are raising their children alone. At the present time, 83 per cent of single-parent families are headed by women. In the riding of Argenteuil—Papineau, that is mostly rural, I can tell you that has become a problem. First, there is the distance from urban centres. Transportation services are almost non-existent. Those women at the poverty level who are bringing up their children alone need to go out from time to time, even only for shopping, they need some leisure time, to belong to some social organization, except they have a problem. In remote rural communities no day care services are available to them and, of course, we have to face facts. It would be financially impossible to open day care centres everywhere, for instance, in all 53 municipalities in my riding.

Here again, I think we must reflect on that particular problem of women, of families, I should say, who live in remote rural communities, to be able to give them the more satisfactory day care service to which they are entitled as first-class citizens and which we have an obligation to make available to them.

Mr. Speaker, we have often talked about the famous problem of women who hire babysitters but do not get receipts for income tax purposes. Listen, we must see things as they are. Some have no other income but welfare. Those women help each other out. You know, there is no better social network than that of women. They help each other. They take turns staying with one another's children in the evening. But they sometimes need sitters who unfortunately are below the poverty line and cannot afford to report the money they earn this way. It is almost that ridiculous. Do you think that a woman . . . It seems as if the income tax services are preying on those poor women who make a little extra money every week by baby-sitting a few hours at one or several neighbours' houses, and I think we should stop harassing those people.

• (2130)

With the increased tax deduction and the possibility for families taking their children to child care services to deduct day care costs without necessarily having official receipts, this will still be a measure that will be of assistance to these women.

Mr. Speaker, 200,000 new subsidized spaces in child care services may not ne enough, there might still be other things to be done, but between 200,000 new spaces and nothing, I think a major progress has been made. Why always criticize? Women have always shown moderation, they told me several times they were aware of the fact that the Government had nevertheless limited resources, but they generally welcome this effort, they have hope, and in the future they will see to it that

this program be improved. In the years to come, Mr. Speaker, I think we will be able to build on this basis and increase once again the number of day care spaces available.

Mrs. Pépin: I would like to ask the following question to the Hon. Member for Argenteuil—Papineau (Mrs. Bourgault). She mentionned earlier the problem relating to the latch-key kid. Being a Member from Quebec, she said that Quebec Education Minister, Mr. Ryan has indicated his willingness to do everything in his power to solve this problem. Consequently, I only want to remind my colleague that schools in her province now have 30,000 spaces, which is unique to Quebec. I also want to draw to her attention the fact that the present Bill, introduced by the Government, contains a clause where it is said that none of this money will in fact go to education . . . funds will not be cut? So, I want to know how she will be able, with her Government and this Bill, to help, or let us say bypass . . . I don't know if we would have to amend the Bill, to continue to offer help to those children. We heard the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) tell us how important it is to fight the drug problem. But we know too well that the teenagers mainly facing this problem are the same children who are alone at home after school, and actually, one of the problems with this Bill is that it does not do anything for the latch-key kid. Secondly, it says in the Bill that the funds allocated for education will be cut. I do not see then how the Hon. Member will be able to solve this problem.

Mrs. Bourgault: Mr. Speaker, that is quite obvious. The provinces will first establish their standards with respect to this program. When I referred to Mr. Ryan a while ago, I was saying that there are 30 000 day care spaces, but that that is not enough in the schools. And we must not forget that parent and community groups are involved in this. There is a lot of volunteer work in this field. But I think that the Member from Outremont is stuck with her party's decision. She cannot state she agrees with the bill. But I understand her very well. If I were in her place . . .

An Hon. Member: In her heart, she is.

Mrs. Bourgault: In her heart, she must be and I thank my colleague for informing me of that. But I am sure that, being an Opposition Member, her job is to oppose. However, she has participated in the committee's work and she has heard the testimony of families, parents and day care workers. She is, I think, satisfied with the effort the Government is making in the field of day care. Once again, I thank her for her support.

Mr. Keeper: I would like my colleague to tell me if she is aware that the existing program, the Canada Assistance Program, does not put a limit on day care expenses. And because of that, the rate of increase was 15 per cent this year. The amounts spent on day care have increased by 15 per cent a year under the Canada Assistance Program. But, with her government's new program, the rate of increase will be brought down to 10 per cent a year. Why has this government decided to postpone the day where we will have an adequate day care program for the children of this country? Has it put a limit on day care expenses because it also wants to spend 8 billion dollars on submarines? Is that the reason why the government has come up with a program which limits day care expenses?

Mrs. Bourgault: Mr. Speaker, once again, the New Democratic Member is obviously mixing apples and oranges. He talked about the Canada Assistance Plan. I just want to point out to him that, under the basic calculation, the federal Government will pay to the provinces 50 per cent of operating costs of commercial or not-for-profit child care agencies as well as 75 per cent of their capital costs during the seven-year period ending on March 31, 1995.

Mr. Speaker, I know why the New Democratic Party is against this initiative. It's because it wants to nationalize child care services like we did for medical care. But you cannot compare the two. Come on!

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Member for Argenteuil—Papineau (Mrs. Bourgault) if she thinks it fair that, under the Conservative policy, the Government offers less tax rebates to low- and middle-income families. Why has the Government not introduced a system giving tax credits instead of deductions to help, for example, a woman working as a baby sitter in her constituency and earning the minimum wage who will get a lot less in terms of income deductions than a female Member of Parliament?

Mrs. Bourgault: Mr. Speaker, here is a question I am tremendously pleased to answer. In the first place, I suggest Liberals have become masters at distorting figures. This is quite clear. It must be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that Paris was not built in one day. What we were left with was a financial mess. And when a country finds itself in such a financial mess as the one we inherited from the Liberals, we cannot remedy overnight all the calamities left by the Liberals. For that reason I feel that our record over those four years is still exceptional, and I for one will quite confidently defend that performance before my constituents, with the conviction that the next four years of Conservative Government will build on the first four ones. And then Canadian men and women will realize the Conservative Party is the Party that should be governing the country, for the benefit of everyone.

[*English*]

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker—

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Waddell: I thank my colleagues very much for that round of applause. As a matter of fact, I just heard them telling the story of one of their distinguished colleagues—no doubt not from our Party—who spoke on the abortion debate and said that he was not intending to speak on the abortion debate but he had missed his bus so he thought he would take the opportunity to speak.

Ms. Copps: That is one of your colleagues there, he's sitting right beside you.

Mr. Waddell: I find that extraordinary. I am rising tonight because I really want to speak in this debate. It is a real privilege to speak in this debate. I did not miss my plane to British Columbia nor did I miss the boat or the bus.

I will have the privilege, I hope, after the next election, of representing a new riding—

Some Hon. Members: Which riding?

Mr. Waddell: A few people have asked which riding it is. It is the riding of Port Moody—Coquitlam.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (2140)

Mr. Waddell: Just in case anyone missed it, that was Port Moody—Coquitlam. In that riding, if I might be somewhat more serious for the moment, the constituents are vitally interested in the issue of child care. The reason is that Port Moody—Coquitlam is like many new and growing areas in Canada, a suburban area with young families. Indeed, I think only 8 per cent of the people are senior citizens, a very low figure. A large percentage of the population is made up of young families with children and they have been hit hard by the Conservative Government. For example, they are paying high interest rates on their mortgages for the new houses they have bought. That is partly a result of government policy which is trying to squeeze down the boom in the Toronto area by keeping interest rates high.

These people are also paying higher taxes than they did in 1984, about $1,000 more per family. They are also being hit in other ways. For example, they drive from the city to the suburbs and they get hit at the pump by higher gasoline prices, again enacted by the Government. As a result, this group of people really want the Government to deliver something good for a change. They have looked at child care as one thing they really need.

There is another reason I am vitally interested in child care and that has to do with equality. I fervently believe, as do my colleagues in the NDP, in the principle of equality. I think full equality of women hinges to a large extent on meeting day care needs. In our society it is still the woman who is left for the most part to look after the children. At the same time, as many Members on all sides have pointed out, women are continually moving into the work force. They have, as I see it, a double job. They are part of the work force, and then in the morning before going to work or in the evening when they come home from work they have to provide the best care they can for their children. During the day they often have inadequate child care and they worry about their children, or they cannot afford to be sick and they have to go to work sick, or they have problems when they are at work and their child is at home sick.

We do not have adequate child care in this country and I think all Parties agree with that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. There is a great debate going on and I would like to hear it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Waddell: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought I heard you say earlier tonight that you had been in the House for 20 years and you have not heard anything relevant. I am glad we established a precedent tonight.

Mr. Redway: He is hoping.

Mr. Waddell: The next time you will not intervene? I know, I will be careful.

I see the Minister of State for Youth (Mr. Charest) is in the House. Earlier tonight he accused me of being a centralist, an old guard socialist, I think he said. I do not apologize for that.

Ms. Copps: You used to be a Liberal.

Mr. Waddell: My colleagues say, coming from British Columbia, that I am practically a separatist.

Ms. Copps: That is not what Bob Nixon said.

Mr. Waddell: The reason he called me that was with reference to my question on Meech Lake and the question of setting objectives for social programs. That is a crucial question.

To be honest, I think the jury is still out on Meech Lake. It may be that national objectives can be set under the new Meech Lake provisions, but this Bill is the first example since Meech Lake of a major national social program and it does not attempt in any way to set out national objectives. That is the great weakness. Whether or not another government of a different political stripe, more committed to national objectives, can set them out we will have to wait and see.

I was going to quote Marjorie Nichols who wrote in *The Ottawa Citizen* today some very perceptive remarks. She said:

> "The bottom line is that this bill will provide the money to build fewer child-care spaces in Canada over the next seven years than would have been built without it, based on current construction performance under existing legislation."

I think she is referring to the fact that the Bill will create fewer child care spaces than would have been created under CAP. She went on to say:

> "The terrible shame of this legislation is, however, that it represents an abandonment by the federal government of its responsibility to be accountable for the collection and expenditure of other people's money."

The Minister stood up a few minutes ago and asked how the NDP can object because the Government is spending $6.4 billion. It is tough to object to the expenditure of $6.4 billion. You do not easily stand up and oppose a child care Bill, it has to be pretty bad, but indeed we are doing that because we believe it is irresponsible to just give $6.4 billion to the provinces without national objectives and accountability. We in British Columbia, with Premier Bill Vander Zalm, do not know where the money is liable to go if you give it to him. It might go to Fantasy Gardens, who knows.

My colleague, the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell), our distinguished critic in this area, received a number of telegrams on this issue and I want to read a couple of them to show that it is not just the NDP who feels this way. Other people with a particular interest in this field feel the same. There is a telegram from Sharon Hope Irwin, a child care consultant:

"Child care Bill very dangerous. Respectfully request your efforts to block Bill on second reading. It lacks national objectives, encourages commercialization to the detriment of child care, and does not deliver the promised spaces. Please promote quality child care—accessible, affordable, with high standards."

That is what my future constituents in Port Moody—Coquitlam want. That is what my present constituents in Vancouver—Kingsway want. They want child care which is accessible, affordable, and with high standards. I have another telegram from Carol Christian, President of the White Horse Day Care Association, and Joanne Oberg, Secretary of the Yukon Day Care Association. It says:

"We urge you and your colleagues to speak against the Childcare Act in the House. It is devoid of national objectives, limits spending on child care, funds the commercial sector and does not satisfy the need for spaces, it does not create a day care system but is a government spending program, this waste of public funds will set back day care to the dark ages."

Those telegrams are worth paying attention to.

We in the NDP believe child care in Canada is in a crisis. We have been waiting for four years for the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) to deliver on his campaign promise. You will recall what that was: an effective national system of child care. We think Canadian families have been let down again. In other words, another broken promise by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister thinks you can just throw money at the problem—build a road to James Bay, buy a constituency, build a prison or whatever. That is not the way to tackle child care.

• (2150)

Neither before, during or after the passage of the Conservatives' inadequate, flawed strategy will our families and our children's needs be met. In fact, this fundamentally flawed legislation moves us backwards. There will be fewer child care spaces for our children after the seven years of the Government's program than under the existing system, even after the expenditure of the money.

Furthermore, this Conservative legislation fails to establish the principles on which to build an effective national system of child care. We should be building the first major national social program since medicare was established, but the Government has failed to provide leadership and set out the principles for quality child care in Canada.

We in the NDP believe that Canadian families and their children need greater access to quality child care at lower cost. This Bill does not deliver that. We have said and will continue to say that the Prime Minister should go back to the drawing board and bring forward a child care program to meet the needs of average Canadian parents and their children for child care services now.

It is not only the members of the NDP who have said this. There is an editorial in *The Globe and Mail* today which criticizes this particular Bill. That is not exactly a New Democratic policy paper. This position comes from all angles of the political spectrum. I have here a letter from the National Anti-Poverty Organization, part of which I will read into the record. It is addressed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) and says:

"Dear Mr. Minister:

I am writing to express, briefly, the concerns of the National Anti-Poverty Organization with Bill C-144, and to urge you to schedule public hearings on the Bill prior to its passage in the House of Commons.

As we told you in past meetings, we were concerned with the expected absence of targeting of funded spaces to low-income Canadians, and with the expected failure of the legislation to require public accountability by public or community-based management of funded centres. In addition, NAPO has historically opposed the use of public dollars to subsidize for-profit operations, particularly in areas of basic social need like child care.

Bill C-144 fails to establish national objectives, much less the federal standards we would have liked to see contained in the legislation. Even the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord permits the establishment of national objectives for new social programs, yet your government has chosen not to include them in the Bill. We believe this Bill permits the expenditure of very large sums of public money without establishing what the government hopes to accomplish through this expenditure. Canadians have a right to know what your objectives are with child care, and we would urge you to include these in amendments to the legislation.

We have been concerned about the targetting of spaces since your announcement that a good portion of the funding for this "new" program would be transferred from the Canada Assistance Plan.

Under CAP, at least spaces could be subsidized only if they were provided to those in need or likely to be in need without the space. While this permitted subsidization of middle-income Canadians, it did not allow for subsidies to the wealthy. Under this legislation, there is no such assurance or guarantee. Both you and your officials have assured us that operating subsidies will go only to targetted spaces. This is not clearly stated in the Bill, and should appear as an amendment to the legislation.

In addition, removing this funding from CAP will allow dollars previously used only for operating and capital costs for not-for-profit child care centres, or for operating costs only in for-profit centres, to be applied to both operating and capital costs of for-profit centres, if so wished by provincial Governments.

There is evidence that has been submitted by specialists in the field that for-profit centres, in the aggregate, offer lower quality service, minimum required staff/child ratios, lower wages to staff, and lower educational requirements for staff. In addition, we believe that public dollars should not subsidize private profits, and should not subsidize operations that are not accountable to the public paying the subsidy, however indirectly. This Bill does not meet these concerns."

That is what I meant by an inadequate system of child care as set out in this Bill.

I heard the Prime Minister speak in the House today about child care. Some of us thought he might use the occasion to announce the election, but he did not. He was really speaking about women's issues. He was addressing women's issues because he is weak, according to the polls, on women's issues. He has a gender gap like George Bush. Women do not trust our Prime Minister and do not agree with his policies. In his speech he never asked why that is, and I would like to take a minute now to suggest to the Prime Minister why that is and I will return to child care after that.

There are a number of reasons why women distrust the Prime Minister. The Government is spending $8 billion on nuclear submarines when there is poverty, there are food banks, and there is a housing crisis in the country. Young families cannot afford to buy a home and the Government is spending $8 billion on nuclear submarines. In the new neighbourhoods of Port Moody, Coquitlam, and Port Coquitlam, British Columbia, you cannot get door to door postal service, yet the Government is spending $8 billion on nuclear submarines. In this country farmers and rural people are suffering, but the Government is spending $8 billion on submarines. The Government is militarizing our economy and women instinctively know this, object to it, and will not stand for it.

The second thing the Prime Minister should consider is his free trade deal with the Americans. That affects the service sector for the first time in any trade deal in the world. Not even in the Israeli-American trade deal is the service sector included. The service sector is the fastest growing job creation sector around, and who works in that sector but women? When you consider how vulnerable to American competition our growing young service sector will be, including data processing, insurance, and computers, you will see that the Americans will take jobs from our service sector in the free trade deal. That will affect women.

Returning to day care, the same families and women who want quality day care want the Government to do something about drugs and impaired driving rather than only making political speeches about them as the present Prime Minister does.

Where was the Prime Minister on abortion? He was not even in the House. The Government's policy on abortion was a mess. It did not even have the guts to introduce a proper Bill on abortion, and Canadians have noticed that. When the Prime Minister wonders why he is not getting the votes of women he should consider what a big phoney he is on these issues and he should tackle them.

To summarize our position on this Bill, it is a flawed Bill on one of the most important subjects. It does not set out national objectives and will not increase the number of day care spaces. It will not benefit the average Canadian family which continues to be overtaxed and underserviced by the Government.

I challenge the Prime Minister and his Party to call an election. We will deal with these issues in the election. We will deal with child care on the hustings. We will deal with the notion of selling out this country to the United States. We will deal with the average family paying $1,000 a month more in taxes as a result of the Government's initiatives. We will deal with the fact that motorists have once again been hosed by the Government. We will deal with all the broken promises of the Prime Minister. We will deal with the fact that the average Canadian family loses under this Government.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please! It being 10 p.m., pursuant to order adopted on Monday, June 20, 1988, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

At 10 p.m. the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, August 12, 1988

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if I could have the attention of the House for just a moment before we proceed. As Hon. Members will know, following the calling of Orders of the Day I will be making a ruling as to at least some of the amendments that were filed. I want to delay for just a moment until a copy of that can be delivered to the House Leaders. I think that we have copies at this moment. I will just wait a moment. Orders of the Day.

[*Translation*]

The French version will be available soon.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-130, an Act to implement the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the United States of America, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

Mr. Speaker: I want to make several preliminary remarks.

[*Translation*]

I am very sorry, but we still do not have the French version and the problem is due to translation, because last night, the Speaker and the Clerks of the House had to work very late; this was necessary considering the number of amendments submitted. I hope that Hon. Members will understand the situation.

The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) has the floor.

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): On a matter of fundamental principle, I recognize that the Clerks of the House worked very late because there were amendments, some one hundred tabled by Members, but I believe that it is right for this Parliament to work with documents in both official languages. Besides, we recently passed Bill C-72, which requires of the Government that any document tabled in the House be in both official languages. It is hard for some unilingual Members to follow the debate. I understand that we have simultaneous translation, but it is still unfair for these Members to have to deal with a document that is only in English, when we know very well that they would understand better and perhaps follow the proceedings better if the material were in French.

I suggest that the Chair wait a few more minutes for a translation to be available for all Members so that here in this House, we can maintain the fundamental principle and work in English or in French with documents available to all.

• (1010)

[*English*]

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I want to lend my voice to that of the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier). This is an important debate, and your ruling will be of utmost importance in the way the deliberations of this House will transpire over the next few days. I think it is only appropriate that we have the document before us in both of Canada's official languages.

May I suggest, since you indicated the translated version will be here shortly, that we recess for a few moments while awaiting the document so that we can begin properly and appropriately, reading from the transcript of your ruling in either of Canada's official languages.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I am naturally in your hands, as are other Members. The provision of draft rulings in both official languages is a convenience for the House. I think it would be in order for you simply to have read your ruling into the record without the provision of draft copies.

We can, however, do one of two things. One might suggest that you read the first two paragraphs of your ruling. I think the essence is that Motions Nos. 1, 61 and 65 are in order and will be debated together, and go from there.

Mr. Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Minister of State but until the Chair gives a ruling I do not think we should be discussing the copy which has been extended to House Leaders, of course, as a matter of courtesy. I will hear the Hon. Minister further.

Mr. Lewis: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I suggest we recess the House until a copy of the provisional ruling in both official

languages, as far as the Table has got, is available to all Members.

Mr. Speaker: I think I told the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) that copies would be available soon. It might not be quite as soon as I thought a few moments ago. Would the House allow me to consult with my officers for just a moment?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been discussions among the House Leaders and we think in view of the circumstances and in view of the importance of the matter before the Chair, and our wish to have every Member of the House in a position to understand your ruling in both official languages, that it would be appropriate to suspend the sitting until 11 a.m. and then commence the normal Statements by Members followed by Question Period. If the ruling is ready, once Orders of the Day are called after Routine Proceedings we could perhaps be in a position then to receive your ruling in both official languages.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate very much the co-operation of Members. First, let me say this. There are 102 motions that were received by six o'clock last night. I repeat, 102 motions. I also point out that a great many people worked well beyond midnight last night to prepare at least part of the ruling on these amendments in order to try to meet the exigencies of today.

I also point out that it was not possible to have in place translators after midnight last night. This is nobody's fault. It is just a fact of life. I have to say that until early this morning the document was not completely finished in any event.

I should also add that I will have to make a further ruling on other amendments which we have not been able to consider. I see some sympathy expressed by House Leaders and I appreciate that also.

I thank the Hon. Minister of State (Mr. Lewis) after consultation with the House Leaders for his suggestion. I think that perhaps is an appropriate way to deal with the matter. We may not by noon have the entire ruling fully translated, but we will have enough of it translated to get started on the debate.

[*Translation*]

I want to say that I greatly appreciate the statement by the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier). There is a problem, but the principle is not at issue today, not at all. So I would ask for the cooperation of all Members, especially the francophones.

[*English*]

SITTING SUSPENDED

Mr. Speaker: The sitting is adjourned until eleven o'clock. We will resume for Question Period at that time, followed by Routine Proceedings. I will then return with the ruling.

At 10.19 a.m. the sitting of the House was suspended.

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 11 a.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

TOURISM

EFFECT OF OLDMAN RIVER DAM ON ALBERTA TOURIST INDUSTRY

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, last week the Friends of the Oldman River laid charges against the Province of Alberta for violating Section 33 of the federal Fisheries Act because construction of a dam on the Oldman River would destroy habitat for brown, brook and cutthroat trout. These fish are of great value to Alberta's tourism and recreation industry.

In addition, the proposed reservoir would flood Indian burial sites, ancient inscriptions carved in stone and ceremonial grounds of the Peigan Indians. Damming one of the only undammed rivers left in southern Alberta would destroy the ecology and native lifestyle of the area for the sake of irrigation for some 300 land owners. It simply does not make sense.

We urge the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon) to prosecute the Government of Alberta on the charges laid by the Friends of the Oldman River, and to subject the Oldman Dam project to the federal environmental assessment and review process. The Oldman River is a treasure worth saving in its pristine beauty.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

VISIT OF POLISH SOLIDARITY LEADER TO CANADA

Mr. Andrew Witer (Parkdale—High Park): Mr. Speaker, Andrzej Gwiazda, Vice-Chairman of the Polish trade union movement Solidarity, and his spouse Joanna, are presently visiting Canada. Mr. and Mrs. Gwiazda, along with other Solidarity leaders such as Lech Walesa, Anna Walentynowicz, Alina Pinkowsa and Bohdan Lis, began a heroic struggle for the advancement of fundamental human rights in Poland which resulted in the establishment in 1980 of Solidarity, the first free and democratic trade union behind the Iron Curtain.

Despite years of imprisonment, Andrzej and Joanna Gwiazda carry on their courageous work for Solidarity's goal; that the state should serve man and not rule over him, and remind us that the struggle for justice and freedom continues in Poland. I call upon all Members of the House to join with me in welcoming Mr. and Mrs. Gwiazda to Canada and in expressing our admiration for their tremendous contribution to the cause of freedom and fundamental human rights.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

CRITICISM OF GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, the aboriginal peoples of Canada have good reason to be suspicious of the Conservative Party's agenda. Buffalo Jump of the 1980s is without doubt the political agenda of this Government.

Add to this the press release of August 2, from the Minister of Indian Affairs (Mr. McKnight). The headline reads: "Amendment to Indian Act Removes 'Death Rule' ". That statement is false. There is no Bill before Parliament and no such amendment has been passed. In fact, even today the Minister's office refuses to provide a copy of the proposal.

This same Minister has Bill C-122 before the legislative committee. This is legislation designed to cut the statutory powers of Indian by-laws. This legislation is unanimously opposed by the chiefs of the First Nations.

Add to this the illegitimate withholding of Bill C-123 on minors' trusts and estates, a Bill completed and to have been reported to Parliament over two weeks ago from the legislative committee. Add to this the improper and illegitimate withholding of the report of the Standing Committee on Bill C-31, a report required by statute to be reported forthwith, and still withheld by the Conservatives from Parliament and the public, a report completed some two months ago. The Minister and his minions abuse the truth, this House, and the First Nations by such actions.

* * *

NATIONAL ART GALLERY

VIDEO SHOWING HOMOSEXUAL INTERCOURSE

Mr. Jim Jepson (London East): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I read on the front page of *The Ottawa Citizen* that, believe it or not, pornographic videos were being shown under the guise of so-called art at the new National Art Gallery. One video, according to the article, showed a close-up of male genitals and intercourse between males as well as other homosexual acts.

The assistant curator of film and video was quoted as saying that the work being shown is unquestionably art. The curator says they explore the difficult questions of our time: sexual identity and the role of the media in our lives.

With such comments as this, is it any wonder some people in the art community have successfully persuaded the Justice Department officials to deep-six the Government's pornography Bill, Bill C-54, in spite of overwhelming public support and mail to the Justice Department? How much garbage such as these videos is society to tolerate in the name of so-called art?

FAMILY VIOLENCE

NEED FOR SECOND-STAGE HOUSING

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I almost gagged when I read the comments made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) in his maiden speech to Parliament on a Bill before the House. He took credit for everything. The things he took credit for were incredible.

What the Prime Minister did not tell the Canadian people and particularly the women of Canada is why it is that under his Government in 1986, we saw for the first time the wage gap between men and women actually getting wider. Why is it that he has introduced a program to assist victims of family violence which will not create a single second-stage house across Canada?

Why is it that in my own community of Hamilton the women's organizations are actually going begging for funds to keep five apartments open for women who have been battered? A woman with five children who will be homeless and out on the street cannot qualify for that program because the Government does not believe in second-stage housing.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) himself said that he could not philosophically support second-stage housing. The women of Canada will not be bought by these ridiculous statements.

* * *

INCOME TAX

ENVIRONMENTAL MEDICAL PRESCRIPTIONS—TAX TREATMENT

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, environmental hypersensitivity is a condition resulting from the inability of the immune system to cope with everyday normal exposure to such things as food, water, mould or dust. The medical treatment for this condition often requires expensive home modifications, and changes in diet and lifestyle.

The Income Tax Act allows only prescriptions dispensed by a licensed pharmacist to be deducted as medical expenses. Special environmental prescriptions are usually not available in a pharmacy. It is time that the Government amended the Income Tax Act to provide equal tax treatment for Canadians who require environmental medical prescriptions.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

DIFFICULTIES FACED BY FARMERS

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, farming is a gamble and a worry. If it is not the grasshoppers, it is the stink bugs; if it is not drought, it is early frost; if the crops are good,

the price is low; if the yields are high, the elevators are jammed; when the granaries are empty, the prices go up; when the grain bins are full, there is a strike at the coast and demurrage costs eat up the profits; when a bountiful crop ready for harvest brings hope, there is a sudden hail storm.

If a farmer trades in an old tractor for a new one, he is taxed because the machine company paid him "too much" for the used machine; when prospects look good and land is purchased with a loan, interest rates rise; when the farmer cannot pay back the loan, the financiers take his land; when he crawls from the soil he loves, Revenue Canada charges him taxes on a capital gain. Is it not a wonder that we have any farmers at all left on the land?

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

SECOND FIRING OF IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, the Government's vendetta against John Quigley continues with full vengeance. Last year the Government fired him because he advised me and other Members of Parliament that the Immigration Department was inviting known criminals to apply for refugee asylum. He was subsequently reinstated following an order by the Public Service Staff Relations Board.

Now, after failing to learn from this lesson, the Government again fired Mr. Quigley, who is the president of his union local, on the allegation that he used a government telephone for union business. This latest move is nothing more than a thinly veiled attempt to get Mr. Quigley at any cost, over any possible excuse.

Rather than utilizing its energies to carry on a petty, vindictive and needless battle with one employee, the Minister should concentrate on vastly improving her Government's management of Canada's immigration policy. The Government looked bad the first time it fired Mr. Quigley and now it looks pathetic. It has opted for the gutter when the high road was clearly available.

I call upon the Minister of Immigration (Mrs. McDougall) and the Government to bring this sad affair to a satisfactory end by reinstating Mr. Quigley.

BANKS AND BANKING

CHARTERED BANKS—REPORTED PRESSURE ON AUTOMOBILE DEALERSHIPS

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt—Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the House aware of yet another set of financial pressures being placed on rural communities. The banks are now telling rural automobile dealerships to get bigger or get out. Most banks are beginning a policy of providing credit for floor stock only if it exceeds $2 million. Smaller inventories are apparently of little or no interest to the banks. Some banks even have a policy of not financing dealerships at all if they are located in rural communities.

Banks do not seem to realize that cutting car and truck dealerships in small towns means the demise of a very necessary transportation service for all rural residents. New vehicles and repairs to older ones are a necessary part of viable communities.

Cutting back on dealerships by imposing preconceived size and volume requirements on credit eligibility reduces the investment potential for all aspects of the small-town rural community and only adds to the devaluation of existing rural assets and loans. I call on the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Hockin) to make that point with Canada's banking system.

* * *

CARTOGRAPHY

COMPUTERIZED MAPPING PROGRAM

Mr. Bill Tupper (Nepean—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed being present yesterday when the Minister of State for Forestry and Mines (Mr. Merrithew) announced a $16-million program to computerize mapping in Canada. Known as the Geographic Information Systems, or GIS, the computerized maps will not only revolutionize the way in which geographic information is produced and stored, they will revolutionize the uses to which maps can be applied.

Canada has taken the lead in developing state-of-the-art computerized mapping techniques. By becoming leaders in GIS technology, we can also service and train customers around the world. It will provide us with enormous advantages in managing and developing our own natural resources.

This is a first step in a national program that will result in GIS expertise becoming world-class. It will mean high-technology jobs for Canadians. It will mean the development of key industries. It will mean increased trade in goods and services. We are poised to make our Geographic Information Services the most advanced in the world.

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT

REQUEST FOR JOB CREATION PROGRAMS FOR ELDERLY

Mr. Gabriel Desjardins (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House some of the findings of a recent survey of the population over 65.

Sixty-one per cent of senior citizens are physically fit and are not under any functional constraints. This means they do not require more than the usual health care and social services. In Quebec, 90 per cent of senior citizens stated they preferred to live on their own instead of moving to a senior citizens' home.

Eighty-five per cent of Quebecers think that governments and employers should take advantage of the knowledge and skills of senior citizens who are able to work, and 42 per cent think they should receive a salary in that case.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore invite governments to set aside more money in their budgets to promote the independence of our senior citizens and set up job creation programs that would take advantage of the experience and skills of senior citizens.

* * *

• (1110)

[*English*]

THE PRIME MINISTER

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, when is the king of patronage going to muster the courage to call a general election? It seems the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) is getting cold feet. He knows, given the opportunity, the people of Canada will reject free trade, reject the Conservative Party, and reject the Prime Minister.

Four years ago, during the 1984 election campaign, the Prime Minister made a lot of promises. Over the last four years we have seen a lot of broken promises. The people of Canada want an opportunity to turf out the Government. They know they were lied to and hoodwinked in that election campaign.

The Prime Minister does not have the courage to call an election because he has personality problems. As a headline said yesterday, "PC grass roots jittery about PM's credibility". This is what a Conservative riding president had to say about the Prime Minister:

> Probably the most prevalent issue I hear is "I don't like Mulroney".

The people of Canada do not like Mulroney.

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Nunziata: They want to defeat him. Let us go to the polls.

S. O. 21

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—SUPPORT FROM THERMOS BOTTLE INDUSTRY

Mrs. Pauline Browes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a company in my riding which I would like to share with Members of the House of Commons:

> "Dear Mrs. Browes
>
> As one of the original Golden Mile industries, Canadian Thermos Products has been manufacturing in Scarborough since 1950.
>
> In August, we will be producing for the United States market all of their Thermos glass vacuum bottles, coffee carafes and workers' lunch kits. The result will be a nearly 100 per cent increase in our Scarborough production.
>
> More importantly, this will create at least 60 new permanent jobs in addition to the current 102.
>
> Although Thermos is committed to moving production to Canada, Free Trade is nevertheless important to our company. The duty on our products entering the United States is 9 per cent, equal to or higher than that on competing products from Europe, Brazil and the Far East. The elimination of this duty under the Free Trade Agreement would lead to a larger market share for our Canadian-made products in the U.S., and consequently increased employment.
>
> We applaud the reasoned approach that the Government of Canada has pursued in both the Free Trade Agreement and the GATT negotiations."

Mr. Speaker, this is good news for the people of Scarborough.

* * *

TRANSPORT

EFFECT OF DROUGHT ON GRAIN TRANSPORTATION WORKERS

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, the head of the grain handlers' union in Thunder Bay has called the grain scene there the worst since the 1960s. The drought, which will reduce farmers' income on the Prairies, threatens long lay-offs for grain handlers, railway workers, seafarers, and grain commission employees in Thunder Bay and other ports on the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Those involved in the grain trade in Thunder Bay and throughout the Seaway need action from the federal Government. I call on the Government to take the following actions: to ensure that a fair share of wheat exports moves through Thunder Bay and the Seaway; reduce the variable entrance requirements for persons laid off in the grain trade so they are eligible for unemployment insurance after ten weeks of employment; review operations under the Western Grain Transportation Act in order to make them more sensitive to the actual cost of moving grain to export ports.

Workers in the grain trade need action from the federal Government and I call on it to take that action now.

[*Translation*]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE—BUILDING OF AUTOROUTE 30 ON MONTREAL SOUTH SHORE

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, about two weeks ago, the federal Minister of Transport (Mr. Bouchard) announced in Valleyfield that he would build a bridge so that construction could start on Highway 30 on Montreal's south shore.

Mr. Speaker, for twenty years, business people, mayors and MPs have been asking for this highway which is vital to the development of the south shore. Only a Progressive Conservative Government could understand, being prepared to do everything in its power to strengthen the economy and increase employment. Highway 30 is vital to the development of Montreal's south shore, and I am proud I helped to make this dream come true.

* * *

[*English*]

HOUSING

SITUATION IN TORONTO—CALL FOR FEDERAL ACTION

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, a poll released this week indicates that only 38 per cent of Ontarians believe that it is possible for young couples to own a home. This is indeed a sad indicator. Under the false guise of Tory economic recovery, the dreams of so many young Canadians have disappeared. One in two Canadians favour a return to the RHOSP program which was eliminated by Tory cut-backs. Two in three Canadians want a mortgage deduction policy to help finance a new home. Yet the Conservative Government has not shown any leadership on these initiatives.

Other solutions to the Toronto housing crisis have fallen on deaf ears as the Government has ignored many proposals. It is readily evident that during the past four years Conservative economic policy has benefited the haves while leaving the have nots at the wayside on the road to prosperity.

With respect to the housing crisis gripping Metropolitan Toronto, the Tories' answer has been a tale of two cities. It is time the Government moves on the affordable housing crisis facing Metropolitan Toronto and other major urban centres before they become the exclusive backyard of the well-to-do.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

ENERGY

OWNERSHIP OF PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Petroleum Monitoring Agency issued a very disturbing report on the declining state of Canadian ownership of the oil and gas industry. It points out that since 1987, there has been a more than 5 per cent drop in Canadian ownership. In contradiction to the Government's stated policy of achieving 50 per cent Canadian ownership, the figures are going the other way.

In light of these very alarming figures from its own agency, which basically say the Government is presiding over the sell-off of Canadian companies, assets and resources in the energy sector, what is the Government going to do finally to put some teeth in its control and protection of Canadian assets and resources?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member's allegations are unfounded and untrue. Investment Canada has a different view of the situation. It really depends upon the classification of Husky. Clearly, Investment Canada considers Husky a canadian controlled public company. When that is considered, the Hon. Member's figures are blown out of the water.

The Petroleum Monitoring Agency uses a potential control test, whereas Investment Canada uses a present control test. I think the two different agencies come at this from different ends and I would prefer to rely upon the approach taken by Investment Canada.

Given that, what has happened during the course of the last few years since this Government has taken office is that we have seen a strengthening of the petroleum industry. We overcame the devastation inflicted upon the industry as a result of the National Energy Program.

I think the Hon. Member would clearly recognize the difficulties that Dome became involved in as a direct result of the policies of the previous Government. He should not take any solace from that.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, we know how credible Investment Canada is. It has received applications for 443 acquisitions and takeovers and has approved 443 acquisitions and takeovers. This amounts to a sell-off of $36 billion worth of Canadian assets since the agency came into being.

PROPOSED SALE OF TEXACO CANADA

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that the Deputy Prime Minister repudiates his own Government's Petroleum Monitoring Agency. It is telling the truth and describing the way things

are. That is the problem. Therefore, I want to ask the Minister this question.

Texaco Canada is now up for sale. The Petroleum Monitoring Agency says Bow Valley, which is foreign controlled, and Husky which is foreign controlled, are now major bidders for that company. Given that, what steps is the Government going to take to ensure that Texaco Canada will not add further to the decline in Canadian ownership by being sold to foreign owned companies?

Mr. McDermid: Who owns it now?

• (1120)

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I do not need any lectures from the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry about telling the truth. I refer to the *Winnipeg Free Press* article of August 9 which outlines the reasons why his Leader and himself should start telling the truth when it comes to talking about the trade deal. The Member may want to read that because it is very good food for thought.

If the Hon. Member is asking the Government to reinstitute the Foreign Investment Review Agency, which contributed to the devastation of the energy sector, the answer is no. We have been encouraging investment—

Ms. Copps: Stand up for Canada.

Mr. Mazankowski: I know the Hon. Member from Winnipeg does not really give a hoot about the energy sector, but there are some Members in this House who do.

As I said earlier, there has been a strengthening in this sector and that has been good for the creation of jobs and good for the stimulation of the economy in all regions of Canada. The Texaco issue will be examined in due course if an application is made to Investment Canada. It will be considered in the appropriate manner consistent with the policies and guidelines laid down by Investment Canada.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, if the Deputy Prime Minister wants to place so much faith in the *Free Press* editorial he should take note of what is in the paper today, that is, that the Liberals are leading in the city of Winnipeg at 45 per cent and his own Party is at 24 per cent. Under those circumstances the *Free Press* can keep writing all the editorials it wants because our percentages keep going up and the Conservatives' keep going down.

GOVERNMENT POLICY

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct another serious question to the Deputy Prime Minister and would like to get a serious answer in response.

Under the proposed trade agreement the Government has changed the threshold to weaken further the control over foreign investment. The U.S. legislation carries with it new negotiating directions to the United States administration to reduce further the grandfathering of investment in energy and other forms of resources.

Is the Government not basically covertly endorsing, not the sale of Canada's resources but the sale of Canada's ownership of its resources? Are we not really selling the country out by your policies in energy, oil, gas and resources? Are we not seeing the sell-out of Canada?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would ask Hon. Members to put their questions through the Chair. The Hon. Minister.

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, this is another indication of why the *Winnipeg Free Press* titled its editorial "Tell the people the truth". The editorial writer said, "John Turner should tell the people the truth".

Mr. Axworthy: That's why we are at 45 per cent in the city of Winnipeg. That's why you will not have a Tory Member left in the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): The Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry should be telling the people the truth and not distorting the truth as he has done in this question and many other questions in relation to investment.

The Hon. Member should understand that the purpose of the free trade agreement—

Mr. Boudria: Where are you going to run, Mike?

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): The Hon. Members do not want an answer to the question. The Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry has said time and time again that we should not be proceeding with the free trade deal but should be working through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. He should understand that GATT is addressing the question of investment and the question of trade in services. The things we have done in the free trade agreement with the United States are very consistent with the things he is going to be proposing that we do with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The Member should get a bit more consistency and less distortion into his questions.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—TARIFF REDUCTIONS

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Deputy Prime Minister. Speaking of telling the truth, for the past year the Government has been telling Canadians that they as consumers will benefit from the full reduction in tariffs with the United States which the Government says will come from its trade deal with that country.

Yet for the past year the Government has had in its possession a secret Finance Department study which makes clear that Canadian consumers would not benefit from reductions in tariffs unless wholesalers and retailers passed along those reductions and lower prices, something which has not necessarily happened at all.

Mr. Mazankowski: That is really startling.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Why has the Government been telling Canadians that the benefits of these tariff reductions will definitely go to them when it knew that this was not necessarily going to be the case? Why will the Government not call an election right away to give Canadians a chance to decide whether they want to have a trade deal from which they will not benefit in spite of the claims of the Government that they will?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the light has gone on.

An Hon. Member: But nobody is home.

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): The House Leader of the Liberal Party has suddenly realized that there is a market-place, that retailers and wholesalers are allowed—can you believe it—to set their own prices in this country.

Some Hon. Members: No!

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): The Finance Department study is not a secret study, it has been made public. The Finance Department study says that on a conservative basis there will be a reduction in prices of a certain amount. I do not have that figure off the top of my head but I think it is something in the order of 4 or 5 per cent.

There will be a reduction in prices of 4 to 5 per cent assuming that the market-place does not pass on the full amount of the reduction. However, if the wholesalers and retailers do pass on the full amount there will be an even greater reduction in prices over and above the 4 or 5 per cent about which I have just spoken.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, why does the Government not confirm that it can give Canadian consumers no guarantees whatsoever that they will benefit one bit from any reduction of tariffs that will come about from its trade deal? Is the Government not, through the Minister of Finance, admitting today that it is leaving what will happen to consumers up to the wholesale and retail sectors and that the Government does not care about what they do?

Why does the Government not admit this right now and confirm that as far as the Government is concerned there will really be no benefit for consumers and that the Government does not really care about that because it cannot guarantee consumers one cent of benefit from its trade deal?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I do not think that anyone in this world can guarantee things for Canadians, whether prices or even whether the Member for Windsor West is going to get re-elected. We cannot guarantee that. We are going to work like hell to make sure it does not happen.

Mr. Gauthier: You know what is going to happen to him, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Axworthy: We will not see you at next year's Christmas party.

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, since I answered the first question I have received a copy of the Economic Assessment. This is the so-called secret study to which the Member for Windsor West referred. If he would read the material that comes out from the Government he might be able to ask more reasonable questions.

In this document it says quite clearly that the cost of consumer goods imported from the United States could be reduced by about 5 per cent on average. I have said that that is based on conservative assumptions.

Mr. Boudria: That is what is wrong with them.

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): If the retailers and wholesalers pass on the full savings we will see those cost savings increase more than the 5 per cent indicated there.

As a final point, Mr. Speaker, I cannot quite understand all this fear, this horror, of free trade. Seventy-five per cent of the goods which are imported into Canada from the United States now are free of tariffs.

EFFECT ON CONSUMERS

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I would like to pursue this question with the Minister further. He suggested that his report is the secret study. Of course what we are talking about is the memo of December 16 that was released to Canadian Press under Freedom of Information.

• (1130)

That memorandum said that consumers would not get the full benefit of tariff reductions. Why has the Minister not let Canadians know of this conclusion? Why has he kept it secret? Why has he misled consumers about the gains they might get?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I do not quite understand why the Hon. Member is so upset about this point. We have made a conservative judgment of some economic analysis. We could have put in that the full reduction of prices would be passed on to the consumer. Then the Hon. Member would be standing up to say that we exaggerated the impact of the free trade agreement, that we were leading the consumer down the garden path. That is not the case. We are saying that this is the conservative judgment

we have made, that only 5 per cent will be there. It could be more.

I want to point out to the Hon. Member that if there is a greater degree of competition, as will come from the free trade agreement, possibly we will see a greater increase in the price reductions as a result of the free trade agreement. Nothing is hidden whatsoever.

DEPARTMENT'S STUDY

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is precisely that misleading approach which the Government has taken in another one of its propaganda documents, the one talking about Canadian consumers and the benefits they will get from the trade deal. It says precisely: "Retailers will pass on to consumers the price reductions resulting from the elimination of tariffs under the agreement". That comes directly from the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Ministry's study which was issued after that December 16 memorandum.

Why is the Government, at taxpayers' expense, putting out misleading propaganda which is telling consumers something that is not true?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, quite frankly I think this is total distortion of what we are trying to do. In the analysis that we have provided on the free trade agreement we have said that there will be a reduction, in our judgment, of 5 per cent on the price of consumer goods. That takes into account a judgment that we have made that the full savings would not be passed on to consumers. However, if the full savings are passed on to consumers, then that 5 per cent will be a larger number. Surely that is not distorting or misleading the consumer.

As I said in my previous answer, if we had not made that more conservative assumption the Hon. Member would be standing up and saying, in a voice of feigned outrage, that we have been exaggerating the impact of the free trade agreement. This has been a conservative, realistic approach to the effects of the free trade agreement.

Mr. Langdon: Yes, but it is not the approach that was taken by the Government's own study from another Department, which was misleading and classifies absolutely as false propaganda.

[*Translation*]

POSITION OF NATIONAL FEDERATION OF CONSUMERS' ASSOCIATIONS OF QUÉBEC

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

Does the Government now agree with the National Federation of Consumers' Associations of Québec that there will be very few benefits for consumers as a result of this agreement?

[*English*]

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker—

Ms. Copps: Read Steven's householder for a change.

An Hon. Member: Why do you not shut up for a change, Sheila?

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Yes, now for Steven's householder.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask that Hon. Members refrain from remarks when questions are being asked—

Some Hon. Members: Table the householder.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask that both sides exercise the courtesies that are expected.

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has just made references to statements of the Government being misleading. Let me read from his householder in which there is a statement that I think is totally misleading. Referring to the free trade agreement it says: "it will let American companies turn our health care system in a for-profit direction that will hurt patients and nurses". That is absolutely false. It is garbage.

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for York—South Weston.

* * *

PAROLE

INQUESTS INTO TORONTO DEATHS

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. It concerns the operation of half-way houses in Canada, particularly in Metro Toronto.

Recently two innocent people, Tema Conter and William Woods, were murdered by two inmates released to Montgomery House, a privately run half-way house in Toronto.

Provincial inquests are scheduled to begin in late September, early October. It now appears that the federal Government intends to challenge the jurisdiction of these inquests. Why does the Government intend to obstruct and delay these investigations? Is it not because they will embarrass the Government right in the middle of a general election campaign?

Mr. Murray Cardiff (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Hon. Member knows, as he indicated, that these inquests have been scheduled for September 21 and October 6. The federal Government is

committed to full co-operation with both of these inquests. There is no intention whatsoever to interfere in the operation of these inquests.

REFORM OF PAROLE SYSTEM LEGISLATION—TIMING OF INTRODUCTION

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Government does not intend to challenge the jurisdiction of the coroner. Canadians generally are fed up with the present parole system. They are afraid of dangerous inmates being released to half-way houses without proper supervision.

Two months ago the Solicitor General announced proposals to reform the parole system in Canada. He promised us legislation within a matter of weeks. That was two months ago. When does the Government intend to follow through on the commitment of the Solicitor General to introduce legislation to reform the criminal justice system, in particular the parole system in Canada?

Mr. Murray Cardiff (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General has taken the initiative of making changes to the parole system. He went across the country and listened to various groups. It is a position that is taking time to have public input. We hope to have a Bill prepared and presented to the House very soon.

* * *

VISIBLE MINORITIES

INTERNMENT OF JAPANESE-CANADIANS DURING WORLD WAR II—DISCUSSIONS WITH NATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. It concerns the issue of redress for Japanese-Canadians which the Deputy Prime Minister knows very well is a matter of honour, national and personal.

In his answers to my questions yesterday the Prime Minister suggested that the Government is dealing with the National Association of Japanese Canadians. However, the President of the NAJC tells me this morning that there are no meetings scheduled to discuss redress.

Does the Deputy Prime Minister, who is managing the politics of multiculturalism for the Government, have any plans to arrange serious and substantial discussions on redress with the National Association of Japanese Canadians?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I do not have to manage the politics of multiculturalism. It is being handled very well by the Minister responsible for multiculturalism. I think he is doing an excellent job.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: I can assure the Hon. Member that he is seized with this very sensitive and important issue and I think the Prime Minister indicated yesterday the sincerity of the Government in trying to deal with this issue. I can tell the Hon. Member, as the Prime Minister indicated yesterday, that we hope to have a resolution to this matter in the very near future.

• (1140)

REQUEST FOR ACTION ON INDIVIDUAL COMPENSATION

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister who is certainly involved in trying to recognize the needs of multiculturalism. Will the Deputy Prime Minister take the kind of action this Government has not seen anyone else take to break the log-jam and get action on individual compensation for Japanese-Canadian survivors? There has to be action of that sort if there is going to be any kind of resolution.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I think the Prime Minister's personal commitment and involvement in this matter are pretty clear from the answers he gave in the House yesterday. The Minister for Multiculturalism has met on occasions with the leaders of the Japanese community. I am not aware if there has been any further meeting scheduled, but there are recommendations that are currently being considered. I can say that to the Hon. Member. I am sure when those recommendations will be considered and acted upon, further discussions will take place, but I can assure the Hon. Member that progress is being made.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—STOCK SAVINGS PLANS

Mr. Jim Jepson (London East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. I am concerned about an issue raised yesterday by the Leader of the Official Opposition concerning the ability of the Quebec Government or, indeed, any provincial Government, to operate or establish new stock savings plans once the free trade agreement is in force. Could the Minister tell the House whether the free trade agreement prevents—

Ms. Copps: Who wrote that, Jim?

Mr. Jepson: —Quebec, or, indeed, any province from encouraging people to invest in their economy through stock savings plans, or from implementing other professional measures?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I think my response yesterday was specifically related to stock

savings plans by the federal Government, but I can broaden that answer to say that the free trade agreement does not—

Ms. Copps: Fontana has the answer.

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): The Member for Hamilton East does not want to listen to an answer to clarify a complete misunderstanding of her Leader on this issue.

Ms. Copps: Fontana will give you the answer.

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Her Leader yesterday had not read, had not understood the free trade agreement—

Mr. Nunziata: Ask John Crosbie.

Ms. Copps: Ask Crosbie.

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): If he had, he would have known that the free trade agreement does not apply in any way to portfolio investments as set out in Section 1601(2)(b), Section 1609(1) or Section 1602, all of which restrict the free trade agreement. It does not apply in any way to portfolio investments, which is the focus of stock savings plans that have been introduced by the provincial governments in our country.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

POLITICAL RIGHTS OF PUBLIC SERVANTS

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. The Prime Minister promised in the last election campaign that he would propose a Bill giving public servants certain political rights. Why did the Government yesterday not keep its promise? Why did it scuttle a very reasonable Bill which was agreed to by all members of a legislative committee of this House? Why did the Prime Minister not keep his commitment to public servants by clarifying the situation, by placing a Bill before this House? What is the Government doing about this? Why did the Prime Minister not keep his promise?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is keeping his promise. He is prepared to fulfil his promise. The Government is prepared to act on this issue as was indicated in the House yesterday. I know the Hon. Member is very responsible on this particular issue. I think he recognizes very clearly the delicate balance which has to be maintained between political freedom and the importance of maintaining an impartial Public Service. It is within that context that we would want to see a measure proceed.

What was attempted by Members on this side of the House was to clarify some areas of the Private Member's Bill that required clarification. I regret that we were not able to deal with this more fully, but I can assure the Hon. Member of our commitment to provide the kind of political freedom and justice that was alluded to during the course of the last election campaign, but also bearing in mind—

Ms. Copps: Why do not you keep your promise?

Mr. Mazankowski: —the decision of the Federal Court of Appeal which has to be taken into consideration as well. I would hope that the Hon. Member would take that into consideration. I can advise him that we will be drafting a Bill and it will be accompanied by a statement which will, hopefully, clarify this issue.

[*Translation*]

BILL C-273—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Government, letting a few Members do its dirty work, literally strangled a Private Member's Bill that was intended to confirm and specify the political rights of public employees.

Why did the Government table amendments in the House yesterday which had the effect of killing Bill C-273? Why is the Government now hurriedly telling us it will keep its promise, when it failed to table any legislation in the past four years? Backbenchers had to do it instead. Why did the Government not have the courage to stand up and keep its promise to federal public servants?

[*English*]

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member were fair, and I think he is a fair individual and I have a tremendous amount of respect for him, and if he had looked at the amendments and examined them closely—

Mr. Gauthier: Sixteen was not allowed.

Mr. Mazankowski: —he would have found that most of them were technical in nature and most of them would have made the Bill more workable and would have, I think, achieved the purpose which all of us in this House want to achieve.

Mr. Gauthier: I will write you a letter.

Mr. Mazankowski: It is really unfortunate the Hon. Member wants to make this a partisan issue.

Ms. Copps: False. Always falsehoods.

Mr. Gauthier: You made it a partisan issue. You did it.

Mr. Mazankowski: I would have hoped that through the co-operation, good will and understanding of all Members of this House, we could have reached a workable compromise which would have maintained that delicate balance which I think we all want to achieve in order to ensure the impartiality of the Public Service is preserved. That is precisely what Members on this side were attempting to do. I would hope that the Hon. Member might reconsider that.

Oral Questions

REVENUE CANADA

CALCULATION OF FARM MACHINERY TRADE IN PRICES

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt—Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance who, during Question Period, outlined what seems to me to be a new government policy. He said: "This Government permits wholesalers and retailers to set their own prices".

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Hon. Member can put his question.

Mr. Althouse: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that this is government policy—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lewis: Isn't that NDP policy, too?

Mr. Althouse: Now that this is the government's new policy—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An Hon. Member: Wait for it!

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member.

An Hon. Member: Try again!

Mr. Althouse: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that this seems to be the Government's new policy, with respect to Revenue Canada's attempts to set trade-in values on farm tractors and combines three or four years after the deal, to re-write the contract, to set the trade-in price for the retailer, does this mean that the Government is going to drop that stupid, regressive policy and allow those deals to stand?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the NDP to the real world.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): They have never understood the workings of the market-place. But I think the Hon. Member, if he reflects on where he buys his gasoline, sometimes might be able to get it at a penny or two less a litre somewhere else.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): Not much less!

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Sometimes there is a clearance sale around the end of the year. Sometimes even where he buys his tractor or his combines, maybe he would see there would be a little bit of competition there.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): Come off it!

Mr. Manly: Answer the question.

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): I know the NDP does not like this. I know that the NDP would like to be able to control all the big levers of pricing, but there is this thing called the market-place which operates very well and very effectively.

Mr. Angus: You missed the point, Mike.

Ms. Mitchell: Why do you not listen?

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): I hope the NDP would adopt this in their thinking.

REQUEST THAT DEPARTMENT CEASE PRACTICE

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt—Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question would be to inform the Minister that his Department, under his ministry, the Revenue Department, has been doing precisely what he is claiming the NDP does, and it is his Government that has been doing it. We have been asking for the last six months for the Government to cease and desist. Will he now do that?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): You would not know a farm tractor if it ran over you.

Mr. Epp (Provencher): And you look like one did!

An Hon. Member: Would you know one?

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): We used to make them in Brantford until you came to power.

Mr. Althouse: Let us hear the answer.

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Sometime, Mr. Speaker, I am going to invite the Member for Brant up to my little farm north of Toronto.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): What are you raising, fish?

• (1150)

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): The Hon. Member has asked a serious question in relation to trade-in values on tractors, combines and other implements. He knows full well that the Department of National Revenue is looking at them on an individual, case-by-case basis. In the case of substantial write-ups, the Department has taken action. But it is being done on a case-by-case basis where there are instances of some shading in the tax rules.

DISASTERS

1985 GANDER AIR CRASH—HEALTH OF PERSONS WHO WORKED AT SITE OF ACCIDENT

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, my question concerns the Gander air crash. I will ask my first question of the Minister of National Health And Welfare.

The Minister of Health will know of the problems experienced by a number of Transport Canada workers, search and rescue workers, members of the Canadian Armed Forces, and members of the RCMP who responded to the crash of the Arrow jet in December of 1985 which killed 256 people all of whom were American.

Will the Minister initiate immediately an independent medical examination of each person who worked at the crash site in order to determine what kind of health problems they have been suffering? We know of at least 24 workers who are suffering from various diseases such as rare blood disorders which are usually caused by the ingestion of toxic fumes.

Will the Minister order an independent medical inquiry? Will he do it now in the way the Public Service Alliance of Canada has been asking since yesterday?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in response to the Hon. Member's question, and just for the record, I should indicate to the Hon. Member that staff members of the Department of National Health and Welfare—and I have the names of the doctors and officials if Members of the House would like to know them—did work with employees who had been at the crash site immediately after the crash took place. The examinations were completed within two months after the incident. As well, instructions were given to medical staff for further follow-up.

I would say to the Hon. Member as well that National Health and Welfare is prepared to do whatever further testing or work is required. What we need is a formal request which might have taken place already—

Mr. Boudria: From whom?

Mr. Epp (Provencher): I said that it might have taken place as of yesterday. If we have not received a formal request, then obviously the testing cannot take place. As soon as there is a formal request we will take that action.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I take it that that formal request the Minister is talking about would be from the Public Service Alliance. I hope that that is the case.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL—HEALTH TESTS

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is addressed to the Associate Minister of National Defence. He will know that there were health tests done on Armed Forces personnel who participated in the work at the crash site and not on the other personnel who were there. Could the Associate Minister tell us what prompted his Department to carry out these tests? Why were only Armed Forces personnel involved? Why were the other people who worked at the crash site not tested as well?

Will the Minister and the Government order an independent commission of inquiry into the whole mess concerning the Gander air crash?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member should know that Transport Canada and the Department of National Health and Welfare have primary responsibility in respect to any action or any testing to be done. The Department of National Defence has been co-operating fully.

What I say to the Hon. Member is what I said in my first answer. We have done testing. We have had people working with both medical staffs and the people involved.

Additionally, in view of the new allegations, statements or claims made yesterday, we are fully prepared to do further testing and to do whatever is medically necessary. The Department of National Defence, Transport Canada, the Department of National Health and Welfare or other agencies would be involved and willing to do that work.

As I said, when the Hon. Member talked about a formal request I meant a formal request from the public service union or from other bodies such as that.

* * *

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

REBUILDING OF CITY INFRASTRUCTURES

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. It is obvious from the analysis done by Angus Reid that people who live in our cities are less than enamoured with the current Government of Canada.

In the House on a number of occasions I have asked the Minister of Finance if he would be prepared to enter into a program with the provinces and the municipalities to rebuild our crumbling cities. I want to ask it once again. Will the Government now consider assisting the municipalities in a very expensive proposition to rebuild our sewers, roads, our bridges and parks? Will he consider that?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is ignoring the responsibility for this particular issue. What we have been doing in our four years in office was rebuilding the economy, putting it into a stronger and more solid position.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): That is reflected by our ability to create the environment for the jobs that have been generated in the private sector. We will continue to do that. However, we still have some very serious financial problems which we are continuing to deal with, ones to which we are committed.

I know that members of the NDP could not care less about that element of government policy. All they want to do is spend, spend, spend—

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Thunder Bay.

REQUEST FOR FEDERAL ACTION

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, the Minister must recognize that his Government is making some financial decisions for expenditures such as on nuclear submarines. That money could be better used assisting our municipalities, as the Government has assisted Halifax in terms of its sewage treatment facility, to give our cities the financial ability to clean up the environmental problems that are created by poor sewer systems, leaded pipes, and crumbling roads.

Will the Minister and the Government reconsider and agree to work with the Canadian Federation of Municipalities, the provinces, and the cities to rebuild our communities?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, this is another question of half truths and things that are bordering on dishonesty.

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Minister's response is also bordering on what is acceptable. I would ask the Minister to give his answer.

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, let me just remove the rhetoric and talk facts. The NDP's proposals on defence call for a $1.9 billion increase in spending over and above what has been talked about in the nuclear submarine proposal.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): Nonsense.

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): The Hon. Member for Brant knows that that is the truth because that is the statement that he himself has made.

It is not a question of nuclear subs versus infrastructure. It is a question of who is responsible for doing the job.

I have said many, many times that I would like to see this work done but those responsible for it are the provinces and the municipalities. If they feel as strongly about it as the Hon. Member implies they do, then they should start getting on with the job themselves. That is where the responsibility lies. If we start spending money in all sorts of areas of provincial and municipal responsibility they will not like that. They will also see the deficit go up. That will lead to higher interest rates and a slow-down in economic activity. That is precisely the direction that we are trying to avoid as a government.

* * *

• (1200)

HOUSING

METROPOLITAN TORONTO—FEDERAL LANDS

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State for the Treasury Board. Back on June 2, the President of the Treasury Board stated in this House that the Department and, in particular, the Bureau of Real Property Management in the Department, was giving serious consideration to releasing federally owned surplus lands for badly needed affordable housing in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

Now, some two and a half months have passed. When are we going to have a decision on this? Is everybody in the Department away on vacation? When can we expect some action?

An Hon. Member: When the election gets called.

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the Hon. Member on June 27, there is an ongoing study with respect to surplus lands in the city of Toronto. My friend, as I have indicated to him on that date, will know that this Government has a policy of selling off surplus lands and making the best use of the land that the Government owns.

In keeping with that policy and in keeping with the efforts of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, we are reviewing the land, and as soon as we have a comprehensive plan in place, that will be announced.

* * *

CHILD CARE

PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister, and it concerns the speech given yesterday by the Prime Minister, parading his social policy, which contained a number of mistruths and fabrications.

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: I think that my admonition of a few minutes ago has to apply to both sides. The Hon. Member for Hamilton East.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, in his maiden speech on a Bill the Prime Minister said, and I quote, "The Child Care Act is about protecting children". The Prime Minister should know that there is absolutely nothing in this Act that protects children, because there are no national standards and no national objectives. I would like to ask who wrote this speech and why does the Prime Minister insist on being a phoney before the women of Canada.

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's intervention in the debate on child care was timely. He put forward the views of the Government on child care. He put forward a national strategy on child care. He talked about the 200,000 new spaces for the children of Canada. He talked about the tax breaks for parents, which obviously the Liberals and the NDP are against.

An Hon. Member: He talked about everything.

Mr. Epp (Provencher): He also put on the record the Government's advances on family violence. He put on the record what the Government had done about child sexual abuse. He put on the record the drug strategy. Do you remember when the Liberals said that there was no problem? He put on the record the issue of drinking and driving, especially for teens. He put on the record the policies—

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Hamilton East.

PROTECTION OF CHILDREN

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, the record speaks for itself, and the women of Canada—

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Ms. Copps: The women of Canada know a phoney—

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member.

Ms. Copps: It was a phoney statement.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An Hon. Member: Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: I will ask the Hon. Member to put her question.

Ms. Copps: My question is this. Can the Minister or any Member on the government side show me a single section of the Act which deals with protecting children? It is not there. That is a national responsibility, and I would like to ask the Minister why the national Government refuses to protect children in the national Child Care Act?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the national Child Care Act does protect children. It provides 200,000 spaces. It doubles the number of spaces. The Liberals spent, at best, $40 million to $50 million a year on child care. They did not protect children. They did not care. They are great on rhetoric, but they do not care.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I might comment that both the question and the answer were probably anticipated debate, but I was very generous with both the Minister and the Hon. Member. The Hon. Member for Burnaby. These will be the last two questions.

* * *

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

LIBERAL NOMINATION IN SAINT-LAURENT

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the President of the Privy Council, who is responsible for the operations of Elections Canada. It concerns the ruthless and dictatorial attempts by the Liberal Party of Canada to deny a Mr. William Dery an opportunity to be nominated as a Liberal candidate in the riding of Saint-Laurent, Quebec, where he lives. Will the President of the Privy Council look into whether or not the statement by the Member for Laval-des-Rapides, saying "he will not get any nomination in this particular riding I will assure you" could in any way be in breach of the—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Ms. Copps: The NDP do not even have conventions. Pope Broadbent anoints his NDP candidates.

Mr. Speaker: I know that that question may or may not be welcomed by some Members in the Chamber, but I think that I have to apply the procedural stricture, that unless the Hon. Member can show that the question has something to do with the administration of Government, it is out of order. I will give the Hon. Member another chance.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I know that the President of the Privy Council is concerned that elections be conducted in a democratic manner. I want to ask him whether in fact he is prepared to look into this question and determine whether this attempt to muzzle and deny access to the electoral process is in

fact in breach of either the Charter of Rights or the Canada Elections Act.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I find this to be a very serious situation particularly when it is occurring in a Party which has as its slogan "Let the people decide".

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I have to advise that that terminates Question Period. I wish to advise Hon. Members that at this time I wish to give a ruling with respect to a question of privilege that was raised some days ago. I want also to indicate to the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) that I will hear the Hon. Member on a question of privilege, and the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis). We will then go to Routine Proceedings.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGE

ALLEGED INTIMIDATION ATTEMPT WITH REGARD TO THE HON. MEMBER FOR GATINEAU—SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: On Thursday, July 14, 1988 the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue claimed that her privileges as a member had been breached in relation to a press release prepared by the Public Service Alliance of Canada, the contents of which were subsequently published in the weekly newspaper "le Dimanche Outaouais". The press release, dated July 6, 1988, which was delivered to the Hon. Member's office on July 7, 1988, dealt with the strike of the federal Government language teachers and a demonstration in support of the teachers organized to take place on the 6th of July, 1988 at the Hon. Member's riding office. The press release, copies of which have been supplied to the Chair, states that the Hon. Member has not supported the teachers in their negotiations with the Treasury Board.

The Hon. Member explained that she had indeed supported the teachers' cause and had told them that she would intervene on their behalf with the President of the Treasury Board regarding their demands for preparation time and language of negotiations. The Hon. Member went on to assert that the information contained in the press release is false and that its distribution and subsequent publication in a local newspaper constitute an attempt to intimidate her as a Member of Parliament in the exercise of her duties and as such represents a breach of privilege.

The Hon. Member may indeed have a legitimate grievance and can certainly dispute the facts as they are reported. The issue which the Chair must precisely decide is whether the preparation and publication of this information about a Member of Parliament constitutes a *prima facie* question of privilege in the traditional sense. Past precedents are highly restrictive in this regard and generally require that clear evidence of obstruction of interference with Member in the exercise of his or her duty be demonstrated in order to form the basis for a claim of a breach of privilege.

Speaker Jerome, in dealing with a similar case on June 23, 1977 ruled that "... the protection of an elected person against unwarranted or intemperate publicity, even abuses or defamatory publicity, is precisely that which is enjoyed by every citizen before our courts". He went on to add that "As elected people we can and do expect to be the targets of attack. "When those attacks seem offensive I think it is appropriate the Hon. Member is offered the courtesy of the House to extend to his hon. colleagues an explanation of the circumstances". He concluded that "... when these matters do take place, if they go beyond the point of being offensive to the point of being defamatory in a legal sense, certainly members ought to and will I am sure pursue matters through the courts."

Past Speakers have consistently argued that freedom of the press is one of the fundamental rights of our society which ought to be interfered with only if it is clearly in contempt of the House. Members who have complaints about reporting of their positions or activities should seek remedy in the courts.

In the case raised by the Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mme Mailly), I must rule that the matter does not constitute a question of privilege but that she may avail herself of the appropriate legal procedures if she feels that her personal reputation has suffered damage. I thank the Honourable Member for raising this issue and trust that this ruling has been helpful to her and to other Honourable Members.

• (1210)

Mrs. Claudy Mailly (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for your customary kindness and competence and also for pointing out that, although this was not a question of privilege in the traditional sense because my privileges were not breached, the former Speaker Jérôme said that when statements were made that might damage the reputation of a Member, the Member in question ought to pursue the matter through the courts. I think that is an indication this matter was serious and important enough to warrant your attention.

I deplore the fact that the Public Service Alliance acted so irresponsibly in this campaign, but I am also very glad, Mr. Speaker, that the agreement was finally signed and that the teachers obtained the guarantees they sought for course preparation time. I am simply very sorry the union resorted to methods that are unacceptable in a civilized society like ours.

[*English*]

PRESS RELEASE OF MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege in relation to a statement dated August 2, 1988, by and over the name of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. McKnight). The statement I bring to your attention and to the attention of the House as a question of privilege is that at the top of the communique, a press release, we find:

> Amendment to Indian Act removes death rule.

If you give me a moment, Mr. Speaker, I will explain to you why I do not think this is simply a matter of literary latitude by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and why it is unacceptable and constitutes a question of privilege.

First, the statement is false. There is no Bill before the House. There is no Bill in the hands of the opposition Parties. The first line of the statement states:

> Bill McKnight, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, has received all-Party support to amend a section of the Indian Act referred to as the death rule.

This morning I again got in touch with the Minister's office and was denied once more the opportunity to see the wording proposed to amend the Indian Act. This is crucial because this House gave the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs a statutory responsibility, not just a reference but a statutory responsibility, to produce for Parliament a report on the impact of Bill C-31, which came as a result of the Lovelace case at the United Nations. This was a reference that placed certain pressures on Canada and on this Parliament to act. The Minister in this press release describes the death rule as a technical error found in the 1985 Indian Act amendments known as Bill C-31.

Over the last 10 days I have been contacted by a number of groups and individuals who believed as a result of this press release that an amendment, a change, had in fact occurred. There are thousands of women and their children who are presently denied reinstatement as status Indians in Canada as a result of this so-called technical error. They, Mr. Speaker, are being denied certain rights and privileges provided by Bill C-31. For example, medical and dental care, educational benefits, the right to be on band membership codes and to live at home in their own home communities. There are thousands of them. If this were simply a communique that had gone out which had had broad literary latitude, I would not have raised the matter. The fact is that the opening line is simply false. It says, "Amendment to Indian Act removes death rule". There is no Bill. No Bill has been passed.

Mr. Lewis: There is certainly no privilege here.

Mr. Fulton: Since I am the spokesperson for my Party on aboriginal matters in Canada and since a false impression has been created right across Canada by this press release, I believe it affects my privileges both as the spokesperson on aboriginal affairs and as a Member of Parliament who deals with this issue on a regular basis. If you find there is a prima facie case of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to move the necessary motion to have it dealt with.

The Minister of State (Mr. Lewis) does not seem to think this is particularly serious. I think it is when a Minister of the Crown puts out a press release that is false. Anyone who can read knows that this press release is false. First, the headline is false. Second, the statement made within it that the opposition Parties had given all-Party support to an amendment we have never seen is categorically false. For him to imply to the First Nations, the first citizens and to the media of this country that what he has obtained is factual when it is not is false. The Minister has abused my privileges and he has abused the First Nations.

Mr. Speaker: I have listened with care to the Hon. Member for Skeena. I will reserve and ask him if he could assist the Chair by sending a copy of the press release to my office.

OFFICIAL REPORT—DELAY IN PUBLICATION

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege on behalf of all Members of the House. We all appreciate the tremendous job which the *Hansard* reporters do and all of the people involved in preparing *Hansard* for Members of Parliament and for all those interested in being aware of the proceedings of the House of Commons.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Riis: My comments in no way are to be a reflection on the tremendous work done by all of those participating in the *Hansard* process.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Riis: I particularly appreciate the fact that the House of Commons sits until ten o'clock in the evenings now as a result of extended hours. At about noon today we received yesterday's *Hansard*, which I think is quite a remarkable feat when you consider these sittings have been going on day after day all summer long. I simply draw to your attention a very serious problem. One of the uses *Hansard* is put to, particularly by Members of Parliament both in opposition and in government, is that in the late evening we review thoroughly what has gone on in the House of Commons and review carefully statements made by individual Members as well as statements made, perhaps more important, by members of the Cabinet. This enables us to raise, if necessary and appropriate, responsible questions in Question Period.

• (1220)

I simply want to draw to the attention of the House the difficulty this poses on Fridays. When we do not receive *Hansard* for obvious reasons until noon on Friday, recognizing

that Question Period begins at eleven o'clock on Friday, it is impossible for Members of Parliament to be aware of comments made by people like the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) or Cabinet Ministers during the previous day's proceedings. That therefore makes it difficult or impossible for us to use the appropriate quotes in questioning.

I read with interest, as have other Members, the speech made by the Prime Minister. A whole set of questions ought to have been raised today in Question Period, but without the transcript of the proceedings being available prior to Question Period, it was impossible to ask those questions.

I wanted to raise this matter, focusing on the comments of the Prime Minister yesterday, at the first and earliest opportunity. It affects the privileges of all Members of the House in that it hinders our ability to do our jobs effectively. If Question Period is the time of the day when the Government is to be held accountable, and if we have an obligation under the traditions of this House to ask appropriate questions at the earliest opportunity, we must have an earlier reading of *Hansard* on Friday. I am simply flagging this issue in the hopes that one way or another, this can be remedied in the future.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) for his intervention. I am not sure that it is a question of privilege. However, I see by indications from other Hon. Members in the Chamber that it is a problem.

The Chair has heard the Hon. Member with considerable concern and I will take some steps to see if there is something that can be done to get *Hansard* available for all Hon. Members on both sides of the House a little earlier. However, I do thank the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap for his very generous acknowledgement that our *Hansard* team is working pretty hard these days. I thank the Hon. Member for raising the matter, and I will see if there is something that can be done to correct the situation.

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, on the same point, is it not possible, given the time constraints of *Hansard* and the difficulties involved, for Members who are really interested to go up and review the audio tapes? I think that that is available to Hon. Members, and in fact I have done that in the past.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member for Hamilton East. I do not think that the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap was suggesting that there are not other ways to possibly cover the debates of the day before. There are, of course. The Hon. Member's suggestion is one, and I would invite Hon. Members to see what arrangements might be made. However, before I indicate that all Hon. Members can avail themselves of the "blues" of statements by other Hon. Members, I think some consideration should be given to what is the policy of *Hansard* there.

As well, it is obvious that with the electronic recordings and television recordings, it is possible, if there is some specific matter, to draw back through the Oasis system the actual television review. However, I do not think that that is what the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap was getting at. In those cases that can be done, but the Hon. Member was talking about the fundamental convenience of having *Hansard* in time for Hon. Members to use it as a reference for the work they have to do.

I thank the Hon. Member for Hamilton East. I do not want to make a blanket ruling on what is available to Hon. Members, but Hon. Members might make inquiries of the *Hansard* office.

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if I might take this opportunity to address a question to the Minister of State for the Treasury Board (Mr. Lewis) concerning Government business. It is a matter which relates to legislation which has been promised for some time in the area of—

Mr. Speaker: I have a bit of difficulty with this. If the Hon. Minister wishes to respond, he can indicate so, but there is a time for these kinds of questions and it is Thursday afternoon. I am in the hands of the House, of course, but I think the Hon. Member is out of order. I have to say to the Hon. Member for Burnaby that there is no consent.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to Petitions Nos. 332-5100 to 332-5102 inclusive, 332-5104 to 332-5110 inclusive, 332-5151, 332-5157, 332-5184 to 332-5186 inclusive, 332-5188 to 332-5207 inclusive, 332-5211, 332-5214, 332-5221, 332-5223, 332-5224, 332-5228, 332-5230, 332-5231, 332-5240 and 332-5245 to 332-5248 inclusive.

While I have the floor, I move:

That this House do now proceed to Orders of the Day.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 505)

YEAS

Members

Bourgault	Hamelin	Sparrow
Boyer	Hicks	Taylor
Brightwell	Horner	Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Browes	Leblanc	Tupper
Chartrand	Lewis	Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Cossitt	Lopez	Van De Walle
Darling	Mailly	Warner
Daubney	Martin	Winegard—36
Dick	Mazankowski	
Ellis	McCuish	
Fennell	McDermid	
Ferland	McKinnon	
Gagnon	Minaker	
Greenaway	Redway	

NAYS

Members

Althouse	Copps	Marchi
Angus	Epp (Thunder Bay—Nipigon)	Mitchell
Axworthy	Gauthier	Nunziata
Benjamin	Keeper	Riis
Blackburn (Brant)	Langdon	Skelly—18
Boudria	Manly	
Caccia		

• (1300)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-130, an Act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States of America, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

Mr. Speaker: I should advise the House that, through no fault of anyone's, we are still without full translation of the ruling I would have preferred to have given earlier today. However, I have adjusted the ruling and I am now prepared to proceed with some of the amendments.

[*Translation*]

As I said in the House this morning, I had the opportunity to review in part most of the hundred motions entered on the Order Paper. In view of what the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) said, I decided to postpone my final decision. In the mean time, for the purposes of the debate, the House can proceed to consider Motions Nos. 1, 61 and 65 together. Then the House can debate Motions Nos. 5, 6 and 8 together, followed by Motions Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14. I hope to be able to provide a final decision early next week.

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Clause 2 be amended by adding immediately after line 21 at page 2 the following:

"Canada" means the territory to which Canadian customs laws apply, including any areas beyond the territorial seas of Canada within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, Canada may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and their natural resources;"

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 61

That Bill C-130 be amended in Clause 60 by adding immediately after line 28 at page 52 the following:

""Canada"means the territory to which Canadian customs laws apply, including any areas beyond the territorial seas of Canada within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, Canada may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and their natural resources;"

[*English*]

Motion No. 65

That Bill C-130 be amended in Clause 76 by adding immediately after line 3 at page 62 the following:

"and "Canada" means the territory to which Canadian customs laws apply, including any areas beyond the territorial seas of Canada within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, Canada may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and their natural resources."

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill C-130 in its interpretation clause tells a very interesting story. The Government has been careful and precise in giving a definition of what is the United States, its territory and its rights and its powers. However, it has forgotten Canada. That tells one something. I do not think that in this respect we can refer to Freudian slips or slight sins of omission. The fact of the matter is that this Bill which introduces a very important and historic agreement is very careful to give a definition of what United States jurisdiction and territory may be but it has neglected to deal with our own country. I am afraid that that in itself leaves a very large story to be told.

• (1310)

Why is it important in a practical sense? If one reads the interpretation clause one will see that it states that "the United States" means the customs territory of the United States, including the 50 states, foreign trade zones located in the United States and Puerto Rico, and "any areas beyond the territorial sea of the United States within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, the United States may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and the natural resources thereof."

I hearken Hon. Members back to the very famous *Polar Sea* incident when the United States refused to recognize the Canadian right to exercise territorial jurisdictions in those areas. It said that that is an international area and not ours. I would also point to the present dispute in the Beaufort Sea in which the Department of the Interior of the United States is in fact giving out at the present time licences to U.S. companies to start drilling in territory which Canada claims to be its own. Therefore it is very important that Canada ensure that the assertion of our right to exercise jurisdiction in these territories is clear, unmistakable and beyond challenge, at least in order to defend our position. In Bill C-130 the Government of Canada has been very clear to ensure that the rights of the United States be recognized but it does not give any credence or even acknowledge that Canada exists in that sense.

What are the reasons? We spoke to officials of the trade negotiating office which put the Bill together. They said: "Everyone knows what Canada is anyway". The Americans do not know. The Americans do not know because they challenged us in the *Polar Sea* incident. They are challenging us again today in the Beaufort Sea. The French do not know because they are challenging our fishing rights off Newfoundland. We are still under harassment by the U.S. Government in the famous Georges Bank case even though there was a court case which gave us clear jurisdiction. This demonstrates that many other countries either will not see or are not prepared to acknowledge our rights in these areas. Thus it is not fair to say that everyone knows what is Canada. It is very important that Canada assert what is our position.

We were then told: "We did not have to do that because the term Canada is not used in the Bill". I thought that that was an interesting comment so I went in and did a little checking. In fact, I found out that on virtually every page—for example, page 2, line 13; page 2, line 15; page 2, line 19; page 2, line 22—the word "Canada" is used. It is used on almost every page of the Bill. It would seem to me that under those circumstances we must define it because it has a very precise and important legal definition.

We were told that we do not have to recognize it because there is a definition of Canada in the agreement. That is correct. If there was a reason for putting a definition of the United States in our Bill, then why did we forget Canada? Why was it important to ensure that the full jurisdictional rights of the United States be recognized in our Bill but we glossed over in a cavalier fashion—perhaps it was an honest mistake—what our territory, jurisdictions and rights will be? That creates a major problem since the United States still refuses to formally recognize laws made by other countries with respect to extraterritorial jurisdiction beyond its own territorial seas. That has been a clear statement of U.S. policy for decades.

With respect to the *Polar Sea* incident the Americans said: "We are moving through international waters and not Canadian waters". By accepting this definition can Hon. Members imagine what will happen when we get into questions of allocating resources? What would happen if under energy provisions a claim were made by Canada with respect to where the proper sharing of oil and gas should occur and the Americans were to say: "From which territory?". We would say: "Will it be from the Beaufort Sea which the United States claims is theirs?" Will we say no, that area belongs to us?, The Americans would come back to say: "We are sorry, in your own legislation you have given us that jurisdiction but you have not given it to yourself".

I submit to the House that this is an important amendment, and one I expect the Government to accept. Even if it believes that it is an omission, then surely to goodness it is crucial that we clarify that point and not make ourselves vulnerable to future challenges over disputed territories and have our own case weakened substantially. In an area in which we are defining these particular rights *vis-à-vis* the United States we have forgotten a very important component—our own country. It will be interesting to hear from representatives of the Government with respect to why it was more important for the Government to recognize U.S. jurisdiction over extraterritorial seas and seabeds and not recognize Canadian rights in the same respect.

One could interpret it to mean this. The Government did not want to incorporate language that might engage it in a dispute with the United States. Once again, as we have seen with respect to every step and stage of the Bill, the Government is trying to pacify, trying to downplay and to cover up, not get our American friends mad at us. That has been the standard operating procedure in this agreement. The consequence that we have seen time and time again is that we end up selling ourselves short. We end up surrendering certain parts of our sovereignty, certain parts of our rights and our jurisdiction.

I submit that this amendment to the interpretation part of the Bill plays an important role. It will have a very significant impact on the interpretation of the agreement if and when or ever it comes about. Surely, if the precedent set within this very important international statement by the Government that we are forgoing our own clear assertion of our extraterritorial rights in key areas of the Arctic, fishing rights, and others, is not corrected I believe it could become a legal precedent to be used against us not just by the United States but by many other countries. If we are not prepared to assert those rights in this crucial document, does that mean in fact

that we are not prepared to defend those rights? That is the reason for this amendment.

• (1320)

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I would like to start in this historic debate by first saying that I think the amendments which have been brought forward by my friend from Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) are sensible and straightforward. It is something that I hope the Government will look at with care and will accept.

I think, at the start of this discussion, at the report stage of the Bill and on this first amendment, that one should also put certain points on the record. One should, for instance, impress heavily on the record the fact that in the legislative committee, where where this and other amendments were considered, a major fight was fought to see to it that across this country people would have a chance to be able to make presentations to this committee. I found it unfortunate that that was not accepted by the committee itself. I found, too, as I looked at the legislation which was in front of us, that the more groups we heard from, the more groups that spoke to us, the more the gaps came out in this Bill. We saw areas, from water to environmental concerns, to our territorial concerns, which had been considered but were not considered in this Bill.

We also felt that there was a certain degree within the committee itself of avoiding what was the major question which came before us again and again as groups called, and still call, for an election in this country, to see to it that they have a say in what happens to them and to their country in the future. Therefore, we have put forward a number of amendments. We have put forward amendments which take, for instance, the United States law and recognize some of the points which are made within that law, which make the United States law supreme over the agreement itself. We were not prepared, in our discussions in committee, to do that, and I deeply regret that because it means that United States law will dominate this agreement.

We were not prepared to respond to United States moves which have been put before us in their legislation, as to how they were prepared to move on subsidies. We felt that it was necessary, in a Bill from this House, to take the same position. We felt that provincial rights should be discussed, protected and safeguarded in this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Langdon: Concerning auto performance requirements, automobiles are very important to my constituency, but they have been desperately important to the whole revival of the economy of Canada throughout this past five years. That revival, I think, requires us to keep our freedom of action with respect to the auto sector.

It is also crucial that we maintain our concern and our control with respect to energy policy. There are parts of this Bill which are before us, to which we will be moving amendments which will very clearly take away the power of Canada to shape its energy policy in the future, while leaving the United States with the power to do so through its federal energy regulatory commission.

We also have a desperate need to look into the human casualties of this trade Bill, and there will be human casualties. The Government likes to talk of human casualties being very minimal. I guess, as one who has looked at adjustment restructuring throughout the world, this kind of major industrial restructuring, agricultural restructuring, social restructuring, services restructuring, is going to bring us, as a country, a lot of human casualties, who will have to be something that we respond to with humanity, with care, with passion.

So I am pleased to see this debate start today. I am pleased to see it start with this particular set of amendments, which set out for all of us to recognize that where we should start from is our definition of Canada, our territorial definition, of course, but also our definition of what we want to see for the future of Canada. Do we want to see a direction which takes us into closer and closer integration with the United States? Do we want to see a future where our children consider themselves essentially Americans? Is that what we want to see? I do not think so. I do not think so and I do not think that this House of Commons should therefore support great parts of this Bill.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Langdon: That is why we have moved these amendments. I also feel—and I say this with the greatest possible sincerity that I can muster—that it is absolutely ludicrous to make a major change in the future of our country, a fundamental shift which Canadians have fought in my constituency since the war of 1812, without their being able to have a say through an election, to see to it that there is a chance for them to shape the future of this country.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Langdon: We, therefore, will support these amendments. We will support other amendments, but above all, we will fight as hard as we possibly can fight to see to it that this Bill does not go through this House of Commons, that it is stopped, and that this Government is forced to go to the people and to let the people have their say, to let the people of Canada make the final decision on this crucial issue to the future of our country.

• (1330)

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to second the set of amendments moved by my colleague, our trade critic, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy).

When you ask Canadians, as many polls have attempted to do over the course of the last few months, about whether you

are in favour or opposed to free trade or whether Canadians ought to have a decision before this deal becomes officially ratified, one of the areas of concern that crosses over provincial and regional lines, economic and social lines, is the question of sovereignty. It is the question of the ability of the people of this youthful, energetic and dynamic country to decide for themselves what directions and aspirations they want to set forth.

As we start off this very important and historic debate for all Canadians, these amendments speak to a fundamental deficiency that I think is symbolic of the Government's entire initiative on the free trade front. When you stop and read Bill C-130, you find that the Government set forth to define what is meant in clear terms by this agreement. It defined what is meant by the word "commission", it defined what is meant by the word "Minister", and it defined what is meant by the word "prescribe", and finally it defined what "the United States" means. As was outlined very ably and articulately by our trade spokesperson, our Canadian Government forgot to define what it means to live in this country through the omission of stating very categorically and clearly what it is we define our Canadian territory to be. It would seem to me that, in a Bill of this magnitude, the Government would at least start from a point of strength, from a point of departure that would put clearly on paper and in writing our undisputed rights and territory as a nation, rather than allowing those very definitions to be interpreted by the Americans, or any other country, as they see fit.

Is it any wonder when you talk about sovereignty that Canadians begin to worry, that they begin to think of themselves as second-class citizens in the face of the Americans? Is it any wonder, when you ask Canadians, who do you think got the better end of the deal, who do you think the better negotiators were, who do you think gave up the most, or who do you think wanted this deal the most, they answer that across the bargaining table the Americans were clearly the victors?

This trade deal starts off by not defining and not recognizing what we as a country and as Canadians have every right to put on the record categorically and clearly, what we think this territory is all about that speaks to the sovereignty of this nation.

The Member from Winnipeg—Fort Garry moments ago pointed out the whole question and experience of the *Polar Sea* incident, the ridicule that Canadians felt as the American vessel went through our waters. Then, to add insult to injury, the Americans said they did not have to check with us and they did not have to get prior approval. What did we do about it? What about the insult Newfoundlanders felt when the Canadian Government put out a colour-coded map for our young students and had the Province of Newfoundland coloured under the United States of America. Those are the symbolic gestures that raise the concern and aspirations of Canadians.

Every Canadian wants to have a brighter economic future. Every Canadian is worried about future generations enjoying a lifestyle that we in this Chamber and our ridings are fortunate to share. They are not willing to do that at the cost of the inherent value of being Canadian and the inherent feeling of being in control of one's own destiny, in feeling the pride that comes with being the architects of our own decisions and ultimately in designing our future as we see fit. Therefore, it is very appropriate indeed that the Liberal Party, in the first seconds of this very important debate, in the opening lines of the free trade legislation that we are studying, is trying to amend and encourage the Government of Canada to recognize what is ours.

Let us recognize in the opening lines of our free trade legislation, or the Mulroney-Reagan trade legislation, what is indeed ours in a proud, profound and categorical manner. That is what our amendments strive to do. They do not strive to do the impossible, but what is expected of any national, sovereign government of the people. If the Conservative Government cannot muster the fortitude to send a signal to the Americans and to the world stating what is clearly ours, then they really do not deserve the opportunity of being at the head of the ship of state. They ought to stand up and be pro-Canadian. They ought to stand up and define what is ours, discuss the vision for those two countries, and then let the people decide which vision they want to embrace.

Very fundamentally and very early on, the Government has taken the time to define everything else, but it has left out our own country, Canada. We think that is very symbolic of what is troubling in this legislation. We are asking the House and, more important, the Government to recognize that deficiency, to recognize that fallacy, to recognize the ridicule and the embarrassment for any Canadian who happens to pick up this piece of legislation and recognizes that the Government has taken the time to define what is the United States of America but has forgotten to define, promote and defend what is clearly ours and what makes up this country.

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to say a few words on the first grouping of these amendments, which I am very happy to support.

In this first grouping we are dealing with the fact that the Tories lack any definition of Canada. When I say that, I do not simply refer to Bill C-130. The Conservative Party today, unlike the traditional Conservative Party, does not seem to have a very clear understanding of what Canada is all about. If it did have, it would not have entered into this trade agreement in the first place. The Conservative Party does not recognize that historically Canada has had a different tradition of government involvement in the economy, in culture and in social affairs than has the United States. The United States generally has followed the dictum, I believe, of Thomas Jefferson, a great American. He said that government is best which governs least. Canadians, because of our history and

geography, have had to take a different approach. It has resulted in a different kind of society, a more caring kind of society, and now that is all being jettisoned.

• (1340)

Being a member of the legislative committee on Bill C-130 was instructive of the refusal of the Conservative members to look at this situation in any kind of total way. Instead, they focused very narrowly on the Bill itself. There was no possibility for the committee to travel to hear Canadians in their local settings saying how they saw this agreement changing their lives for the worse or how they saw the selling out of the future for their children and their grandchildren. Any hearings held had to be in the rather ornate setting of the Railway Committee Room, pretty far removed from the everyday lives of most Canadians.

Hundreds of organizations and groups from across Canada had wanted to be heard, but because of the time constraints the Government put on this legislation in trying to ram it through, they were not heard. Those who were heard were not able to be heard on the substance of the issue itself. They could not talk about the agreement with any hope of having the Government listen to them.

Mr. McDermid: Come on, Jim.

Mr. Manly: Not with any hope of having the Government listen to them. The agreement was not a part of the hearings. People could make representations on the agreement, but the agreement was closed. It was not possible to make any amendments to the agreement, and the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary knows that because he emphasized that time after time in the hearings.

The agreement was something that we could talk about, but it was not something that could be changed. It was cast in stone. The point that needs to be recognized is that when committee hearings—

Mr. McDermid: Be honest.

Mr. Manly: I am being honest. Why does the Hon. Member not be honest?

When the committee travelled across Canada for a very brief whistle-stop tour last fall, it dealt only with the principles of the agreement. The text was not yet available. The final agreement was signed on January 2 without the Canadian people having had an opportunity to deal with it.

Mr. Dick: Two and a half years.

Mr. Manly: Not with the text. Now all we are able to deal with is this Bill that implements the agreement, not the agreement itself.

I think it is important that we should pay some attention to what some of the witnesses said, not just those witnesses who were opposed to the agreement but some of those who supported it as well. For example, Mr. Powe, the Vice President of the Canadian Life and Health Insurance Association, said before the committee:

> "—they must always look at how favourable a climate there is between the two countries in terms of the legislative framework and the tax structure, which is extremely important."

I stated:

> "It would be important for Canada to keep its tax measures somewhat in line with those of the United States."

Mr. Powe answered:

> "Very much so."

It is this kind of concern we have. We are concerned that Canadian tax policies will be harmonized with those of the United States. This is something that the Canadian Life and Health Insurance Association agreed would have to take place if we were going to be able to compete. It is this sort of thing that will make it very difficult for us to maintain our social programs such as medicare. It will make it almost impossible for us to introduce new social programs.

When the Hon. Donald Macdonald appeared before the committee, we were talking about services. I see that Mr. Macdonald, a prominent Liberal who is supporting the trade agreement, has gone to his reward. At the committee, I said:

> "But the right of establishment is the key to this whole issue."

He said:

> "It is certainly one of the keys. The right of establishment, and you are established there, the right to be treated in exactly the same way as the local business. This is the concept of national treatment in article III of GATT. Traditionally, of course, this has been applied to products; it is now also going to be applied to the service sector."

I asked:

> "Would it be fair to say that the United States is much more of a service-exporting economy at present than Canada?"

He said:

> "There is no doubt that they regard this as one of their advantages. On the other hand, there are Canadian service industries that have had very considerable success in their market."

I asked:

> "Which Canadian service industries?"

Listen to the answer, Mr. Speaker. He said:

> "The Reichmann family, for example, has engaged in major developments on Manhattan Island.
>
> They are not taking down Canadian money, they are not taking down Canadian blocks of cement; they are taking down the ability as developers. They are taking those services into that market."

Our new High Commissioner to Great Britain has said that this agreement is basically designed for people like the Reichmanns. It is not designed to be of benefit to the average Canadian and it will not be of benefit to the average American. It will be of benefit to multinational corporations on both sides of the border.

We need a definition of Canada that is not only written into this legislation but is one that members of the Conservative Party have in their hearts and minds. We need a definition of Canada that will look at Canada as a nation that has developed in a distinct, separate way from that of the United States, a nation that has a contribution to make to our world and that is being foreclosed by this trade agreement.

I urge all Hon. Members to support this grouping of amendments moved by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy). Even more than that, I think we have to move to give the people of Canada a chance to make their voices heard in this issue and to decide whether they want Canada to remain as a distinct society, or do they want to see our tax laws and eventually our social programs merged with those of the United States so that we will in fact become the 52nd or the 53rd state.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, it is very peculiar that on a Friday afternoon, when dealing with such an important amendment, the Government would be silent. There have already been four speakers, and I am the fifth, who have spoken on this amendment, which is of significance for reasons that have been explained and which I will explain as well. However, the Government is silent, and that is very peculiar.

Has the Government decided that it has a sufficient majority and that it is so drunk with arrogance that it does not have to reply?

Mr. Dick: We know what a filibuster is.

Mr. Caccia: If the Government had replied to the first speaker, perhaps we would have already moved to another amendment. However, we are still waiting to be enlightened by the Government on this matter.

It might be interesting for those who do not have the text of the Bill before them to know that in the interpretation of Bill C-130, there is a very thorough definition of the United States. It reads:

> "United States" means
>
> (a) the customs territory of the United States, including the fifty states of the United States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico,
>
> (b) the foreign trade zones located in the United States and Puerto Rico, and
>
> (c) any areas beyond the territorial sea of the United States within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, the United States may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and the natural resources thereof."

One would then want to know where Canada fits into this agreement. This amendment is being put forward because the United States is mentioned many times in the Bill and is defined. Canada, however, is mentioned many times in the Bill but is not defined. Therefore, it a very legitimate amendment put forward by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy). He is asking the Government and the backbenchers on the government side why it is that Canada is not included in the interpretation of this Bill. Why is there this imbalance? This is what we cannot understand.

I am the fifth speaker on this amendment. The Government has been silent. I would hope that the Government would find the courage and the intellectual pride to give us an explanation as to why a definition of Canada is missing. This is an international trade agreement, with emphasis on the word "international". This is why in the interpretation there is a definition of one of the two parties to the agreement. Why is the other missing? We invite the Government to reply. Give us an explanation. Why does the Bill go on at great length defining the United States but not Canada? Not at all.

• (1350)

These are not rhetorical questions. They relate to the very substance of the Bill. They refer to the international incidents the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry referred to some 40 minutes ago. Yet all we have is silence.

Evidently the Government is embarrassed. Evidently it does not have a good answer. Evidently it feels that when it comes to the vote, it has the majority to steamroller us regardless of whether or not it gives us an answer. That would be most unfortunate. I hope the Government has enough pride in and respect for this institution to get up very soon today and give us an answer.

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that no Member on the government side has an answer to the fundamental question posed here today. Where is the Parliamentary Secretary with respect to the definition of Canada? I would be very happy to allow Members on the government side, so few in number though they may be, who are interested in this issue—

Mr. McDermid: Look around you.

Ms. Copps: —tell us as to why it is there is no definition of Canada.

Mr. McDermid: Sit down and I will tell you.

Ms. Copps: The Minister responsible, who never even read the document, would probably stand up and say "trust me". We heard that before. We heard that about senior citizens' pensions.

As was pointed out by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy), what happened there in the first year of the Government's mandate when sovereignty was threatened by the *Polar Sea* was that you had the Prime Minister on the one hand saying it was not an incursion, and on the other hand you had the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) saying it was. They were playing ping pong on the issue. The American Congress must have been laughing. They must have had a big chuckle because they know that if Canada brings forward enabling legislation which does not define what Canada is, then obviously the territorial

dispute over the Beaufort, the George's Bank, and the dispute involving the *Polar Sea* in the Arctic will all go in their favour.

The legislation defines the United States but it does not define what is Canada. I would like to put forward the proposition, bizarre though it may seem, that the reason the Government failed to include a definition of Canada is that it does not understand the fundamentals of this country, territorially, geographically or spiritually.

What happened when the Americans came into Canadian waters on the *Polar Sea*, uninvited? Did the Prime Minister stand up and fight for Canada? Did the Secretary of State for External Affairs say to the U.S. President that you are uninvited, unwelcome, and you had better clear out of our territory? The only person who was charged as a result of that incident was the pilot of a small Canadian plane hired by the Council of Canadians who actually flew over the *Polar Sea* and dropped a Canadian flag on the deck. He did that so the Americans would know that in this country we understand what a territorial border means and we respect that.

The Prime Minister of Canada, kneeling as he usually does, to the President, did not say a thing to the Americans. Neither did the Secretary of State for External Affairs. However, a charge of dropping a dangerous object was laid against the pilot who flew that plane. That dangerous object was a Canadian flag. That pilot was charged with dropping a dangerous object on a boat which should not have been in Canadian waters in the first place.

That is why, in the context of this enabling legislation, we do not take the words of the Parliamentary Secretary who says "trust me", or the words of the Prime Minister who said that seniors citizens' pensions will never be touched. They are a sacred trust. We know what the words of the Government mean. They mean very little, and that is why we need a definition in law so our resources are protected both onshore and offshore. We will then be able to tell future trespassers on Canadian territory that by our law they have violated the agreement.

Yet the Canadian Government, in an obtuse, maniacal way, is trying to thrust a Bill on the Canadian people that will do nothing more than attempt to save the Prime Minister's political hide. Let's face it, the article in yesterday's *Citizen* was quite true. His own Party thinks the Prime Minister has a severe image problem with the public. He has a personality problem. People do not trust him. How is he going to be able to pull this one out of the bag? He has only one hope. He has to convince the Canadian public that somehow the trade deal is more important than his own character flaws. Unfortunately, he is afraid to see the trade deal illuminated in all its pieces, including a very fundamental lack of a definition of Canada. He is afraid to let the Canadian public see the details of the Bill and the agreement.

Today we saw the secret memorandum which was kept in the Ministry of Finance which basically told consumers that the people who may benefit from these—

Mr. McDermid: When are you going to start telling the truth for a change?

Ms. Copps: —alleged tariff reductions, 20 per cent though they may be, may be the retailers or wholesalers but it will not flow through to consumers. The Parliamentary Secretary is very anxious to speak from his seat, but unfortunately he has refused to give the Canadian people an opportunity to review this document in detail.

We believe this amendment is fundamental. We believe the definition of Canada with respect to asserting its territorial sovereignty is critical. That is why we feel this is a very supportable amendment. Certainly it will at least begin to put some flesh on the bones of legislation which is literally on the way to selling out Canada.

I hope the Hon. Member stands up and speaks, but I do not take the word of a Government and Prime Minister which has given us four years of broken promises. I want to see it in law. Any person in this Chamber who has practised law will know—

Mr. McDermid: Have you?

Ms. Copps: —that if it is not in the law, all the alleged good intentions of politicians and others mean absolutely nothing.

Mr. Dick: That is not true.

Ms. Copps: Why would the Government bring forward legislation that defines U.S. territory but not Canada? It is because the Government does not understand what Canada is all about. It does not understand what Canadians are all about. It is up to the Opposition through the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry to move this amendment in order finally to put a definition of Canada in this Bill.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There have been discussions between the Parties, and we appreciate their co-operation on this matter. I think you will find there is unanimous consent to the Government calling Bill C-145 and dealing with it in all stages without debate today and then immediately proceeding to Private Members' Hour.

• (1400)

Bill C-145 is an Act to amend various Acts to give effect to the reconstitution of the Quebec Provincial Court, Court of the Sessions of the Peace and Youth Court as the Court of Quebec. The Bill stands in the name of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member's proposal?

Court of Québec

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the Official Opposition was indeed consulted and that we have given our approval to the proposed procedure and that we will join the Government in passing Bill C-145.

[*English*]

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, speaking on behalf of the New Democratic Party, we, too, agree to this process and believe that this legislation will in fact improve the administration of justice in Quebec. For that reason we are prepared to facilitate passage of the Bill.

* * *

QUÉBEC COURTS AMENDMENT ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Doug Lewis (for the Minister of Justice) moved that Bill C-145, an Act to amend various Acts to give effect to the reconstitution of the Quebec Provincial Court, Court of the Sessions of the Peace and Youth Court as the Court of Quebec, be read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Paproski in the Chair.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being two o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS--BILLS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-264, an Act to amend the Criminal Code (instruments and literature for illicit drug use), as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

Mr. Bob Horner (Mississauga North) moved:

That Bill C-264 be amended in Clause 1 by striking out lines 11 to 15 at page 1 and lines 1 to 5 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"ited pursuant to the Narcotic Control Act, controlled pursuant to Part III of the Food and Drugs Act or restricted pursuant to Part IV of the Food and Drugs Act;

"illicit drug use" means the importation, exportation, cultivation, sale or possession of a narcotic, drug or other substance contrary to the Narcotic Control Act or Part III or IV of the Food and Drugs Act or a regulation made thereunder;

"instrument for illicit drug use" means anything designed primarily or intended under the circumstances for consuming or to facilitate the consumption of an illicit drug, but does not include a "device" as that term is defined in section 2 of the Food and Drugs Act";

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise to speak briefly on this very important Bill and the amendment which I tabled two days ago. I want to explain some of the reasons why this amendment was tabled and why this Bill is very important.

We debate things like child care in this House. We speak about doubling the number of spaces to look after the needs of the young people in our nation. Since 1984 we have reduced youth unemployment by six points. We have just debated for an hour the free trade agreement to ensure continued prosperity for the youth of the nation.

However, we abdicate our responsibility and duty by allowing contradictory messages to be sent to the youth of the nation by allowing head shops or drug paraphernalia outlets to sell their products, such as hookah pipes to the youth, the most important resource that we have in Canada.

A couple of associations objected to the Bill as it was worded and that is why I tabled amendments. The Canadian Pharmaceutical Association was concerned that under this Bill, as it was reported from committee, drug stores could be convicted of selling or giving hypodermic needles and syringes to diabetics. The Canadian Medical Association was concerned that if these hypodermic needles and syringes were obtained by someone claiming to be a diabetic who was actually a drug addict, it could promote the spread of AIDS.

Therefore, I believed it was necessary to move an amendment covering illicit drugs, illicit drug use, and instruments for illicit drug use. The first section of the amendment would add to the definition of illicit drug the category of controlled drugs regulated under Part III of the Food and Drugs Act. Controlled drugs include amphetamines and barbiturates. The Bill reported out of committee would have dealt only with narcotic drugs and restricted drugs. Any drug paraphernalia associated with controlled drugs would not have been regulated.

The second part of the amendment is technical in nature. On June 23 the legislative committee amended the definition of "illicit drugs" by adding the phrase "used in a manner contradictory to the provisions of the Narcotic Control Act". The committee accepted this amendment to respond to concerns from the Canadian Pharmaceutical Association regarding the application of the Bill to needles and syringes.

There were drafting problems, and this brought about the second part of the amendment.

The third part of the amendment has to do with instruments for illicit drug use. This amendment is designed to exempt medical devices which are subject to control by Health and Welfare under the Food and Drug Act from inclusion in this Bill. There was no evidence offered during meetings of the legislative committee to support the contention that medical devices such as needles and syringes are a problem in promoting illegal drug use. The Bill as reported by the committee would make it an offence for any group, which would include public health offices, to operate needle exchange programs to prevent the spread of AIDS. I have, therefore, submitted these amendments.

I went to the library and got the Act respecting food, drugs, cosmetics, therapeutics and so on. "Device" is defined as:

> "Any article, instrument, apparatus or contrivance, including any component, part or accessory thereof, manufactured, sold or represented for use in
>
> (a) the diagnosis, treatment, mitigation or prevention of a disease, disorder or abnormal physical state, or the symptoms thereof, in man or animal,
>
> (b) restoring, correcting or modifying a body function or the body structure of man or animal,
>
> (c) the diagnosis of pregnancy in humans or animals, or
>
> (d) the care of humans or animals during pregnancy and at and after birth of the offspring, including care of the offspring,
>
> and includes a contraceptive device but does not include a drug;"

These are worth-while amendments and I request that every Member of the House support the Bill, not because I have brought it forward, but because we are sending a contradictory message to the youth of today. There are approximately 1,000 head shops across Canada, 27 on Yonge Street alone. These unscrupulous people set up head shops next to video arcades, where many youth of our nation tend to congregate, and sell this drug apparatus.

• (1410)

Cocaine is an illegal substance in Canada today yet the youth of our nation can walk in and buy a cocaine free-basing kit to make crack. It seems absolutely ridiculous.

I have asked for a legal opinion on the constitutionality of Bill C-264. I will willing to table a report to Charles Robert. It states:

> This opinion has been discussed with Marcel Pelletier who agrees that Bill C-264 could probably withstand a constitutional challenge.

It also states:

> "I trust that this opinion is satisfactory for the committee's purposes. While Bill C-264 would appear to be constitutionally valid for the reasons given herein, I cannot guarantee that a court would not come to a different conclusion based on a particular set of facts before it. Still, having taken into account what I believe to be the relevant considerations, the committee should feel sufficiently secure on the constitutional question to proceed as it wishes."

I have been given the assurance that the Liberal Party would support a Bill such as this. I believe any thinking Member would support a Bill such as this.

Many statements have been made in debate on this Bill to the effect that we might have to eliminate the writings of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle about Sherlock Holmes because Sherlock Holmes was a cocaine addict. Nothing could be further from the truth.

We are talking about eliminating magazines like *High Times*, a magazine which promotes the use of drugs to the youth of our nation. Why should we be sitting in the House debating child care, free trade agreements and trying to make opportunities for the youth of this nation when the moral fibre of our youth is being decayed? I urge speedy passage of this Bill and look for the co-operation of every Member of the House.

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to make some brief submissions with regard to this piece of this legislation. As a representative of the Liberal Party I participated in the committee deliberations with regard to this Bill. I indicated at committee that the Liberal Party is prepared to support this private Member's initiative. I hope that the Hon. Member has the support and endorsation of his colleagues on the government side.

This legislation is a small step in the right direction. In my view, drug abuse is a national tragedy deserving of national consideration. It is not a problem that is unique to metropolitan Toronto, Montreal or any major urban centre in Canada. Drug abuse is a problem in every community in the country.

The people who are harmed the most are young people. They are exposed to drugs at a very early age. We as parliamentarians have a responsibility to do what we can to try to curb and eliminate to the largest extent possible illicit drugs in Canada.

One has to recognize that it is not the young people who import narcotics into Canada. It is not the young people who are primarily responsible for the trafficking of narcotics in Canada. They are adults. Any national drug strategy ought to include very serious and strict measures to curb the importation and distribution of narcotics.

This legislation would deal with drug paraphernalia which, as the Hon. Member indicated, is sold in head shops across the country. He indicated that there were approximately 1,000 of these outlets in Canada. We heard evidence from representatives of different police forces. We heard evidence from the drug enforcement section of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. They indicated as well that it was a step in the right direction. They feel that this legislation will at least stop the promotion of the use of illicit drugs in Canada.

As I was indicating, this is only a small step. There was a study done by the Standing Committee on National Health and Welfare which reported to the House. The committee

looked into the problem of drug abuse in Canada. It concluded that alcohol is also a drug that ought to be considered in dealing with substance abuse. Many recommendations were made in that particular report, one of which particularly addressed drug paraphernalia.

In my view, what is also needed is a government initiative similar to the initiative taken in the United States, where they refer to it as zero tolerance. In other words, no amount of illicit narcotics, however small, will be an excuse before some very serious and far-reaching penalties are imposed. For example, if a single marijuana cigarette is found in a vehicle attempting to cross the border, then that particular vehicle ought to be impounded.

It seems to me that if we are truly serious about combating drug abuse in Canada, we can talk all we want as politicians and parliamentarians, but we in Canada should adopt a similar strategy of zero tolerance. In other words, if narcotics are found in a vehicle, then that vehicle ought to be impounded.

It seems strange that in the Province of Ontario, if one fishes out of season or hunts out of season and is caught, one is required to forfeit fishing gear, the trailer and all the fishing equipment that is used. There is public harm done when one fishes or hunts out of season, but it does not compare to the public harm that is done when people distribute and are in possession of narcotics.

Another major step that should be taken by this Parliament is the implementation of criminal legislation that will come down heavy on those who choose as a profession or as a way of making money the importation, distribution and trafficking of illicit drugs. If drugs are found on their person or in their possession, if they are convicted of a criminal offence, there should be forfeiture.

• (1420)

This Government has taken certain initiatives with respect to the profits of crime. In other words, those who profit from crime, those who profit from the drug trade, should not be allowed to reap the benefits of their illegal activity. If someone is convicted of trafficking in narcotics, why should the profits made as a result of that particular criminal activity not be seized and forfeited to the Crown? However, in my view, the initiative taken by the Government does not go far enough.

I believe the New Democratic Party expressed reservations about this particular government initiative in terms of the requirement of the major banks to report large transactions. In the United States there is a more stringent requirement. Banks and other financial institutions are required to report transactions, to track down and trace, as the Hon. Member put it, "black" money, that is money obtained by criminal activity. However, here in Canada, for some reason, the banks objected to this particular proposal. They felt it was an invasion of one's privacy. They thought it should be done voluntarily and they should not be required to report to the Government the unusual movement of money within their institutions. So if the Government is serious, it should move in that direction as well.

Let me conclude in the same way that I began. Drug abuse in Canada is a national problem. It is a national tragedy. The Government must take unequivocal and specific action to ensure that we do as much as humanly possible to eliminate the illicit use of drugs in Canada.

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in debate on the amendment before the House. We are now at report stage of Bill C-264, presented in the name of the Hon. Member for Mississauga North (Mr. Horner). I want to make it very clear that we support the amendment, which would in fact ensure that concerns expressed both by the Canadian Medical Association and the Canadian Pharmaceutical Association are addressed.

In the Bill, as originally presented to the House, the sale of needles and syringes would be illegal. The Canadian Medical Association pointed out that this would cause major problems for diabetics and other patients requiring needles and syringes for self or home treatment. They also noted that the restricted access resulting from this legislation would result in more extensive sharing of syringes and needles among drug abusers, thereby increasing their risk of both hepatitis and AIDS infection. So to the extent it deals with this concern of the Canadian Medical Association and the Canadian Pharmaceutical Association, we support the amendment.

I just have a few brief words on the legislation itself. Members will know that the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs reported to this House in September of 1987 on the whole question of booze, pills and dope. It made a number of recommendations in this respect. One of the recommendations was in the area of drug paraphernalia and so-called "head shops". I think it is important to read into the record the recommendation that was made by the standing committee. It recommended that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn), in co-operative efforts with his provincial counterparts, develop legislation to close head shops, commercial enterprises whose principal business is the sale of drug paraphernalia and items which describe their use and which advocate the use of illicit drugs.

Following that recommendation, the Government responded officially and announced the establishment of an interdepartmental working group to look into all aspects of this problem. Officials from the Department of Justice, the Department of the Solicitor General and the Department of National Health and Welfare were included in this interdepartmental working group. The mandate of the group was to consult with interested parties, including provincial Governments, and to review developments in the United States and other jurisdictions.

The mandate of this interdepartmental working committee is very important. I would suggest that its consultation with parties interested in this area and, particularly, its consultation

with provincial Governments, is very important. Its examination of the history of similar legislation in the United States and elsewhere is also very important.

I suggest it is only appropriate that this House respect the work of that important interdepartmental working committee. For that reason, I suggest that to move ahead at this point, today, with the legislation, improved though it may be by passage of the amendment which is now before the House, would in fact preclude the very important study which is being done by the interdepartmental working group. I believe we should recognize the important work that is being done. This is a sensitive and important question. There are a number of areas of concern with respect to the whole question of drug abuse and the very serious inadequacies of the Government's response in the area of alcohol and drug abuse, particularly in terms of rehabilitation and education programs. That is an area about which we, as New Democrats, feel very strongly.

We believe as well that there has to be a careful examination of the legislation to ensure that it does in fact comply in all respects with the provisions of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. I note in particular the provisions with respect to literature. I know this will not be the only opportunity in which this House will have the occasion to discuss this legislation. As I understand it, it will in fact, under the rules, come back before the House. Let us hope that the interdepartmental working committee which is addressing this question seriously will examine the important issues surrounding it and will report back to the Government and that following that report, we can then examine the legislation, giving it the care it obviously deserves.

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton—Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak strongly in favour of passing the Bill today and to say that I think we owe an enormous vote of thanks to parents, legislators, store owners, victims of all manner of crimes, Canadians generally, and to the Member for Mississauga North (Mr. Horner) for bringing this measure along. As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, between 1980 and 1983 I tried to get a similar Bill through but was not successful. I can only pay the utmost respect to my colleague for having persevered and pushed this Bill through to the point at which it is now.

I understand that Assistant Commissioner Heaton of the RCMP told the Standing Committee on National Health and Welfare that closing head shops—and we heard earlier there were thousands of them across Canada—would be the single biggest factor in combating the drug trade. I understand that head shops have been abolished in approximately 40 States in the United States and that young people are now coming to Canada where the paraphernalia can be bought freely and taking it back to the United States.

I was extremely disappointed to hear the spokesman for the New Democratic Party indicate that those Members will attempt to talk the Bill out today. I very much hope that this will not be done by other Members in the House for many reasons. I would indicate to Members of the New Democratic Party that if they do talk the Bill out, everyone watching this debate or reading about it, will know—

Mr. Robinson: Let's have the question now.

Mr. Keeper: Why do you raise that prospect?

• (1430)

Mr. Kilgour: At 3 p.m. we will know whether or not members of the New Democratic Party will talk this Bill out. If they do I can assure them I will do everything I can to make it an election issue in the upcoming election.

Mr. Keeper: Why do you not deal with the substance of the Bill instead of throwing around accusations?

Mr. Kilgour: My friend from Burnaby objects to the possible censorship aspects of the Bill. The Hon. Member for Mississauga North dealt with that. If my friend from the NDP is suggesting that magazines such as "High Times", "How to Cheat Your Drug Dealer", and "How to Make Money in Dealing in Drugs" are the kind of titles he is worried about, then I do not think his constituents share his view.

The Bill has had amendments made to it which will make it a better Bill. It deserves the support of all Members from all sides of the House. I give full credit to the Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata) for his contribution to the debate. I believe his Party has indicated that it will support the Bill.

The drug problem has been called an epidemic in this country. I know that Hon. Members will say that the Hon. Member for Edmonton—Strathcona used to be a drug prosecutor. I also indicate that I have defended people charged with drug offences. I would like to give an example of a client that I once defended on a heroin charge. This is a matter of public record since he said it in court. He began his day every morning at 8 a.m. or 9 a.m. by getting up and going around and breaking into apartments. In this case it was in Winnipeg. He did that until 2 p.m., by which time he would have raised enough money to buy his two caps of heroin. He would arrange to deliver the money to his dealer. He would take his two caps of heroin and get high, have dinner and go to bed. He would wake up the next day and do the same thing. He would do this seven days a week.

A study done in Philadelphia showed that about 200 drug addicts—that few—over a 10-year period committed something in the order of half a million crimes in the City of Philadelphia. If that is the type of thing that the Hon. Member for Burnaby—

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Let us make it abundantly clear that the New Democratic Party does not advocate that. Possibly the Hon. Member for Edmonton—Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour) does. The absolutely misleading presentation by this Member is completely—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would say that that is a point of debate. If the Hon. Member wishes to express it in debate, that is fine. The Hon. Member for Edmonton—Strathcona has the floor.

Mr. Skelly: If he would use it properly maybe we would all benefit from it.

Mr. Kilgour: The people of Canada will know and judge whether Members opposite calling for more study and for more interdepartmental committees—

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The previous speaker's information and presentation is absolutely incorrect. The Government is calling for more study and wishes to present that study—

Mr. Horner: That's wrong!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That, too, is debate. The Hon. Member for Edmonton—Strathcona has the floor.

Mr. Skelly: You are full of hops.

Mr. Kilgour: The Hon. Member for sunglasses tells me that I am full of hops.

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My riding is Comox—Powell River.

Mr. Kilgour: The point in this debate is not hops. It is coke, crack and heroin. It is all manner of narcotic drugs which, as I was indicating, have caused in one city alone half a million crimes in a 10-year period. As someone who used to be a prosecutor in Vancouver, I assure the Hon. Member that they have caused a great many crimes of violence, crimes of property—all kinds of tragic crimes in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia.

Mr. Skelly: Maybe we are talking about the quality of prosecution and not the relevant issues of this particular Bill.

Mr. Kilgour: Let me say to you, Sir, or to anyone who might be watching this debate or reporting on it that if the five other members of the New Democratic Party who are sitting in the House when I sit down talk about this Bill beyond the next 25 minutes—

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to know why the Hon. Member does not deal with the substance of the Bill. Why does he not tell us what he thinks about the issue?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That is not a point of order. The Hon. Member will have an opportunity to speak this afternoon. There will still be plenty of time.

Mr. Keeper: Restrain this man and tell him to stick to the truth.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Edmonton—Strathcona has the floor.

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, let the people of Thunder Bay, Winnipeg, Vancouver and Regina note if these Members get up to talk this Bill out. If this Bill is not passed today—

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Member continues to accuse us of doing things which we have no intention of doing. He is not dealing with the substance of the amendment. What is wrong with him?

Mr. Skelly: He is talking the Bill out.

Mr. Kilgour: Let the people know that we have 20 minutes and if the four of them get up to talk this Bill out it will drop to the bottom of the list. There will then be 11 matters ahead of it before we can vote on it.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have two points to raise. First, at this point, as I understand it, we are debating an amendment. I would ask the Speaker to restrict the scope of debate to the substance of the amendment. Second, we are prepared to vote now on this amendment. It is the Hon. Member for Edmonton—Strathcona who appears to want to continue the debate. Let us get on with the vote.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That is not a point of order. The Hon. Member for Edmonton—Strathcona knows what the amendment is. I would appreciate very much if he would carry on with his debate.

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to sit down and vote on the amendment. I hope very much that I am in error when I am told that the New Democratic Party will talk this Bill out. I am delighted to say that I support the amendment. The reasons have been given very capably by the Hon. Member for Mississauga North. I will now sit down.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of the Bill proposed by my colleague from Mississauga North. I am also pleased to support the amendment that is offered to the Bill. I want to indicate that I would have supported this Bill with or without the amendment that has been proposed.

If this Bill can, and I believe it can, in some small measure contribute toward the lowering of drug abuse in our society, then we should congratulate the Hon. Member for Mississauga North and all others who support it. I know that my colleague from York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata) was the only opposition Member who participated in the committee process on this Bill. As a matter of fact, one Party did not participate in the debate at the committee level at all.

Mr. Della Noce: What was the Party?

Mr. Boudria: An Hon. Member asks me what is the name of that Party.

Mr. Nunziata: The NDP boycotted the committee.

Mr. Boudria: I have to say that it was the New Democratic Party.

Nevertheless, without prolonging this debate any further, I want to indicate to the House that on behalf of my colleague from York South—Weston and myself we are prepared, if it is required, not only to adopt the Bill now but to give unanimous consent to move immediately to third reading so that we can pass it in all stages and so that it can be sent to the Senate this very afternoon.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 13(5), the recorded division stands deferred until 6 p.m., Monday, August 15, 1988.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to make it abundantly clear for the record that it was members of the New Democratic Party who stopped this Bill from becoming law. They could have given their consent to this Bill to become law this afternoon.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being 3 p.m., pursuant to Order made Monday, June 20, 1988, this House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 2.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, August 15, 1988

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to Petition No. 332-5095.

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

* * *

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Doug Lewis (for the Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-147, an Act to establish the International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the Hon. Minister have leave to introduce the Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN CENTRE FOR MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Harvie Andre (on behalf of the Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-148, An Act to establish the Canadian Centre for Management Development and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to give the Minister leave to introduce the Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Speaker: When shall this Bill be read for the second time? At the next sitting of the House?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

[*English*]

POSTAL SERVICES REVIEW ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-149, an Act to provide for the review of postal rates and services and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the Hon. Minister have leave to introduce the Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

Introduction of Bills

• (1110)

MAGNA CARTA DAY ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-315, an Act respecting Magna Carta Day.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the Hon. Member have leave to introduce the Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

• (1120)

(Division No. 506)

YEAS

Members

Axworthy
Belsher
Benjamin
Bernier
Blouin
Caccia
Caldwell
Cardiff
Chartrand
Copps
Crofton
Dewar
Duplessis
Fennell
Fretz
Fulton
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Halliday
Harvey
Hees
Hovdebo
Isabelle
James
Ladouceur
Lanthier
Lesick
Lewis
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Marchi
Marin
McCain
McCurdy
McDermid
McDonald
(Broadview—
Greenwood)
Minaker
Nickerson
Nystrom
Oostrom
Plourde
Ravis
Ricard
Riis
Robichaud
Rossi
Schellenberg
(Nanaimo—Alberni)
Sparrow
Thacker
Towers
Vincent
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)—51

NAYS

Members

Blenkarn
Greenaway
Taylor—3

• (1140)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, in anticipation that later today the Government will likely indicate its intention to invoke closure and muzzle Parliament, I thought this would be an appropriate Bill to introduce.

The purpose of the Bill is to afford Canadians, as beneficiaries of the gradual development of representative parliamentary democracy, the opportunity to commemorate, with the appropriate ceremonies in schools and other public places, the signing of the Magna Carta on June 15, 1215, an act which marked the beginning of the decline of arbitrary power and the emergence in Britain of responsible government from which the entire democratic world has benefited.

Mr. Riis moved that the Bill be read the first time and printed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

• (1150)

(Division No. 507)

YEAS

Members

Axworthy
Belsher
Benjamin
Bernier
Blaikie
Blouin
Chartrand
Comeau
Crofton
Dewar
Duplessis
Fretz
Fulton
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Harvey
Hees
Hovdebo
James
Ladouceur
Langdon
Lanthier
Lewis
MacDougall
(Timiskaming)
Marin

McCain
McCurdy
McDermid
McDonald
(Broadview—
Greenwood)
Minaker
Nickerson
Nystrom
Oostrom
Plourde
Ravis
Riis
Rossi
Sparrow
Thacker
Towers
Vincent
Wilson
(Swift Current
—Maple Creek)—42

NAYS

Members

Copps
Greenaway
Marchi—3

• (1220)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point or order. I have been awake here all morning. As far as the House of Commons is concerned and the work it has done, it might as well be in a sleep walk. I was here with a tie, still with my open-toed sandals, but that is the compromise and that is not the point. I did not vote, although I was here, and I do not intend to vote on any more of these facetious delaying tactics.

I abstained because I believe a Member has the right to bring in a Bill, but obviously what is being done is being done for many other reasons than to introduce a Private Member's Bill. It is a perversion of the parliamentary process.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I was present in the House when the vote was taken. I did not vote because I refuse to take part in this foolish waste of time.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I voted against the motion, not because I am against the Magna Carta but because the New Democratic Party is using this process as a delaying tactic. New Democrats do not want to discuss the substance of the trade Bill.

Mr. Marchi: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on the same point of order. I am not against the principle of introducing motions. I am against the principle of the New Democratic Party that with closure will be unable to—

* * *

AN ACT TO AMEND THE FOOD AND DRUGS ACT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap) moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Food and Drugs Act (cautionary label on alcoholic beverage containers).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Shall the Hon. Member have leave to introduce the Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

• (1230)

(*Division No. 508*)

YEAS

Members

Axworthy
Belsher
Blaikie
Blouin
Caccia
Chartrand
Crofton
Duplessis
Fulton
Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Harvey
Hees
Hovdebo
James
Joncas
Lanthier
Lewis
McDonald
(Broadview—
Greenwood)
Oostrom
Plourde
Ravis
Riis
Vincent
Young—25

NAYS

Members

nil/none

• (1300)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I was present during the vote but again refused to take part in this foolish waste of time.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Bill is to amend the Food and Drugs Act to require sellers and importers of alcoholic beverages to place a cautionary label on the containers of these beverages stating that excessive drinking impairs driving ability.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It is after one o'clock. I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this day.

At 1.07 p.m. the House took recess.

S. O. 21

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

HERBICIDES

BAN ON USE OF 2,4-D ADVOCATED

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, the pesticide 2,4-D prompted two studies in the United States, each suggesting that there is a link between a form of lymphatic cancer and this common weed killer. A recent Canadian study has shown that the frequency of this type of cancer and the number of deaths it causes have doubled, claiming 1,500 lives in 1986. Yet most other types of cancer have been declining in Canada.

Because the effects of 2,4-D occur over a long time, it is unlikely that we can accurately determine how many Canadians are at risk today. But evidence is mounting that the pesticide 2,4-D is a threat to public health. The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp), who has a clear responsibility to protect the health of Canadians, must fulfil his mandate and ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) to suspend the use of 2,4-D in Canada until we know for certain that public health is not threatened.

* * *

NATIVE PEOPLES

NEEDS OF SASKATCHEWAN INDIAN AND MÉTIS SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. Don Ravis (Saskatoon East): Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has the second highest proportion of its residents which are of native ancestry. Unfortunately, as a recent study points out, Indian and Métis elderly are experiencing a great deal of hardship in obtaining quality housing. There are problems with inadequate sanitation and other amenities which seniors require on a day-to-day basis. This situation will require that the needs and concerns of the Métis and Indian elderly are dealt with urgently.

These are only several examples of the problems facing Indians and Métis senior citizens. It is apparent that CMHC and Indian Affairs must respond to improve the quality of housing and social services that are made available to this group of Canadians.

FISHERIES

BRITISH COLUMBIA SALMON FISHERY

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, the present Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon) has managed to enrage commercial fishermen, native fishermen, sports fishermen, community groups and even the general public in British Columbia.

The fisheries resource—in particular salmon—is highly prized for food as a source of income and for recreation. The Minister does nothing when his friend, Bob Wright, publishes false and misleading ads in the *Vancouver Sun*, encouraging people to come to the Queen Charlottes for "unlimited salmon fishing". The Minister in fact supports this by suggesting that when the commercial sports catch increases, there will be a reduction in the quota for the commercial troll fleet, and obviously further closures for native and sport fisheries.

At a time when there needs to be a serious and clear-headed approach to negotiating and settling the issue of aboriginal rights to fish, the Minister supports litigation to halt all negotiations.

At a time when there needs to be a serious development of user group watershed management boards, to assist in developing plans to protect our endangered runs, the Minister doles $6 million to study why pollution is killing the belugas in the St. Lawrence but does nothing to stop the pollution or to protect our B.C. salmon and steelhead. Canada needs a Minister of Fisheries and Oceans who finds solutions, not one who creates problems.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FREE TRADE

LOSS OF NUMEROUS JOBS IN GRANBY

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to report to this House today that 131 people have already lost from free trade. Last Friday, Mr. Speaker, the Simonds Company of Granby announced that it was laying off 131 workers and told the local press that it was moving all its operations back to the United States in order to serve the North American market from its base in Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, Simonds has just given the people of Granby, Quebec and Canada a bitter foretaste of free trade. And unfortunately, at this time, there is no adjustment or early retirement program for these workers, who are already in their fifties, and even if Canadian interests wanted to take back this factory, there is no industry adjustment program for businesses.

So in the coming days and weeks, we will ask the Government to assume its responsibilities and to act on this free trade issue for which 131 families have already paid the price.

Mr. Speaker, Quebecers and Canadians care about this issue and I am convinced that the Simonds example shows us how the Government intends to treat Canadian workers in future.

* * *

• (1405)

[*English*]

UNITED NATIONS

IRAN-IRAQ CEASE-FIRE—CANADIAN PEACEKEEPING FORCE

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, the senseless war between Iran and Iraq had gone on for too long, and the world welcomes the cease-fire arranged through the auspices of the United Nations.

Canada, with its expertise in peacekeeping operations, has been asked by the United Nations to help monitor the cease-fire and re-establish peace in this beleaguered region.

Our good wishes go with the 500 Canadian troops who will be involved with this difficult and dangerous work. May their efforts be crowned with success.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

WESTERN CANADA—FEDERAL CONTRACTS

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, for decades westerners have known that they have not received their fair share of attention from the federal Government. Whether it was regional development programs, industrial grants, CIDA contracts, or orders from Supply and Services, the West never received its fair share.

Have things improved with the Mulroney Government? No. In 1985, 6.5 per cent of federal Supply and Services spending was in British Columbia. In 1986 that figure fell to 5.3 per cent; and in 1987 Supply and Services spending plummeted to account for only 4.1 per cent of federal spending. B.C.'s share of Supply and Services contracts has fallen by 37 per cent since the Mulroney Government assumed office.

B.C. has 11.4 per cent of Canada's population, yet last year received only 4.1 per cent of Supply and Services contracts for various goods and services. This is a disgrace. It is high time that British Columbia and the West got their fair share of the federal Government's support. Westerners are not prepared any longer to accept being second-class citizens of Canada.

S. O. 21

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

GREAT LAKES—POLLUTION OF SEVERN SOUND

Mr. John Oostrom (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, Severn Sound, a shallow bay which is the entrance to the Trent Severn Waterway, has been classified by the International Joint Commission as one of 17 toxic hot spots on the Canadian side of the Great Lakes.

The study has found that this area, noted for its fine sports fishing, is experiencing a decline in such species as bass and pickerel. Mercury contamination has been found in large pickerel.

It is clear that this area, one of the province's best both visually and economically, is facing a crisis if action is not taken soon. Regulations must be brought forward which will control the amount of phosphates presently entering the water from boats, farms, and towns. Phosphates, like acid rain, are threatening to take away Canada's beautiful environment. I urge federal and provincial agencies to take action before it is too late.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—NIAGARA GRAPE GROWERS

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, farmers in the Niagara Peninsula are literally dying on the vine while the Government does nothing about an alleged promise to buy them out on the basis of the sell-out of the free trade deal. Last week I met with grape growers in my riding and they will be forced to come to Ottawa to dump sour grapes on the desk of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) if they are going to get any action. They do not want the grape buy-out to be simply another election promise. They need action now.

There are farmers who cannot get operating loans. There are farmers who want to move into other commodities. They are unable to do so because the Government has failed again in its promise to help those grape growers who were sold out as a result of this trade deal.

There are seven seats in the Niagara Peninsula. There is not a single Conservative who will be re-elected in that area because they have not spoken out to fight for their people. They have forced the farmers on to the streets of Ottawa to fight for justice.

I urge the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) to follow through on his promise at least to provide financial compensation for the Niagara grape growers.

S. O. 21

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—NORTHERN ONTARIO BUSINESSES

Mr. John A. MacDougall (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, having had the opportunity over the last number of weeks to sit as the representative from northern Ontario on Bill C-130 in the legislative committee on trade, may I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to those in the House who have a tendency not to believe in the trade deal and how important it is for regions of the country such as northern Ontario, that the President of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, Roger Hamel, came out strongly in support of the free trade agreement which will benefit small and medium-sized businesses in northern Ontario, as has the Canadian steel industry which is vital to northern Ontario, my riding, and the mining community.

• (1410)

The C.D. Howe Institute has stated that Canada should establish and maintain the attitude that we should have a free trade agreement with the United States.

When one listens to members of the Opposition and the negative approach that they have, one cannot help but conclude they are not interested in building a strong future for Canada and Canadians. They are more interested in destroying something that will be good for each and every one of us.

* * *

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

CRITICISM OF GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, it has been reported that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) has been very generous to the people of his home riding of Manicouagan. Over $288 million has been spent in that riding, confirming what we already know about the Conservatives' tactics. When a region matters in terms of electoral politics, it can be assured of financial attention from the Prime Minister. This was true of Lac-Saint-Jean, and it is true of Manicouagan.

But what about the rest of the country? Some areas are not as well served. In Newfoundland, in Nova Scotia, and in the interior of British Columbia, people are struggling with high rates of unemployment and few job opportunities. Where are the hand-outs there? In my riding of Hamilton Mountain many older workers were laid off last January and they are still waiting for a federal government program to help them cope until they can collect their pensions. But they do not live in an important riding for the Conservatives, so they will have to continue waiting.

The Conservatives have made regional disparities in this country worse, because they can only see where their interests lie, and not the importance of all Canadians' interests.

AGRICULTURE

EFFECT OF DROUGHT ON FARMERS IN SOUTHERN ONTARIO

Mr. Jim Caldwell (Essex—Kent): Mr. Speaker, while some parts of Ontario have received adequate rainfall over the past few weeks—and it rains here in Ottawa today—the drought and its effects continue in my riding of Essex—Kent. Above normal temperatures and lack of rain have devastated many of the earlier processing crops, many of which have had to be by-passed or ploughed down because of poor quality.

Corn and soybean crops have not matured properly, and yields are expected to be reduced dramatically. Fruit crops, such as apples and tomatoes, have not fared well from the extreme heat and lack of rainfall.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) indicated earlier that assistance would be forthcoming for Ontario farmers.

The farmers in my riding have been thankful for the assistance the Government has provided in the past, but they do not want to be forgotten as conditions improve in other areas of the province. The drought is still a reality in the deep south of Ontario, and its effects continue to take their toll on crops and on the financial position of farmers.

* * *

POLITICAL PARTIES

FREE TRADE DEBATE—POSITION OF LIBERAL PARTY

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, the Mulroney-Reagan trade deal is currently at report stage in the House of Commons. Because the agreement seriously compromises the integrity and sovereignty of our nation, it is absolutely vital that Members are permitted the opportunity to debate a host of important amendments proposed by our Party's trade critic which seek to correct a piece of legislation that will drastically alter the fabric of Canada.

Yet, for the last several days, between the Government's threat of imposing closure, which would prematurely choke off any debate, and the daily, useless delay tactics of the NDP, which prevent the debate from continuing, the principle of conducting a mature and frank discussion is being sabotaged.

While the Liberal Party is firmly opposed to this deal, it is not afraid and indeed wishes to discuss the issues freely and fully. By threatening to close debate, the Tories are revealing their undemocratic streak, while the NDP's delay tactics are clearly non-democratic.

We Liberals not only demand that the Government should let the people decide, but we are also asking, for the peoples' benefit, that the Conservatives and members of the NDP should let the Members speak.

[*Translation*]

FREE TRADE

NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON AGRICULTURE—NEED FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, on July 30, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture issued a press release expressing its concern about Bill C-130, the Bill to implement the Prime Minister's trade agreement.

According to the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, the Bill contains harmful measures for many agricultural sectors. For example, this group mentions that the marketing system and the future of quotas are in danger; that the whole Canadian Wheat Board marketing system is threatened; that the quality standards for Canadian agricultural products are seriously affected and finally that Canada's horticultural industry is in danger.

Considering this alarming situation, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister must ask Canadians for their consent before final passage of this Bill.

The Prime Minister received a mandate against free trade. If he changed his mind in favour of such an agreement, he certainly did not consult the public and above all, he does not have the right to impose this agreement without the approval of the Canadian people. The final decision belongs to the people.

* * *

• (1415)

[*English*]

POLITICAL PARTIES

FREE TRADE DEBATE—POSITION OF NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I would like to state just for the record that what the New Democratic Party is doing is to try to use this democratic House to see to it that there is sufficient opposition placed before the Government in its attempt to push through a trade deal for which this country has not given it a mandate. For the Liberal Party to criticize us for trying to use this democratic House is absolute idiocy of the highest order.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CENTRAL AMERICA—SUGGESTED ROLE FOR CANADA

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I think this weekend all Canadians were encouraged by the sight of troops of our Armed Forces going to join a UN peacekeeping mission in the Middle East. We all applaud the reinvigoration of the United Nations as a way of resolving conflict.

I hope this initiative will not deflect our attention from major conflicts in our own hemisphere. The situation in Central America is deteriorating rapidly. There have been new calls by the Reagan administration for support for military aid for the Contras. President Arias in Costa Rica is once again appealing for outside countries to provide some support.

Six weeks ago a Commons committee unanimously put forward a series of recommendations as to how the Government of Canada could provide important and constructive recommendations, proposals and initiatives to help the peace initiative along. We have heard nothing from the Government since then. This is where Canada could provide a major contribution to an area of conflict in our own hemisphere and demonstrate our capacity and maturity as a country to help resolve conflicts.

I hope this House will call upon the Government to take some action and show the kind of initiative for peacekeeping that we can provide in Central America.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

FISHERIES

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR—INSHORE FISHERY

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. It concerns the disastrous failure of the inshore fishery in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador this year. Indeed, the fishery has suffered through all of Atlantic Canada. The fishing season has been under way now for 13 weeks and many fishermen, particularly those on the great northern peninsula of Newfoundland, during that 13 week period have only been able to earn an income for a maximum of two or three weeks. Incomes are so low that fishermen and their families are no longer just frustrated or angry. For the first time ever, they are hungry. They are simply not earning enough to feed their families.

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Tobin: Fishermen are primary producers just as the farmers of Canada are primary producers. They deserve assistance from their Government in times of natural disaster.

My question is a straightforward one. Is the Government prepared, given the natural disaster that is happening and the human tragedy that is unfolding, to provide direct financial compensation to fishermen and their families throughout Newfoundland and Labrador and, indeed, those fishermen and their families who are affected throughout Atlantic Canada?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, this Government, whenever it has been shown that an additional program is needed to assist inshore fishermen, has instituted such programs.

I noticed, listening to the hon. gentleman with care, that he did not cite any facts whatever to establish the point that he is attempting to suggest, namely, that there has been a disastrous failure in the inshore fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador this year. He cited no facts because the facts do not support that statement.

There is no evidence, Mr. Speaker, of a disastrous inshore fishery about the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador this year. In certain locations fish may or may not have come in, as happens from time to time. Generally and by and large, the inshore fishery in Newfoundland has been a good and reasonable fishery this year. If there are areas where fishing disasters occur locally, where special assistance might be needed, certainly we would consider that.

• (1420)

I might point out to the hon. gentleman that we have invigorated and added funds to the Small Craft Harbours Program. For example, I announced last week the awarding of a contract in Bauline for a $2.2 million breakwater for the fishermen of Bauline, as well as a $2 million contract in Flat Rock for the same purpose, all of which assists our inshore fishery.

PROPOSED MEETING OF FISHERMEN

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of Parliament going on nine years now, and in those nine years I have met fishermen many times. I have often seen them angry. I have sometimes seen them frustrated and sometimes seen them happy, but I have never seen fishermen whose spirits were broken and who had tears in their eyes. If the Hon. Member for St. John's West were in his riding, he would know what the evidence is. It is human tragedy right on the wharf. That is the evidence.

There is also the evidence of a telegram from the President of the Fishermen's Union of Newfoundland and Labrador which says that there is mounting evidence of a failure of disastrous proportions of the inshore fishery in the Straits of Belle Isle and along the West Coast of Newfoundland. If the Hon. Member for St. John's West were less concerned about pork-barrelling in St. John's West and more concerned about—

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the Hon. Member to put his question.

Mr. Tobin: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Fishermen and their families, wives and children, cannot wait for an election campaign for assistance.

If the Hon. Member for St. John's West wants evidence of what is happening out there in the inshore fishery, will he accompany me, or will he have one of his colleagues accompany me to a public meeting to be held in St. Anthony, Newfoundland, Saturday night, where many hundreds of inshore fishermen who are hungry and whose families are hungry will turn out in the hope that someone is listening and someone will give them the same kind of consideration rightly given to the farmers of Canada when they needed help?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I repeat, we have yet to hear one solid fact, any fact, that shows, in the hon. gentleman's words, that there has been a disastrous failure of the inshore fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador this year. I can vouch for the fact that in the areas that I have visited which are in my own district, Peter's River, St. Mary's Bay and other places on the Avalon Peninsula, there has been quite a good inshore fishery this year.

There are some spots where the fishery is bad, like Lawn and the St. Lawrence area. There may be some areas in White Bay where the fishery has been bad, but the spirits of the fishermen are not broken. There has not been a disastrous inshore fishery in Newfoundland.

As a matter of fact, the cod fishery on the Labrador coast, particularly in the Black Tickle-Batteau area, has improved tremendously in the recent several weeks. The complaint there is that there is glut that cannot be handled. There is so much fish being caught that they cannot all be properly disposed of.

With reference to the mention of St. Anthony, I know that St. Anthony has recently come within the boundaries of the hon. gentleman's district, because this is the first time I have ever heard him mention St. Anthony in this House.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, we just heard from the Minister representing Newfoundland in the House of Commons that, providing there is no problem in St. John's West, there is no problem in Newfoundland and Labrador. That is exactly the problem with that kind of parochial, pompous mentality of this Minister.

REQUEST THAT MINISTER SEND REPRESENTATIVE TO MEETING

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, the Minister obviously takes his cue from the Prime Minister who said: "I gave you $261 million". What kind of morality has a Government that has a quarter of a billion dollars to help the re-election of a single Member, even the Hon. Member for Manicouagan, and no money for inshore fishermen who are hungry right now?

I ask the Minister again, if he cannot make it because he cannot find his way outside St. John's West, will he send representatives to St. Anthony to talk to real inshore fishermen in real difficulty who want real help, not more clichés in the run up to an election campaign, and who want help now?

• (1425)

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I do not need to travel to St. Anthony. If St. Anthony had a credible representative in this House he could report to this House on the situation in St. Anthony, not this ridiculous posturing that there has been a disastrous inshore fishery in Newfoundland this year. That is not a true statement and no facts are given to back it up.

With reference to Newfoundland, this Government is trying to spend $1 billion in Newfoundland and the other four Atlantic provinces under the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and it was voted against in this House by the hon. gentleman, and stopped in the Senate by the Liberal Party of Canada. Despite that, there have been 132 projects and an expenditure of something like $40-odd million under that program in Newfoundland and Labrador alone this year. It is the Liberal Party that is the enemy of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Why does the hon. gentleman not announce what district he is going to run in? He does not even have the guts to say he is going to run in his own district. He is getting ready to make a strategic move.

Ms. Copps: Stick to cucumbers, Crosbie.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FREE TRADE

CLOSURE OF SIMONDS COMPANY IN GRANBY—LOSS OF JOBS FOR NUMEROUS EMPLOYEES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Minister for International Trade, who challenged my colleague to find a genuine case of human suffering.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday 131 workers at Simonds in Grandby were advised that their plant would be closing because Simonds was transferring all its operations to the United States—all in the spirit of free trade—to take advantage of the economies of scale, and that North America would be covered from Pittsburgh, Massachusetts.

I want to ask the Minister for International Trade what kind of program and what kind of reply he has in mind for these 131 workers who are the first 131 victims of free trade.

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, there are no victims of free trade, nor are there likely to be any, particularly if the free trade agreement is passed by this Parliament and goes into effect. There will be no victims. There will be 26 million Canadian beneficiaries if this agreement goes through.

How can the hon. gentleman get up and ask me a question about victims of free trade when the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement is not even in effect, and when the hon. gentlemen opposite say they are going to see that it is not passed, that they are calling on the Senate to forestall the legislation being passed? They are going to forget the conventions of the Constitution. Next they will call on the Governor General to dismiss the Government and act in the Government's place. That is just as democratic a procedure. Perhaps they will ask the United Kingdom to have the Queen take over there as well.

[*Translation*]

MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. Just imagine, you are a man with a family who just got his lay-off notice and you are listening to the Minister's asinine statements . . .

Mr. Speaker, even supporters of free trade . . .

Mr. Speaker: Would the Hon. Member please ask his question?

Mr. Lapierre: My supplementary to the Minister for International Trade is this: What kind of answer does he have for 131 heads of families who, as of November, will no longer have their jobs because their U.S. company has decided to close its branch, in line with the principles of free trade, to take advantage of the economies of scale, the economies of greater volume, and centralize its operations at a simple plant in the United States? What does he have to say to these men who are in their fifties and who have mouths to feed?

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to look at, and it would be interesting to establish, the exact facts with respect to the establishment to which the hon. gentleman is referring. A plant is not closing in Granby or anywhere else because of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. There is no agreement in effect. There might be some employer attempting to use this as an excuse, because blaming somebody else for your own actions, of course, when you are being criticized is always very easy.

I imagine this is a situation comparable to a letter we had from Robert White of the Canadian Auto Workers alleging that a plant in Lindsay, Ontario, was being closed because of the free trade agreement. It turns out that it had nothing at all to do with the free trade agreement and that all 86 employees were being transferred to another plant in Ontario by the same company. That is the kind of despicable tactic that the hon. gentlemen opposite and the NDP are too fond of using.

• (1430)

HOUSING

PROPOSED NATIONAL SALES TAX

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. He will be well aware that at this moment tens of thousands of young Canadian families are struggling to achieve what used to be an attainable dream in Canada, that is, home ownership. The Minister will remember that two years ago he eliminated the Registered Home Ownership Savings Plan.

The Canadian Homebuilders Association indicates that Part II of tax reform, which the Minister does not take much time to mention to Canadians these days, means that the new national sales tax, which is stage 2 of tax reform, will add on average 9 per cent to the cost of a new home in Canada. In Metro Toronto that means, of course, that the average price of a house will be increased by at least $20,000.

At a time when an increasing number of Canadians are finding it difficult to qualify for a mortgage and afford their first home, why is it that the Minister's tax reform proposal will result in at least $20,000 added to the price of a home in Metro Toronto as suggested by the Canadian Homebuilders Association?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, first, I should point out to the Hon. Member that we have had an extended period of housing starts. There have been over 200,000 annually with the rate sustained practically on a monthly basis for the last year and a half or two years. There are clearly a lot of homes being built and those homes are being sold to end purchasers.

I do not deny for a minute that we have had a significant increase in the price of housing in the Metropolitan Toronto area. That is obviously of concern. I have commented on that in the House prior to this.

With regard to the specific question the Hon. Member has raised, I think it is too early to draw the conclusion which the Homebuilders Association has drawn. We are working closely with that Association in order to assess its view of the impacts of Phase 2 tax reform.

We must also recognize that there is a significant amount of tax in the price of a home now, whether federal sales tax or retail sales tax. That must be taken into account because in any new sales tax reform existing sales taxes will be replaced.

LEVEL OF PROPOSED TAX

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Finance respond to the suggestion by the Canadian Homebuilders Association that the 9 per cent which they predict will be the actual federal sales tax which will be introduced, likely next year, will make it impossible for about 60,000 young families to own their own homes? The Minister of Finance may deny that figure.

However, since Phase 2 of tax reform is coming in, likely next year, what percentage will the national sales tax be? Will it be 5 per cent, 8 per cent or, as the Canadian Homebuilders Association has suggested, about 9 per cent? Will he at least come clean and tell us what the percentage will be?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in the White Paper on Tax Reform brought out a little over a year ago we were pretty clear on a number of elements of tax reform as we knew them at that time and were able to assess them at that time. Since then we have had considerable consultations with provinces and industries including, as I said, the homebuilding industry, in order to assess how Phase 2 of tax reform should be implemented in the fairest possible way. Those discussions are continuing.

We have had a number of meetings with the Homebuilders Association, as I said, and a number of meetings with provincial government representatives. Those consultations are continuing. Once we have had a chance to pull all of this together there will be further statements on behalf of the Government setting out the answers to some of the questions the Hon. Member may have in his mind.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Finance prepared to accept the fact that when the national sales tax is introduced next year it will result in a massive tax grab by the Government and that the average family will be losing hundreds of dollars through new taxes that the federal Government will be imposing on the average Canadian family? That will result in a significant increase in the rate of inflation which will obviously drive interest rates up.

The Minister of Finance ought to come clean on this whole scenario before the general election. However, if he does not respond to those questions, perhaps he could at least give us a commitment now that the new national sales tax will be no more than 10 per cent.

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, any new sales tax proposal will not be the massive tax grab that the Hon. Member said it will be. That might be the case should the New Democratic Party, God help us, form the Government. That is not going to be the case with tax reform.

Canadians will remember that I said, in the lead-up to the personal income tax changes, that 85 per cent of Canadians would see an increase in their take-home pay as a result of tax reform. That is happening. If Canadians reflect on what happened in July they will see that what I said before was correct. They will see that their take-home pay has gone up.

Tax reform is a tax-neutral exercise. We are not attempting to gain new revenues as a part of tax reform. We did not in

Phase 1, we have said we will not in Phase 2, and we are going to hold ourselves to that commitment.

* * *

REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

PROPOSED QUÉBEC AND MANITOBA ALUMINUM SMELTER PROJECTS

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Deputy Prime Minister. This weekend the Prime Minister announced the federal Government's endorsement of a proposed aluminum smelter plant in Sept-Îles in his riding in Quebec.

Is the Government aware that Alumax, another consortium, is presently examining the possibility of an aluminum smelter in the Province of Manitoba? The Prime Minister's announcement this weekend will severely prejudice the decision being made on that aluminum smelter, by indicating support for one region of the country and not for another.

Why did the Prime Minister make this announcement before the Government has had a chance to undertake the proper feasibility studies, to announce a policy related to the support for aluminum smelters, and to ensure that there was a proper regional balance of support and resources for those kinds of initiatives all across Canada?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, with reference to the proposal for setting up an aluminum smelter plant in Sept-Îles, of course the Government is quite favourable to having this plant in Sept-Îles, a region that was severely affected during the last recession. However, this does not mean we will not consider other regions in Canada. It does not mean a decision has been made. It means that the Government looks very favourably on the proposal made by members of an international consortium that wants to set up operations in Sept-Îles. If they want to go ahead, the Government will support such action, but we intend to support other proposals along the same lines in many other regions in this country.

[*English*]

MANITOBA PROJECT—REQUEST FOR FEDERAL SUPPORT

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I am asking a serious question about whether the Government is prepared to support two massive aluminum smelters in Canada for an export market which has already virtually reached capacity.

My supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion. The Conservative Government of Manitoba has already asked the federal Government for support and endorsement for the project in Manitoba but has yet to receive any kind of acknowledgement, support, or promise of any resources for that project. Therefore, in order to ensure a proper balance, fairness, and equity, is the Government prepared to support the project in Manitoba as equal to that in Sept-Îles?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand why the Hon. Member is apparently opposed to job creation and economic development across Canada. The Government has always said it was in favour of creating jobs. And that is exactly what we are trying to do. We are trying to create jobs where there is genuine potential for doing so, and we intend to support projects as they are submitted, in all regions across the country, as we have been doing for the last four years.

* * *

[*English*]

THE ECONOMY

EFFECT OF INTEREST RATES ON EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. An analysis by the Economic Council shows that a 1 per cent drop in interest rates in the U.S. and Canada would increase jobs in Canada by 84,000 jobs by 1990. Could the Minister tell us the job losses that Canada will suffer from last week's large interest rate increases in the United States and Canada?

• (1440)

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member is honest with himself and the people of Canada, he will read much more from that study by the Economic Council where they point out to the Hon. Member a number of aspects of such a study that they probably sensed the Hon. Member would ignore.

If the Hon. Member wanted to put the total question to the House he would also say that if we do not address the problem of inflation now we will see interest rates rise on a much more permanent basis, with a far more deleterious effect on pricing levels in this country, on the competitiveness of this country, and therefore on our job creating capacity.

I have said in the House on many occasions that we are trying to avoid that with the interest rate policy that the Bank of Canada is following today.

GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, this is a case of interest rate increases in both Canada and the United States. How much will that cost across Canada in

terms of lost jobs, compared to what we would otherwise have? How many jobs is his policy costing this country?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, this line of questioning takes me back to November, 1984, and May and June of 1985, when his Leader said the policies being proposed by this Government through the economic statement and the Budgets would cost this country 100,000 to 200,000 jobs. Since that time we have created somewhere between 1.2 million and 1.3 million jobs.

That is the fundamental point that I am making.

Mr. Riis: Look what kind of jobs they are.

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): They are permanent jobs. The Hon. Member asks what kind of jobs they are. They are permanent jobs, 85 per cent full-time jobs, unlike the previous four years under the Liberal Government when they were 85 per cent part-time jobs.

Let me get back to the point raised by the Hon. Member. You cannot isolate one element from economic policy and ask the simplistic question that the Hon. Member just asked. You have to look at the full range of economic policy, including controlling inflation. It was back in the 1970s and early 1980s that we let inflation get out of control in this country, beginning under the regime of the Leader of the Opposition when he was Minister of Finance, when they allowed inflation to get out of control. That led to interest rates in excess of 20 per cent—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell.

* * *

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

FEDERAL SPENDING IN MANICOUAGAN

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. It concerns the shameful performance of his boss over the weekend. During the weekend the Prime Minister bragged about pouring millions of taxpayers' dollars into his own riding. The largess of these hundreds of millions of dollars is reported to be somewhere between $261 million and $500 million.

How can the Prime Minister justify favouring his own constituency while ignoring the needs of millions of other Canadians? How can he justify the use of government jets to do what he himself qualified as campaigning?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member might be more specific. I would like to know precisely what he is against. He talks about the $200 million, but in that figure is included $110 million to clean up the St. Lawrence River. Is the Hon. Member against that? If that is the position of his Party, let him so state.

Mr. Boudria: I am for equity, that is what I am for.

[*Translation*]

QUERY WHY PRIME MINISTER DOES NOT FAVOUR OTHER CONSTITUENCIES AS MUCH AS HIS OWN

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): I would like to ask the Deputy Prime Minister, and I may remind him that it was his Government that put an end to regional development programs and made it harder for people on unemployment insurance to receive their benefits, to explain the Prime Minister's largesse in his own backyard and the fact that by the same token he is neglecting other Canadians.

The Prime Minister said yesterday that his constituents had sent their taxes to Ottawa for forty or fifty years, but if that is a prerequisite for receiving federal funding, why doesn't the Prime Minister make the same funding available to the 281 other ridings in this country? And why is the Prime Minister showing favouritism to his own riding instead of trying to help all Canadians from coast to coast?

[*English*]

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Hon. Member had his question written out before he heard the answer provided by the Minister of Finance to another Member with regard to the economic performance of this Government, particularly in the area of job creation throughout Canada. Some 1.267 million jobs have been created across the country because of sound economic policy, with sound regional development policy.

If the Hon. Member is arguing against a $65 million program for regional development in that particular area which has had significant amounts of high unemployment there, if he is against the fact that this Government zeroes in on pockets of high unemployment, let him so state.

The fact is that the performance of this Government in terms of job creation, economic growth, and in terms of addressing regional development problems has been 1,000 per cent better than the administration of which he was a member.

* * *

REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

MANITOBA ALUMINUM SMELTER PROJECT

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, my question relates to a previous question in which the Minister who responded said that he did not understand the nature of the question and the concern that Manitobans had about the Prime Minister's promises respecting an aluminum smelter in Quebec. That tells me that the Minister and his colleague still

do not understand the sensitivity of Manitobans about how they have been treated by the Government on the CF-18 decision and a host of other matters.

Perhaps the Minister in charge of Manitoba, the Member for Provencher, can state why Manitoba had to be treated to this spectacle of hearing over the news that the Prime Minister was responding with respect to an aluminum smelter in Quebec, when the Government and people of Manitoba have yet to have their request in that respect even acknowledged?

Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member asks a valid question that deserves an answer. I believe that in Quebec there is a concrete proposal that has been discussed by companies, which has been put forward, and which received support in the initial form. In Manitoba there is not a proposal. There are two companies in Manitoba that are presently discussing with the Government of Manitoba the opportunities that can be provided there. The Government of Canada is familiar with that, and when something concrete comes forward the Government of Canada will react.

Mr. Blaikie: It is ironic that the Conservative Government is always talking against the notion of a planned economy but it seems it has nothing against an economy that is planned according to the election agenda of the Government.

GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to whomever is responding for the Government next on this issue. What is the Government's plan with respect to aluminum smelter development in Canada? When will the people and the Government of Manitoba know what is the policy, or is there only a policy that relates to the electoral agenda of the Prime Minister as he sees fit from weekend to weekend?

Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification): Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member should know, back in 1982-83 there was a proposal for an aluminum smelter in Manitoba when the NDP Government happened to be in power at that time. There was a concrete proposal at that time in 1982-83, and nothing came forward in Manitoba on an aluminum smelter in 1982-83.

Mr. Axworthy: The offer was made.

Mr. McKnight: There was not an offer made.

Mr. Axworthy: Yes there was.

Mr. McKnight: It was rejected if there had been one, because it did not take place. There is not an aluminum smelter in Manitoba.

There are two companies discussing opportunities with the Government of Manitoba. When those opportunities are further developed, the Government will explore them with the Province of Manitoba, as we would with any other Government.

* * *

• (1450)

HEALTH

PESTICIDE ALLEGEDLY USED BY CALIFORNIA GRAPE GROWERS

Mr. John Oostrom (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. The United Farm Workers of America have accused California grape producers of using a pesticide which may cause cancer and birth defects. A nerve gas type agent is being used which has not undergone any testing at all with regard to long-term health effects.

Will the Minister investigate these allegations? If indeed the grapes have been sprayed with this pesticide which may affect an individual's health, will he ban the importation of grapes from California?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the Department of National Health and Welfare and the Department of Agriculture, as the Hon. Member will know, conduct regular examinations and tests of fruit imports, in this case California grapes, for pesticide residue on those grapes.

It is interesting to note that members of the California Department of Food and Agriculture have also spoken on this issue claiming that the grapes are safe. The CLC has stated that one of the pesticides, dinoseb, is a residue on the grapes. Dinoseb has not been used since 1986, but it still claims that they were using it. Perhaps it is an old briefing note that it had.

From National Health and Welfare's point of view, our officials are continuing to test. Obviously, if there is any pesticide residue, those grapes would not be allowed in under regulations that are in place.

* * *

[*Translation*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

PERIOD REQUIRED TO QUALIFY FOR BENEFITS—
DISADVANTAGED REGIONS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Fernand Robichaud (Westmorland—Kent): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State (Employment and Immigration). The people in southern New

Brunswick are still unsure of their status with respect to the period of eligibility for unemployment insurance. The change-over from ten to sixteen weeks applies to all rural areas, which are bearing the brunt of a change that was meant for urban centres. In July, the Minister allowed for separate treatment for the Outaouais area, because the urban area of Hull did not reflect the situation of the rural population. The situation is exactly the same in New Brunswick. Furthermore, the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration stated in its unanimous report, right at the beginning, and I quote:

> Your Committee believes that there should be no tightening of entrance requirements nor reductions in either the level or duration of benefits in high unemployment regions. At the same time, your Committee supports the principle that the same treatment should be afforded claimants in all regions.

My question is this: Can the people of New Brunswick expect to receive the same treatment as the people in the Outaouais, and will the fair treatment the Prime Minister demanded for the people in his riding and for people in disadvantaged areas also apply to the people of New Brunswick?

Hon. Monique Vézina (Minister of State (Employment and Immigration)): Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with the situation in our so-called disadvantaged areas because I come from a region where as far as I am concerned, the unemployment rate is still far too high. So I can assure the Hon. Member that I am concerned about these regions.

The House is also aware that regional unemployment is used to determine the number of weeks required to meet the criteria: between ten and fourteen weeks. It is also true that when the economy improves, which happened, because we are an excellent Government, in certain regions, the criteria must be changed as well. So I can say that I am concerned. I have ordered a study, and in the weeks to come, I should be delighted to provide the requisite response.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member has the floor to ask a very short supplementary question, please.

SITUATION IN NEW BRUNSWICK—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Fernand Robichaud (Westmorland—Kent): Mr. Speaker, the answer is completely unacceptable. For people in some regions, they act right away. For New Brunswickers, they take the time to conduct studies. The Minister has all the information at hand, namely the unemployment rate for all regions of New Brunswick. So will the Minister act now to give New Brunswickers justice?

Hon. Monique Vézina (Minister of State (Employment and Immigration)): Mr. Speaker, this Government treats Canadians of whatever region fairly. We worked hard with an employment strategy and a healthy economy. Economic conditions are excellent and as I was saying, we are putting in place mechanisms tailored to workers in New Brunswick as elsewhere.

[*English*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

WALPOLE ISLAND—PROPOSED WATER PIPELINE FROM LAKE HURON

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Finance. Since the dramatization of the blob in the St. Clair River by my colleague from Essex—Windsor the communities of Wallaceburg and Walpole Island Indian Reserve have experienced 247 spills and five water cut-offs. The Province of Ontario has promised 75 per cent of the funding for a pipeline from Lake Huron.

My question to the Government is this. When will the Government respond to the requests of the Hon. Member for Kent and the people of Walpole Island and Wallaceburg and kick in its share so that that pipeline can be completed?

Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the Hon. Member that members from the Government side have already brought this matter to our attention. There have been meetings held by the regional office in Ontario to discuss with the Walpole Band and other concerned citizens the opportunities that can be realized by joining together with the Province of Ontario and the Government of Canada to provide the service. The Hon. Member must recognize, and so should the Province of Ontario, that Indian people who happen to live on Walpole Island also have an opportunity to secure drinking water from that pipeline without additional costs being provided.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have no idea what the Minister was trying to say. The question is very simple. Some $288 million was provided for the Prime Minister's riding. Only a couple of million are necessary here to provide clean water for Walpole Island, which is a federal responsibility, and Wallaceburg. You have a Member there who is being hung out to dry.

Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification): Mr. Speaker, my colleague is not being hung out to dry. He has been very active in acquiring an opportunity that has been provided because of an expenditure by the Government of Ontario so that we can join with the Government of Ontario to provide access to drinking water to Walpole Island. There are discussions going forward now between the regional district in Ontario and Walpole Island.

The Hon. Member talks about spills and clean water and refers to the Prime Minister's riding. Some $110 million were spent on the St. Lawrence, which goes beyond the Prime Minister's riding. If the NDP and the Hon. Member are against the clean-up of the St. Lawrence, then please say so.

HERBICIDES

2,4-D—REQUEST FOR SUSPENSION OF USE

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare who undoubtedly knows that a study has been completed in his Department by Dr. Morrison showing that there is a steady increase in the occurrence of a form of lymphatic cancer linked to the common weed-killer 2,4-D.

The study by Dr. Morrison also establishes that the frequency and the number of deaths have doubled at a time when most other types of cancer have been declining. He suggested that there is a link with the 2,4-D weed-killer.

My question is simply this. Will the Minister ask the Minister of Agriculture to suspend the use of this weed-killer until there is a clear demonstration that such a weed-killer is not a threat to human health?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, this question or a similar one was asked of the Minister of Agriculture last week. The Hon. Member knows what the reply was.

I should indicate to the Hon. Member that there is an ongoing study of the issue, as well as a working committee. I will check with them again in terms of that work and in terms of any recommendations. The answer that the Hon. Member and the House received last week on 2,4-D is still the same this week.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Davenport on a short supplementary, please.

REQUEST FOR MINISTERIAL COMMITMENT

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, because the answer was inconclusive it is important for the sake of public health to ask this question of the Minister himself. He has a mandate to protect Canadians from a threat to their health.

Therefore, I need to know from the Minister whether he will take it upon himself not to launch another study and put at risk the health of Canadians, but urge the Minister of Agriculture to suspend the use of 2,4-D until it is proven that there is no such threat as demonstrated by the study by Dr. Morrison. Will he give us that commitment today?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in my first answer I was not suggesting another study. I was outlining for the Hon. Member and the House the work that is ongoing and that is being done with respect to 2,4-D.

• (1500)

Additionally, the Hon. Member should know that information and very strong recommendations in terms of the application of 2,4-D and how those who apply 2,4-D can protect themselves have also been part of the ongoing work of the Department of Agriculture and of my Department. For example, much of the damage was done by people who were not taking proper precautions in the application of 2,4-D. That work has been done.

In the remainder of that answer, Mr. Speaker, I was not suggesting another study.

* * *

FORESTRY

REQUEST THAT SEPARATE MINISTRY BE ESTABLISHED

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. During the 1984 election campaign the Prime Minister promised time and again that there would be a full Ministry of Forests and a full Minister appointed at the federal level, and that was restated in the *PC Campaign Handbook* on page 105.

I would like to ask the Deputy Prime Minister if, before the next election is called, there will be a full Minister of Forestry and a full Department at the federal level.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I think that everyone in the House would realize that the current incumbent who is responsible for forestry is doing an excellent job and has made a tremendous impact upon the forestry industry.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: Success is what we are after here, and there has been a tremendous amount of success in terms of promoting the forestry industry in Canada, and particularly recognizing the jurisdictional responsibility in the hands of the provinces.

Clearly the federal Government has accepted its role and responsibility in this regard, and will continue to do so.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL FORESTRY AGREEMENTS

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I take it that the answer is no, that there will not be a full Minister of Forestry in Canada under a Conservative Government.

My supplementary question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister or to the Minister of Finance. Has the Government decided in principle whether or not to sign new five-year forest renewal agreements with the provinces?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, those agreements are currently under consideration by Cabinet colleagues. When a decision is reached with regard to them, and the other ERDA agreements are completed, an announcement will probably be made.

Vacancy

Mr. Speaker: I want to advise that there will be a single question from the Hon. Member for Hamilton East, and a single question from the Hon. Member for Yorkton—Melville.

* * *

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

COMPOSITION OF IRAN-IRAQ PEACEKEEPING CONTINGENT

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of National Defence I would like to direct my question to the Deputy Prime Minister. I am sure all Canadians are praying for the safety of the 500 person contingent that is being sent over on the peacekeeping mission.

I would like to ask the Government, why Canada, without any advice or suggestion from the United Nations, has unilaterally decided to send a contingent which excludes women, excludes people of Jewish and Arabic origin, and which is contrary to the Canadian Human Rights code.

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can answer that question as Acting Minister of Defence and indicate that I am not able to provide an answer to the question of the Hon. Member at this time. I will have to seek to establish whether those are the facts of the situation.

I am sure that the Hon. Member will appreciate that this is a dangerous situation into which Canadian troops are being sent. There is a great deal of evident danger that might be more perilous for certain persons than for others, and that may well be part of the consideration in taking this into account.

Nevertheless, I will determine the facts and make sure the Hon. Member receives a complete answer.

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

NORTHERN HIGHWAY EXPENDITURES

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. A few days ago his boss was in his riding of Manicouagan, Québec, and he announced that some $288 million was being spent in that riding. In addition, some $40 to $50 million was committed during the Lac-Saint-Jean by-election to build a road from Lac-Saint-Jean to Baie James.

In the name of regional fairness, I would like to ask the Deputy Prime Minister why the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has cut back on northern highway spending by $25 million in the last three years, and why it has cut back spending on the Alaska Highway by some $13 million between 1983 and 1987. In the name of regional fairness, why is that happening?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I can only draw from the criticism of the New Democratic Party the fact that it is against the clean up of the St. Lawrence River, because $110 million of the funds the Hon. Member has referred to is included in that.

If the position of members of the New Democratic Party is that we should not support the clean up of the St. Lawrence River, let them so state. If it is also the position of the members of the New Democratic Party that we should not be extending regional development programs in areas of high unemployment, let them so state. This is precisely what is being done.

We are attacking the problems of high unemployment in certain areas of the country where the rate of unemployment is unduly high. We are attacking pollution. This Government has one of the best environmental records in the history of any Government in Canada. If Hon. Members are not supporting that, let them so state.

* * *

VACANCY

EGMONT—GEORGE HENDERSON, BY RESIGNATION

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a communication notifying me that a vacancy has occurred in the representation, namely, George R. Henderson, Esquire, Member for the electoral district of Egmont, by resignation. Accordingly, I have addressed my warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer for the issue of a new writ of election to the said electoral district.

The Hon. Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development on a question of privilege.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

PRESS RELEASE OF MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the question of privilege which was initiated on Friday in my absence by the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton). The Hon. Member for Skeena suggested that a press release put out by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development was not accurate. In reading that press release it could lead one to believe that legislation had already been passed.

I would like to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the discussions that had taken place in the standing committee in

March, May, and June where it was my understanding, in looking at *Hansard*, that all Parties supported a change in the death rule.

I had forwarded to the clerk of the committee on aboriginal affairs, and the two spokesmen from the opposition Parties, draft comments on the legislation regarding the remedial action needed to correct this inadequacy in Bill C-31. I received support from the Hon. Member for Cochrane—Superior (Mr. Penner). I believe that the actions we have taken and will take will correct the problem.

In referring to the press release, Mr. Speaker, if it is read in pieces, it does lead one to infer that action has already been taken. I am sorry if that is the way the press release was presented, but in no way has the ability of the standing committee on aboriginal affairs been impinged to reply on Bill C-31.

If the Hon. Member for Skeena suggests that there is not all-Party support for the changing of the death rule as it applies to Bill C-31, I can correct that and state that I believe I have the support of the Hon. Member for Cochrane—Superior and his Party and of the Government to change that.

Mr. Speaker: This matter refers to a question of privilege raised by the Hon. Member for Skeena several days ago. The Chair has not decided whether or not it is a question of privilege. Listening carefully to the Hon. Minister's remarks, I take it he concedes that at least part of the press release was inaccurate; am I correct in understanding that?

Mr. McKnight: It could be viewed as misleading.

Mr. Speaker: From what the Hon. Minister has said, I take it that he is expressing his regret, and that may well end the issue. However, naturally there may be some debate between the Hon. Member for Skeena and the Minister about what may or may not flow from that. However, I will hear the Hon. Member for Skeena in response.

• (1510)

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister. I think his remarks were kind, useful, and helpful to those people who did misunderstand the intent of the press release. It was widely carried in the media, quite often as a letter to the editor, and a great deal of confusion was caused in many areas of the country where the death rule has been a problem.

With respect to all-Party support in the way it was worded there is no doubt in principle that all three Parties want the death rule amended. When I raised the matter on Friday the way I did, I wanted to make it clear to the Minister that I had contacted his office and was refused the opportunity of being provided with what I thought might be another draft.

There is an earlier draft of some months ago which I think the Minister, a member of the Liberal Party, and myself have seen, but following the press release I thought some other action might have been taken and I wanted to peruse the new amendment. If it is the same amendment as before, perhaps the Minister could indicate that that is still the case.

I thank the Minister for having cleared on the record the problem with the misunderstanding right across the country.

Mr. Speaker: As I indicated, there may be some question that both the Hon. Member and the Hon. Minister may want to discuss and that might be a very convenient thing to do.

First, I want to say that the complaint brought to the House by the Hon. Member for Skeena was clearly a justifiable complaint. It may not have been a question of privilege but it was certainly a complaint.

I want to thank the Hon. Minister for coming into the House at the first opportunity and very clearly acknowledging that perhaps at least in some particulars the press release was not as carefully drafted as it should have been. I think that ends the issue.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Friday, August 12, consideration of Bill C-130, an Act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States of America, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee; and the amendments of Mr. Axworthy:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-130 be amended in Clause 2 by adding immediately after line 21 at page 2 the following:

"Canada" means the territory to which Canadian customs laws apply, including any areas beyond the territorial seas of Canada within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, Canada may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and their natural resources;"

Motion No. 61

That Bill C-130 be amended in Clause 60 by adding immediately after line 28 at page 52 the following:

"Canada" means the territory to which Canadian customs laws apply, including any areas beyond the territorial seas of Canada within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, Canada may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and their natural resources;"

Motion No. 65

That Bill C-130 be amended in Clause 76 by adding immediately after line 3 at page 62 the following:

"and "Canada" means the territory to which Canadian customs laws apply, including any areas beyond the territorial seas of Canada within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, Canada may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and their natural resources."

Mr. Speaker: Before trespassing into the difficult ground of this ruling on amendments, I am informed, and I hope that this is so, that copies of my ruling, in both official languages, have been distributed. This may well be because we had a few extra days to task the translators with what has been for them a difficult time, which I know all Hon. Members understand. I am sure Members would want me to indicate to our translators that we do sympathize with their difficulties and appreciate what they do for us so much of the time.

I am now ready to give a final ruling on the motions in amendment to Bill C-130, an Act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States of America.

There are 102 motions in amendment set down on the Notice Paper in relation to Bill C-130, an Act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States of America. As Hon. Members know, I gave a preliminary ruling Friday last on the first three groupings. Members will thus bear with me, I am sure, as I go over all the motions in this final ruling as I wish them to be as complete as is possible.

[*Translation*]

Motions Nos. 1, 61 and 65 are in order and will be debated together and a vote on Motion No. 1 will apply to Motions Nos. 61 and 65.

On Motion No. 2, I have serious reservations because the intent of the amendment is to add a definition of cultural industries to the Bill. This is a substantive amendement as there is no mention at all of cultural industries in the Bill.

I would refer the Hon. Member to Paragraph (10) of Citation 773 of Beauchesne's 5th edition, on page 233:

> A substantive amendment may not be introduced by way of a modification to the interpretation clause of a bill.

The reference is to the Journals of May 21, 1970, page 835. Consequently the motion is out of order.

[*English*]

I have misgivings with respect to Motion No. 3. The Member's intention is to amend the agreement as published in the Canada Treaty Series under subsection 2 to exclude explicitly the large scale export of fresh water. I wish to remind the Member that treaty-making power is within the prerogative of the Crown and, therefore, the agreement itself cannot be amended. In Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 778, it is stated:

> When a Bill is introduced to give effect to an Agreement and the Agreement is scheduled to the Bill as a completed document, amendments cannot be made to the schedule. An amendment to the clauses of the Bill for the purposes of withholding legislative effect from the document contained in the schedule is in order; also as are amendments to those clauses which deal with matters not determined by the document contained in the schedule.

Consequently, I have to rule the amendment out of order.

[*Translation*]

I also have misgiving with respect to the admissibility of Motion No. 4. This motion seeks to amend Clause 3 which stipulates the purpose of the Bill and sets out the objectives of the Agreement in terms identical to those found in Article 102 of the Agreement. The Chair is of the opinion that this motion changes the intent of the objectives as stated in the Agreement and, therefore, rules it out of order.

Motions Nos. 5, 6 and 8 are in order and will be grouped for debate but will be voted upon separately.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 7, 18, 26, 27, and 34 were moved in committee. Motions Nos. 26 and 27 were ruled out of order and Motions Nos. 7, 18, and 34 were moved, debated, and negatived in committee. Slight variation in the wording does not affect the intent of the motions. Therefore, according to Standing Order 114(10), I will not select them for debate.

I also have misgivings with regard to Motions Nos. 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14. There is nothing mentioned in the Bill or the agreement concerning aboriginal claims and the various programs referred in these motions. However, the intent of these motions is to limit the operation of this Act with respect to these matters. I would, therefore, give the benefit of the doubt to the Hon. Member and allow these motions to be put to the House. In addition, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry after consultation has convinced me that Motion No. 11, which was debated and negatived in committee, is of enough importance that it warrants further consideration.

[*Translation*]

Thus Motions Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 will be grouped together for debate and a vote on Motion No. 9 will apply to Motions Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14.

Motion No. 7A which is similar to Motion No. 10 will not be selected.

[*English*]

I also have reservations with regard to Motions Nos. 15 and 35. These Motions seek to ensure that the provincial Governments are free to exercise certain powers notwithstanding the provisions of the agreement. There is, however, no reference in the Bill to any restrictions or obligations on the provinces in the matters stated in the motions. Both the Bill and the agreement place the responsibility for implementation on the Government of Canada. These motions go beyond the scope of the Bill and are thus out of order.

Motion No. 16 causes me concern because the intent is to restrict the powers granted to the federal Government to proceed with legislation in the future with regard to this agreement as set out in Clause 6. This, in my opinion, goes beyond the scope of the Bill because it is introducing a new concept which is inconsistent with Clause 6. Therefore, I must rule it out of order.

[*Translation*]

Motions Nos. 17, 19, 21, 22, 23 and 25 will be grouped for debate and voted upon separately.

Motion No. 20, in accordance with paragraph 3 of Citation 773 of Beauchesne's Fifth edition, is out of order.

Motions Nos. 24, 33, 42 and 82 will be grouped for debate. A vote on Motion No. 24 will also apply to Motions Nos. 33, 42 and 82.

• (1520)

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 28 and 29 infringe upon the financial prerogative of the Crown since the creation of such a commission or an inquiry board would require the expenditure or disbursement of public funds, and I refer Hon. Members to Citations 540 and 773(7) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition. Thus, these motions in amendment are out of order.

Motion No. 31 is in order and will be debated and voted on separately. Motions Nos. 30, 32, 38, 41, 43, 44, 50, 56, and 58 are in order and will be grouped together for debate. A vote on Motion No. 30 will also apply to Motions Nos. 30 to 38, 41, 43, 44, 50, 56, and 58.

Motion No. 36 causes the Chair concern because of its notwithstanding provision which regard to the right to require performance commitments from auto makers. It appears that the purpose of this motion is to ensure that Canada can set its own rules, regardless of any commitment under the agreement. Since the purpose of this Bill is to implement the agreement and Chapter Ten incorporates trade in automotive goods, I must rule the motion out of order.

[*Translation*]

I have serious reservations with respect to Motions Nos. 37 and 49A for two reasons. Motion No. 37 does not fit under part II, "Procurement Review Board", and the intent is to amend the Agreement. I would also refer Hon. Members to the reasons given in earlier Motion No. 3 out of order. Motion No. 49A is also an attempt to amend the Agreement. For the above reasons, I must rule the Motions out of order.

Motions Nos. 39 and 93 are in order and will be grouped for debate and a vote on 39 will apply to Motion No. 93.

[*English*]

I have reservations with regard to Motion No. 40. The Hon. Member is attempting to change the definition of a panel as set out in Annex 1901.2 in the agreement. All such panels are clearly stated to be binational. Therefore, Motion No. 40 is out of order.

Motions Nos. 45, 46, 47 and 48 under Part III, amendments to the Special Import Measures Act, will be grouped together for debate. A vote on Motion No. 45 will also apply to Motions Nos. 46, 47, and 48.

Motion No. 49 is in order. It will be debated and voted upon separately.

[*Translation*]

Motions Nos. 51, 80, 90 and 91 are in order and will be grouped together for debate. A vote on Motion No. 51 will also apply to Motion No. 80 and a vote on Motion No. 90 will apply to Motion No. 91.

Motions Nos. 52 and 70 are in order and will be grouped for debate. A vote on Motion No. 52 will also apply to Motion No. 70.

Motions Nos. 53, 54 and 55 under Part IV, "Related and Consequential Amendments to Implement the Agreement ", are in order and will be grouped together for debate but voted upon separately.

Motions Nos. 57, 59 and 60 are in order and will be grouped for debate and voted on separately.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 62 and 63 are in order and will be grouped for debate and voted upon separately. Motion No. 64 is out of order because it attempts to amend the agreement. I refer Hon. Members to the many citations I have quoted earlier in this regard.

The Chair has some misgivings with respect to Motion No. 66. The intent of this motion is to reserve to the Governor in Council the power to make certain orders more than once within a stipulated period. However, the agreement specifies that each party shall exercise such powers no more than once within that period. Since the Hon. Member is being permissive in his motion, I am going to give him the benefit of the doubt and allow the motion. It will be debated and voted upon separately.

[*Translation*]

Motions Nos. 67 and 68 will be grouped together for debate and will be voted upon separately.

Motion No. 69 causes the Chair concern because of its notwithstanding provision with regard to Canada's right to exercise certain powers. It appears that the purpose of this motion is to ensure that Canada can continue to set its own rules in these matters regardless of any commitment under the Agreement. Since the purpose of the Bill is to implement the Agreement, I must rule the motion out of order.

Motions Nos. 71 and 72 are in order and will be debated separately and voted on separately.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, and 79 will be grouped together for debate and will be voted upon separately. Motions Nos. 81, 83, and 84 are in order and will be grouped together for debate. A vote on Motion No. 81 will apply to Motion No. 83, but Motion No. 84 will be voted upon separately.

Motions Nos. 85, 86, and 87 will be grouped together for debate. A vote on Motion No. 86 will also apply to Motion No. 87. An affirmative vote on Motions Nos. 86 and 87 will obviate the need for a vote on Motion No. 85, but a negative

vote on Motions Nos. 86 and 87 requires that the question be put on Motion No. 85.

[*Translation*]

Motions Nos. 88 and 89 will be grouped for debate. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 88 obviates the necessity of a vote on Motion No. 89. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 88 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 89.

Motions Nos. 92, 95 and 96 are in order and will be debated separately and voted upon separately.

Motion No. 94 is beyond the scope of the clause and is thus ruled out of order. The clause deals with the Western Grain Transportation Act and West Coast ports and this amendment attempts to introduce East Coast ports. This is not in order.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 97 and 98 are ruled out of order because they seek to make the coming into force provisions of this Bill subject to conditions outside the legislative process. In this connection, I would refer Hon. Members to Erskine May, Twentieth Edition, paragraph 10, on page 557.

Motion No. 99 is out of order because it seeks directly to amend the agreement. Again I refer Hon. Members to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 778.

Motion No. 100 is in order and will be debated and voted upon separately.

To recapitulate briefly, the following motions have been ruled out of order: 2, 3, 4, 15, 16, 20, 28, 29, 35, 36, 37, 40, 49(a), 64, 69, 94, 97, 98, and 99. The following motions were not selected: 7, 7(a), 18, 26, 27 and 34.

I think I might add, for the benefit of Hon. Members and the public watching, as I have said, the Bill we have before us is a Bill the object of which is to implement the agreement between Canada and the United States and, as a consequence, much of it is taken up with amending existing public laws, but there are additional paragraphs as well which of course are of some importance.

• (1530)

Hon. Members will realize that under the rules amendments aimed at altering the actual terms of the agreement are not acceptable, but other amendments aimed at the provisions of the Bill itself, under certain circumstances, have been acceptable and are of course set out in this ruling. I might just indicate to Hon. Members and the public that as of the end of Thursday, the Chair had received 102 amendments and 77 of those have been accepted for debate. I think Members will find that they are presently in 26 groupings.

I want to thank all Hon. Members who submitted amendments for their co-operation with the table officers. This, as all Hon. Members will know, was no easy task given the number of amendments, and I hope Hon. Members will feel that they have been carefully and properly dealt with.

Mr. Axworthy: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. First let me say that I echo your words in closing. I want to compliment the Chair and table officers for a monumental and effective task and to say that I for one, who was responsible for some of your late evenings last week, appreciate the judgment and the fairness with which it was completed. I think it points out how realistic and relevant the amendments were which have been accepted.

I am not challenging the ruling, but I wonder if you would be in a position to provide some elaboration. During the course of the hearings the committee chairman cited a ruling by Erskine May which indicated that those items included in the annex could be amended through the legislation. That would include in this case both the agreement itself and the tariff schedules. I have noticed again in several of the rulings made by the Chair that those particular matters were ruled out of order.

I think it is an important matter and for that reason we submitted amendments that would seek to alter the agreement, particularly on crucial matters like water, because of that Erskine May citation. I wonder if the Speaker would be kind enough to elaborate on the reasoning behind that because that was the understanding we drew from the ruling made in committee.

Mr. Speaker: First, I want to thank the Hon. Member for his courteous and kind remarks. Any Speaker, I think, ventures with some trepidation into explanations of a ruling and I am not so sure I am going to do that to any great extent.

I do want to clarify one thing. I think the Hon. Member said that the chairman of the committee, apparently following the citation from Erskine May, indicated that the annex could be included in the legislation. That seems as though it would be in error, and I can say to the Hon. Member I assume he meant "could be included in an amendment".

Mr. Axworthy: Amendment, yes.

Mr. Speaker: All right, I have that straightened out.

I, of course, have not considered the remarks of the chairman of the committee. I know the Hon. Member would not mind if I took a moment or two to do that. The basic principle upon which I have been operating and upon which I am compelled to operate under the rules is that, strictly speaking, the terms of the agreement cannot be amended. It may be that by the ingenious use of superior intellect the Chair can be persuaded to allow amendments which to some degree may clarify or give some certainty to parts of the legislation, but they have to be aimed at amending one of the clauses of the statute itself.

However, I will take under consideration the comment that the Hon. Member has very properly brought before the Chair, and report back as quickly as possible, perhaps having one of the officers of the table discuss the matter with him.

In any event, I think that gives sufficient information to the House for the debate to continue.

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, I would first very much like to add my voice to that of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy). I think to try and work one's way through 102 amendments is an extremely daunting task.

As with all Speaker's rulings, there will be some that one will feel surprised about and some that one will feel pleased about. I do not want to get into those kinds of questions at all, but I did want to raise with you a matter which I wondered if you could perhaps interpret for me a little more fully.

I am especially concerned with Motions Nos. 26 and 18. With respect to Motion No. 26, as you note in your ruling, this was ruled out of order in committee because of where it was put in the Bill. Therefore, the motion I brought to the floor of the House put it in a general part of the Bill which, from the ruling made in committee, seemed to be the place it belonged. I would appreciate some sense of whether such a shift of that sort to take account of a ruling made in committee is proper and acceptable, or whether once ruled out of order one cannot bring the same subject matter back, even if the reason for ruling it out of order was the place that one had originally moved it in the Bill.

With respect to Motion No. 18, your judgment quite correctly notes that quite a similar motion was moved, debated, and negatived in committee. At that time the debate revolved to a significant degree around the fact that this motion dealt with the concerns of Canadian wine growers and whether they could be subject to government action as the clause in question makes clear. People who voted against the motion suggested that its formulation would allow action to be taken despite the fact that both major provinces in which grape growing and wine production takes place would be opposed. It was for that reason that there was what I thought was a significant change made from 50 per cent to 65 per cent in the proportion of population which would have to be involved in those provinces approving of action with respect to this clause. Again, I wondered, with respect to your comments, whether slight variations in the wording does not affect the intent of the motions.

• (1540)

My concern, as the person drafting the amendment, was that I did not see this as slight but instead as responding to the concerns which had been expressed in the committee. I wondered if, for that reason, there might not be some logic to giving at least the benefit of the doubt to that particular motion.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor for his kind remarks which I know will be appreciated by all of those who have worked hard on this matter.

We have had a practice for some time now which is working very well, that is, because of extensive consultations at the time amendments are tabled, the Chair has felt that for the most part it has not been necessary to hear further discussion on them. However, I am aware, as are other Hon. Members in this Chamber, that this is a matter of some importance. All matters here are important, but this is one of some magnitude in the number of amendments that the Chair had to consider. I have, therefore, extended to the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry and the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor the courtesy of listening carefully to what they have said. I appreciate their additional assistance to the Chair.

With respect to the two motions which the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor has raised with me, I will look again at Motion No. 26 and discuss it with the table officers who will communicate with the Hon. Member. However, I think I can dispose of Motion No. 18 at this time. I remember this very distinctly and have asked the Clerk to bring me Motion No. 18.

While I understand perfectly the Hon. Member's substantive reason for putting this forward, I am bound by the procedural law. Even the change to which the Hon. Member refers does not get around the fact that, at least in the opinion of the Chair, it is out of order. Although I do understand the reasons behind the amendment, I regret that I cannot assist the Hon. Member further.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in thanking you and the table officers for your effort and the speed with which your ruling has been brought down in this matter. The Government moved ahead with report stage using the 48-hour time limit, and I appreciate that this puts an extra burden on the Table. We do appreciate the effort.

I wish to advise the House that earlier today I approached the House Leaders of the Official Opposition and New Democratic Parties in a bona fide effort to determine the amount of time required by the two Parties at report stage and third reading. This request was made in good faith to my colleagues. I received in reply the following letter addressed to myself:

> Dear Mr. Lewis,
>
> Pursuant to your inquiries earlier today regarding an allocation of time to the report stage and third reading stage of Bill C-130, we wish to inform you that our respective parties are prepared to agree to an allocation of a further 150 days to the report stage and 200 days to the third reading stage of this bill.
>
> Should your party agree to this allocation, the requirements of Standing Order 115 will have been met. If, however, your party cannot accept this proposed allocation, it remains that the majority of the parties have agreed, pursuant to Standing Order 116, to the allocation of a further 150 days to the report stage and 200 days to the third reading stage of the bill.

That letter is not on what one might call coalition letterhead but is signed by the House Leader of the New Democratic Party and the House Leader of the Liberal Party.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this makes a mockery of negotiations in good faith. I regret that we could not have had some sort of reasonable suggestion from the other side. This is also confusing because we understood that the Liberal Party

had rejected a coalition with the New Democratic Party but now find that the coalition is back on.

Therefore, I wish to advise that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 115 or 116 with respect to an allocation of time to the report stage and third reading stage of Bill C-130, an Act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States of America and, under the provisions of Standing Order 117, I give notice of my intention to move a time allocation motion at the next sitting of the House for the purpose of allocating a specified number of days for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at those stages of the Bill.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Windsor West rises on a point of order. If the Hon. Member is going to enter into a long argument, I have some doubt whether this is the appropriate time to do so. The Hon. Minister of State has given notice but what will happen after this is still, of course, speculation. I will hear the Hon. Member subject to my caveats.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, thank you for recognizing me. I think I understand what you have in mind. You may feel that a point of order is more timely if and when a motion is actually moved. However, since what I have to say deals with the whole procedure for the use of Standing Order 117, I hope you will allow me at least to put briefly some points on the record. At any time that you feel I am going beyond what you think is acceptable, in at least a preliminary way, I know you will call me to order.

Mr. Speaker: I certainly do not want to restrict the Hon. House Leader of the Official Opposition from raising a point of order if he so wishes. At the moment, however, all the Chair has before it is a notice. If the Hon. Member for Windsor West feels there is some error in having heard the Minister or some error in the way the Minister has given the notice, I will hear him. However, I am anxious not to have arguments before the Chair which may well be premature. We have been through this before. I think that in at least one instance, if I can put this very gently, it may be that the wisdom of the Chair proved to be right in delaying an argument which ultimately did not have to take place.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I first want to say something about the notice itself which has supposedly just been given with respect to Standing Order 117. I understand that previously notice has always specified the precise number of days to which debate is to be limited. As I heard the Hon. Deputy Government House Leader, he simply indicated that pursuant to Standing Order 117 he was giving notice that a motion would be made to allocate time within which the remaining stage or stages of debate must take place. Therefore, I respectfully submit that the notice just given is defective and not what is required under Standing Order 117 because it does not specify the precise number of days within which the Government wishes to limit debate.

• (1550)

Finally, it is my view on behalf of the Official Opposition that since it was possible for a majority of Parties in this House to reach an agreement with respect to allocation of time under Standing Order 116, the Government cannot proceed with a motion pursuant to Standing Order 117. I will reserve further comments on that point if and when the motion is argued.

I also want to point out that since some 77 amendments offered by the Official Opposition have been ruled by yourself to be in order, it cannot be said that the number of days referred to in the letter signed by myself and the New Democratic Party House Leader is an excessive number for the debate of 77 amendments.

Furthermore, contrary to the insinuation or innuendo of the Deputy Government House Leader, the letter itself bearing the signatures of myself and the House Leader of the New Democratic Party has been presented as it has to meet our understanding of the requirements of Standing Order 116. I find it deplorable that the Deputy Government House Leader, who has a mandate to uphold and take seriously the rules of this House, is reflecting in this way on a serious attempt to make use of Standing Order 116.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I want to add my comments to those of the House Leader of the Official Opposition. He indicated that the Deputy Government House Leader stated in his notice that he was referring to Standing Order 117, which states that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 115 or 116.

Standing Order 116 refers to a majority of the representatives of the several Parties coming to an agreement in respect of a proposed allotment of days or hours for the proceedings at any stage of the passing of a public Bill. That is exactly what we have done. There has been considerable consultation between the Opposition Parties. The feeling was that considering this is the most important trade deal in world history, if I recall the words of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), it would not be inappropriate to set aside a further 150 days at report stage to deal effectively with all the concerns raised by the opposition amendments. Of course, another 200 days at third reading stage would enable us properly to flesh out the most important trade deal in world history.

After consultation between the two Opposition Parties, we have come to an agreement in terms of the appropriate allocated time to complete this debate.

Mr. Speaker: I listened carefully to Hon. Members. I just want to point out that at the moment the Chair's reading of Standing Order 116 is very clear:

> When a Minister of the Crown, from his or her place in the House, states that a majority of the representatives of the several parties—

It is not a majority of the Parties. However, I have the other points.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the arguments of the coalition Party. Let me point out that Standing Order 117, as I read it, contains no specification that the notice itself specify the number of days. There are some comments with respect to how little time has to be given in the actual motion that is moved. I submit that I have met the requirements of Standing Order 117 by way of negotiation and notice.

I listened with interest to the coalition Party's comments that a majority of the Parties has come to an agreement on what is appropriate. I will leave it to the people of Canada to decide whether they are actually serious about 150 days at report stage and 200 days at third reading. I would point out that a majority of the Parties represents 25 per cent of the Members of the House. I am not denigrating the efforts of that 25 per cent but pointing out that the use of the word "majority" is not correct on that point.

I return to Standing Order 117 to indicate to the Chair that it only requires that the point be made that an agreement could not be reached and therefore the Government is moving under that Standing Order. It is our intention to do so tomorrow.

I regret this very much. We wanted a debate on the substance of the amendments and the substance at third reading. The delaying tactics of the Opposition which wasted all of last Wednesday and two hours this morning, without any effort to debate the substance, is the reason, along with the fact that we could not reach any agreement, the Government is taking this position.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to clarify a point made by the Deputy Government House Leader. Earlier today the two Opposition Parties negotiated, discussed, and through consultation came forward with what we thought was a reasoned approach. If the polls of the day are to reflect the standings, then the two Opposition Parties have reflected the view of 65 per cent of the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: I think the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap is an experienced procedural advocate and knows that it is not the place of the Chair to get into debate on what the polls mean or what they do not mean.

In any event, I have the point raised and I will give it some careful consideration and return to the Chamber shortly.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, in order to assist you in your deliberations, I want to clarify a factual point. The consultations in question did in fact involve the representatives of the three Parties in this House. When I spoke of a majority of the Parties, I should have made it clear that I was talking about a majority of the representatives of the Parties in the sense that the agreement in the letter read out by the Deputy Government House Leader was made between myself as representative of the Liberal Party, the Official Opposition, and the Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) as representative of the New Democratic Party.

Contrary to what my hon. friend, the Deputy Government House Leader, has been saying about coalitions, let me stress that we are simply carrying out what we understand to be the requirements to put into place the operations of Standing Order 116, which has nothing to do with coalitions or lack of coalitions.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate the comments of the Hon. Member for Windsor West. Of course I will consider his comments.

I think that is sufficient discussion on that point. I will return as quickly as possible to give the House the benefit of my considerations.

• (1600)

Mr. Speaker: Resuming debate. The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary.

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I just want to thank you and those of the table for the work that you have done over the last couple of days. It has been a very difficult task for you. I might say that a number of the amendments that have been introduced in the House were either introduced or voted down at committee stage. They have been changed somewhat so that they can be reintroduced at the report stage. We understand the reasoning behind these amendments from the opposition Parties. It is interesting to note that both of them are going to tear up the agreement, yet they have all these amendments that they want to introduce to Bill C-130. If you would pass on our word of thanks to all those who were involved in putting in those extra hours, I would appreciate it on behalf of the Government.

The Government has examined the amendments proposed by Hon. Members opposite, and it has found them to be unacceptable for a variety of reasons. Indeed, many of these amendments are an affront to Parliament and show just how irresponsibly the Opposition has approached this whole debate.

When he appeared before the legislative committee on August 2, the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) stated that he could not accept amendments proposed by the Opposition at that time, for three reasons.

First, a number of them conflicted directly with the free trade agreement itself, an international agreement entered into by Canada. It is not the role of Parliament to pick and choose among the pieces. Many in fact were ruled out of order.

Second, a number of amendments purported to exempt from the legislation and agreement matters which are already covered.

Finally, a number were downright silly and frivolous. That was on August 2. Now, we have before us today much the

same assortment of inappropriate, unnecessary and even frivolous amendments. They were not made in an attempt to improve the legislation, but rather to score political points.

Recognizing that there were amendments tabled in committee that would be buried in the obscurity that they so richly deserve, my hon. friends opposite chose not to move many of them in that forum but instead sought to inflict them upon this House. Of course, the difference between committee and this House is that they have television, so they can play to the crowds.

You will have noticed that what has been taken here is a destructive—not a constructive—approach. The Liberal Party, for example, has proposed a number of amendments that would simply delete large chunks of the legislation—without proposing substitute language—thus rendering it a meaningless patchwork. They have repeated the same baseless and tired old arguments about the alleged impact of the free trade agreement on native land claims, the environment, social programs and so on. Why do they not propose an amendment saying that nothing in this Act shall affect the flow of air between Canada and the United States? That would make about as much sense as most of the amendments that we have before us today.

I find it sad—but not surprising—that the best that my friends opposite could come up with in this package of obstructionist, irrelevant and even silly amendments has been ruled out of order in large numbers. I am looking forward to debating these amendments on the floor of the House of Commons, because I believe that we can conclusively show why these amendments should be defeated.

The first group of amendments that you have put together, Nos. 1, 65 and 66, was debated at some length on Friday afternoon by the two opposition Parties. They went on and on and waxed eloquently all afternoon about why the boundaries of Canada are not under the interpretation of the Act. We heard great claims that the Government has forgotten Canada and that we do not care about Canada. Then we had my colleague, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) stand up. Let me quote what he said in the House of Commons. I think that this shows the type of misleading information that is presented to the House of Commons. At page 18276 of *Hansard* he said:

> We spoke to officials of the trade negotiating office which put the Bill together. They said: "Everyone knows what Canada is anyway".

An Hon. Member: That is right. That is what they said.

Mr. McDermid: That is a total untruth. That is factually incorrect. Totally.

Mr. Axworthy: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry on a point of order.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has just said that he is calling me a liar, and he knows that it is against the rules of the House. If he wants to get the evidence, we are prepared to call the official whom we spoke to and who in fact made that kind of utterance.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I do not believe the Hon. Member said that. I think that he said there were some untruths, but I may be wrong. I was trying to read the free trade Bill and if the Hon. Member has said it, I know that he will retract the statement.

Mr. Axworthy: We will call the official. We have his name. We will call him in front of the committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would like the Hon. Member—I cannot very well address the Hon. Member if he is not going to allow me to address him.

Mr. Axworthy: I am listening.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary has the floor.

Mr. McDermid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did not accuse him. I said that the statement was wrong. I have read the statement and have said that the statement was wrong.

Mr. Axworthy: You said that it was untrue.

Mr. McDermid: Now, if he feels, by inference, that I am calling him a liar, I did not say that at all. I said that that statement was incorrect. I will tell you why it is incorrect.

Mr. Axworthy: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is part of the rules of the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): On a point of order, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry.

Mr. Axworthy: The Member for Brampton has said that what we have said in the speech was untrue. Now he is changing his tune. If he wants to challenge it, that is fine. But he said it was untrue, and now he is changing his tune. I think that that is against the rules of the House.

Mr. Andre: He can say it is untrue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will decide whether the person should withdraw or not. The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary has the floor.

Mr. McDermid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may proceed, the statement is untrue. I have checked with the officials of the TNO, and none of them have claimed to say that. Had the Hon. Member called TNO and asked their opinion on that particular thing, he would have got these facts.

Mr. Axworthy: We did call him.

Mr. McDermid: First of all, the reason for defining the United States in this particular part of the Act, in the second section under "interpretation", is because we had to define their customs territory. That was very important, because we are dealing in customs matters. That is why they are defined in there. Under the free trade agreement, we amend many different Acts that pertain to United States goods and services, and to those of other countries. So, the United States is mentioned in those amendments, and we had to define their customs territory, and that is what we have done here. That is very important to understand why that definition is here.

As far as Canada is concerned, Canada and its areas beyond the territorial seas are already defined. This may come as a surprise to the Hon. Member, but they are already defined for the purpose of laws relating to customs as follows. There are three areas that he should be aware of.

Mr. Axworthy: Where is it defined in the agreement?

Mr. Riis: Show us in the Bill.

Mr. McDermid: In the Customs Act, Canada is defined to include the land mass of Canada. That shows the ignorance of the Hon. Member in not understanding the free trade agreement. There is somebody that has not even opened the first page. He does not even know what he is talking about. I would advise him just to sit still.

Mr. Riis: We will wait for five minutes and then you can sit down.

Mr. McDermid: Canada is defined in the Customs Act to include the land mass of Canada, the internal waters and the territorial sea. Definitions in the Customs Act—a surprise for the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy)—apply to the Customs Tariff. Therefore, Canada is defined for the purpose of the Act. As well, the Customs and Excise Offshore Application Act, which applies Canadian laws relating to customs and excise to designated goods within the limits of the Continental Shelf, defines the Continental Shelf to mean the seabed and sub-soil beyond the territorial seas of Canada. Canada is totally covered under the free trade agreement and defined under the Customs Act.

• (1610)

Clearly, that is what we are talking about. We are talking about customs' areas. If the Hon. Member had called the Trade Negotiations Office and asked, that would have been the explanation he would have received. For him to say that negotiators from the Trade Negotiations Office said that everybody knows where Canada is and it is not necessary is totally wrong. It is a totally false statement.

Therefore Motions Nos. 1, 61 and 65 are totally unnecessary and should be defeated.

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, first, I think that the Parliamentary Secretary should be questioned as to why he began his remarks reflecting on the Chair. I can say nothing else but that he reflected on the Chair in a totally mean-spirited and unnecessary fashion.

Mr. Riis: Shameful.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): The Parliamentary Secretary, after going through some compliments addressed to the people who worked on the Speaker's ruling, in effect through his language verbally trashed the ruling. He said that the amendments which the Speaker ruled in order were trivial and unnecessary amendments which had already been rejected at committee. I think this is quite improper. If the Speaker uses the authority given him by this House to say that amendments are in order and acceptable for debate in this House then it is not for the Parliamentary Secretary, in spite of his arrogance and that of the Government's, to tell the Speaker that he was wrong, and because the Government considers the amendments in question to be trivial and unnecessary they are not to be accepted and not to be debated in this House.

Mr. McDermid: There you go telling untruths again.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): I also want to say that I think that it was quite wrong for the Parliamentary Secretary to reflect on the actions of Members of this House in putting down moved in committee. This is something provided for by the rules, the rules adopted by all Members of this House. The Members of this House have a perfect right to put down amendments which were not moved in committee. I think it is wrong for the Parliamentary Secretary to reflect as he did on the intentions and motives of those Members of the House who tabled amendments which had not first been put forward in committee.

What the Parliamentary Secretary was saying is illustrative of the whole approach of the Government to this matter. The approach of members of the Government is: "We know what we are doing. We are right. Everyone else should yield to us without question or debate because if they do not do that we will steamroller them out of the way. We will push them aside". They may be able to use their majority in this House for that purpose up to a point. However, it is not yet clear how far they can go. I say this. They are not yet in a position to tell the Speaker, much less Members of the House, that the Speaker was wrong in accepting amendments and it was his authority to do so and that Members of the House were going beyond their right and their duty in tabling amendments which they thought appropriate to put before the House.

I also say this to you, Mr. Speaker. The public is increasingly aware of the blind arrogance of the Government and they will make their judgment on that arrogance when they vote in an election. I say that no matter what use is made, what abuse is made by the Government of its majority on this matter in the House it will still not prevail before the will of the people of this country who do not want to see this deal imposed on them because they think it is an absolute sell-out of what they

have accomplished now and what they have yet to accomplish as a country.

In his vain efforts to cast aside the rights of Members to present and debate amendments, the Parliamentary Secretary was even unable to put forward an argument that was not contradictory and conflicting within the very words that were used. First, he complained that all the amendments offered by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) simply struck language from the Bill. He then rose to speak about an amendment which specifically wanted to add language to repair one of the very serious omissions in the Bill. I refer to a definition of "Canada" for the purpose of this Bill.

I want to say that I have just been informed by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry that Maurice Rosenberg at the Trade Negotiations Office was the person with whom the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry spoke on the matter—

Mr. Axworthy: The research bureau.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Rosenberg was not spoken to by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—For Garry but a representative of the Liberal Research Bureau as to why there was not a definition in Bill C-130 of "Canada".

Mr. Caldwell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am becoming somewhat confused as to who said what to whom. I think the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry has said he talked directly to the person who gave him that message. Now we understand that it was the Liberal Party Research Office who spoke. Who spoke to whom? The Hon. Member told the Parliamentary Secretary that he spoke directly to the person.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That is a point of debate and not a point of order. Once Hon. Members get their messages straight, I would appreciate knowing about it. The Hon. Member for Windsor West has the floor.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): This matter can be settled very easily. Our rules provide for the summoning of a witness to the bar of the House to answer questions. I would be quite prepared to move the appropriate motion so that Mr. Rosenberg can be summoned to the bar of the House and questioned about the conversation he had on this matter.

I want to conclude by saying it is illustrative of what is wrong with the approach of the Conservative Government to this whole matter of our dealings with the United States when the Parliamentary Secretary attempts rather vainly to argue that it is more important in this Bill to define "United States" and not to define "Canada" for the purpose of the trade deal. As far as the Parliamentary Secretary is concerned the Customs Act and the definition in it is sufficient even though it is very clear from the terms of the Bill that it and the trade deal to which it refers supersedes and prevails over any legislation that may have anything to do with this trade deal.

If this matter is important to the Government, and the Parliamentary Secretary was rather weakly trying to get that across, then one could ask why as a matter of certainty the Government did not put a definition of Canada in the Act in the first place and why for the purposes of certainty it is not willing to accept the amendment now before the House offered by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry.

• (1620)

There are all sorts of definitions in the Bill, and there are all sorts of definitions in the trade deal; all sorts of things are put in there for reasons of certainty. For example, there is an exclusion from the deal of beer and logs, and a number of other things that I could come up with. If it is made clear that logs and beer are not supposed to be covered by the deal, surely it would be a very limited and minor concession by way of certainty to agree to this amendment and have in Bill C-130 a definition of Canada, in order that if this deal ever comes into effect the lack of a definition of Canada in this legislation would not give the United States the opportunity to have more *Polar Sea* incidents, to take over the resources of our sea bed, and do all sorts of things which the administrative statements—

Mr. McDermid: It gives teenagers acne, too.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): I say to my hon. friend if there is any problem with teenage acne it must be on the inside of his head.

I am sorry that the Canadian people have to see a matter of this seriousness treated in this manner by the Parliamentary Secretary. I am making serious arguments. It shows what is wrong with the whole approach of the Conservative Government that it is not willing to accept, as a matter of good faith and good will, that we who do not agree with this measure do so out of deep conviction and deep seriousness. This amendment is a serious amendment. The Government is showing what is wrong with its approach to this deal, and what is wrong with its approach to the future of this country in not being willing to accept this amendment which simply wants to put into the deal a definition of Canada.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, this is a very important amendment that we are debating at the moment regarding the trade deal with the United States. To put it in some context, one could simply raise the question: "Was this left out inadvertently?" Did the Government consciously decide that it did not want to define what Canada was in the trade deal? Why should this come as a surprise?

When our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) was a little boy he took a great deal of pride when the big American corporate leaders would come to Baie Comeau. He would play the piano and sing songs for quarters, and they would cheer and say what a nice boy he was. A little time passed and the Prime Minister decided to work for an American subsidiary in Canada, the Iron Ore Company of Canada. Part of the work

that he was asked to do was to shut down Schefferville, which he did with a great deal of satisfaction. This was his job and he had no hesitation. Then he was arm in arm with Ronald Reagan in Québec City singing *When Irish Eyes are Smiling.*

Then it came to negotiate the trade deal, which some people have called the sell-out of Canada. It is not the sell-out of Canada. When someone sells something they receive something in return. This is a giveaway of Canada. There was no selling. We got nothing. We have lost it all.

When one looks at the trade deal it carefully describes at some length what the United States is. It states:

> "United States" means
>
> (a) the customs territory of the United States, including the fifty states of the United States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico,
>
> (b) the foreign trade zones located in the United States and Puerto Rico, and
>
> (c) any areas beyond the territorial sea of the United States within which, in accordance with international law and domestic laws, the United States may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and the natural resources thereof.

That is a very precise definition of what the United States is. When one looks through the pages and pages of the deal, there is no definition of Canada. There are two equal players in this negotiation, the Americans and the Canadians. The United States went through a great deal—

Mr. McDermid: Read the Customs Act, that's exactly where it is.

Mr. Riis: I ask the Parliamentary Secretary, why was the definition of Canada left out of this document? Perhaps the Government did not care about Canada. I do not think that it cares about Canada—

Mr. McDermid: It is in the Customs Act, and you know it.

Mr. Langdon: It is not part of this Bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would hope that there would be some courtesy on both sides of the House. The Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap has the floor.

Mr. Riis: I find it odd, and the people of Canada will find it surprising that in the Canada-U.S. trade deal the Government went to a great deal of pains to describe what is meant by the United States, but forgot to describe and define Canada. The Parliamentary Secretary probably says that the Americans know where Canada is and know what our boundaries are. They do not know where our boundaries are on the west coast.

Time and time again the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) has raised the question of the A-B line where the Americans want to get critical fishing and resource grounds off our west coast. They do not accept the definition of the boundary between Canada and the United States on the west coast.

We all remember Georges Bank on the east coast where year after year American and Canadian fishermen were arguing what part of the fishing grounds is part of the United States and what is part of Canada. There is no recognition by the United States there. As a matter of fact, when the Americans look under the polar ice cap, which is obviously part of Canada, they state that these are international waters and it is not part of Canada.

You may remember, Mr. Speaker, when the Americans were issuing drilling licences in the Beaufort Sea they stated that that was part of the United States. Whether it is the North, the East, or the West, the Americans have proven time and again that they do not understand where Canada is. Therefore, I find it absolutely incredible that the Government did not include a definition of Canada after going to so many pains to establish a precise definition of what the United States was all about.

This is simply one of the many reasons why Canadians from coast to coast, as they learn more about this deal and what it does to their country, are rejecting it. Seven out of ten Canadians have said time and again that they want an election on this issue. The Government is jamming and rushing this issue through. Earlier today it gave notice that it was going to announce closure to muzzle the debate and jam and rush this legislation through before an election. Seven out of ten Canadians will be offended and feel affronted if they do not have an opportunity to register whether or not they support this deal. The Government ignores them and ignores the parliamentary process and the process of democracy.

I do not understand how Hon. Members on the government side can sit there day after day, hunkered down, not say anything, and accept this incredible abuse of the democratic parliamentary system. Yet they do. They are mute as they sit in their seats hour after hour.

I see the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) is present. I hope he will stand up and explain to the House why he feels we do not need a definition of Canada in the trade deal. I also hope that others will. The Government went to a great deal of pain to get the definition of the United States of America, but Canada, forget it. We do not need a definition of Canada, the Americans understand it. The Americans do not accept our west coast borders, our east coast borders, or our northern borders of Canada.

This Government stated that it did not want to travel across Canada and hold hearings so that the people of Canada can express their views. It curtailed what is obviously the most democratic thing to do when talking about such an important trade deal. It should be taken to the people and let the people have an opportunity to decide. At least let the people have an opportunity to express their views. Members of the Government said absolutely not. They did not want to hear from Canadians. They were not going to tour. We suggested televising the hearings so at least people could sit in their livingrooms and listen to the debate and the witnesses, but no

the Government was not going to televise the debate. It did not want the people of Canada to learn any more than they already know about this deal, because government Members know that every day as Canadians learn more and more about what this does in terms of the ultimate sell-out and give away of this country that they are rejecting it.

My constituency butts against the grapegrowing areas of British Columbia. Hundreds and hundreds of growers who have struggled for years, some have struggled for decades, to develop the vineyards and the small wineries of the Okanagan Valley have all of a sudden had the rug pulled out from under them as this Government says: "We don't care about you. We don't care about your industry. We are going to finish you in a number of months". Those are the first obvious victims of this trade deal. The vineyards are gone. The cottage wineries are gone. The small, medium-sized wineries are gone.

• (1630)

Mr. McDermid: You are totally wrong.

Mr. Riis: When the Prime Minister was in the Okanagan Valley trying to explain the trade deal he was laughed out of the Valley. People said: "You have guts to come here and tell us that this is good for us. Look at our hillsides in Vernon and Kelowna. The vineyards are withering because we cannot go to the banks to get operating loans, and you are telling us this is good for us?" The Prime Minister was the laughing stock of the entire central valleys of British Columbia. I do not think he has the courage to go back there again. With the kind of response that he got, I know I would not be going back if I were the Prime Minister trying to pull this fast one on Canadians.

What we are saying in this very serious motion is that Canada be defined as meaning the territory to which Canadian customs laws apply, including any areas beyond the territorial seas of Canada within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, Canada may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and their natural resources. Is that an unreasonable request to define in Clause 1 of the agreement what Canada is all about? This particular motion before us is an appropriate motion that ought to be debated. I will be listening carefully this afternoon as Government Members explain to Canadians why they do not want to define what Canada means in this trade deal.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to speak on Motions Nos. 1, 61 and 65 which are definition clauses of Canada. It might be interesting to analyse why a definition clause is not in the Bill to start with. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister suggested that the definition is in another Act. Maybe the definition is not in this Bill because the definition that we have of Canada is not acceptable to the United States. Because the Americans would not accept it Canada acquiesced and said: "We will not put in a definition. You make your own." When the panel deals with issues brought before it, it will put into the agreement its own definition. Still it is necessary to see why this particular definition is not there. Maybe we have been missing the point.

Every area and industry will be affected by this Bill, not just areas which we have a tendency to think of as being the borders of Canada, nor those industries that we feel are the most common ones. Every area and every industry will be affected by this definition and Bill. We are not opposed to the liberalization of trade. Maybe I should not use that word because President Reagan suggested that the word liberalization is a dirty word and therefore should not be used. Maybe that is another reason that liberalization of trade is a little bit of a problem. We are not opposed to more liberal trade laws. We are opposed to the agreement where all the generosity and liberal treatment is on the Canadian side and we get nothing in return. We are against the particular Reagan-Mulroney trade deal put before the House and that we are in the process of implementing through Bill C-130.

We got very little from this agreement, but we gave away a lot. The Government is spending $30 million to $50 million, depending upon who you are talking to, to brainwash the people of Canada about how good a deal this is. If this deal were as good as the Government says it is, the Government would not have to sell it. It would sell itself. The Government would not have to waste $30 million to $50 million of the taxpayers hard-earned money, trying to buy people with their own money. The Government is having a hard time selling the deal and we could go on for a long time saying why. Let me touch on a couple of reasons.

First are the foreign investment possibilities that are established. Foreign investment is unlimited after this deal is put into place. Any American company can buy any Canadian company with no limitations, no monetary structure and no way of looking it over. Most people consider that we already have too much foreign ownership. Fifty per cent of the profits made in Canada go out of the country already. Those profits are being used to buy other companies and corporations in Canada. In other words, not only is this Government using the taxpayers money to sell a deal that is bad for Canada and bad for the Canadian taxpayers, but the Government is saying with this unlimited, unmonitored investment policy eventually every penny of profit in Canada will be used to buy further corporations in Canada until our ownership level is less than today, and it is bad enough now.

Sweden has approximately 7 per cent foreign ownership. When that foreign ownership went up to 7.75 per cent or 8 per cent, Sweden looked very hard at the possibility of using legislation to limit the amount of foreign investment. Sweden has foreign investments all over the world and depends to a great extent on its own investments in other parts of the world. But Sweden recognized, as do most countries in the western world, that if you give away the ownership of your industries, you are giving away control of your economy.

That is exactly what is being done in this case. This is only one of the objectionable clauses to the people of Canada which is being used to make this deal more palatable to Canadians.

I have another example. We are giving away in this Bill—

Mr. McDermid: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My point has to do with relevancy. The Hon. Member is delivering a prepared speech, I believe, from the NDP fact sheets. He is not referring in any way, shape or form to Motions Nos. 1, 61 or 65. I wish he would get to addressing the motions.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point or order. This is astounding. Here we have a Member rising in his place who just took the floor a few moments ago and took about seven minutes to put a diatribe to the House which had nothing to do with Motions Nos. 1, 61 or 65, and who then has the gall to call another Member to order on relevancy. This is a fraud.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I know the Hon. Member will be getting on in the debate and explaining Motions Nos. 1, 61 and 65. The Hon. Member for Prince Albert has the floor.

Mr. Hovdebo: Mr. Speaker, if you are defining the boundaries of Canada, you are defining the areas which this free trade deal affects. The elements in the free trade—and I do not have any notes here except the ones I wrote a few moments ago—

Mr. Gauthier: And what is wrong with notes?

• (1640)

Mr. Hovdebo: If this trade deal is made for Canada, it is made for every part of Canada. Therefore, we should define what Canada means.

I suggest there is a second area in which we are selling out Canada. We are giving away our natural advantage of resources, the natural advantage that has made it possible for us to develop industries all across Canada. Those resources have been used to help our economy, to pay for social services and to make Canada the country it is. Now, through this Bill, we will be selling those natural resources to the United States at the same price at which they will be sold to Canadian industries. Under this Bill, we cannot sell resources at a price higher than that at which we sell them to our own industries.

We can stop doing that. We do not have to sell our resources to the States, but if the U.S. uses 50 per cent of our gas now and we get short of gas in a couple of years, we will still have to give the Americans 50 per cent of our short supply. We cannot sell that gas to our industries at a price which would give them an advantage over the United States industries.

Those are the kinds of decisions in this Bill that affect all Canadians. There has been a great neglect in the whole approach to this Bill. At every stage, we have given the United States the little advantage for which it asked and without which it would not sign the agreement. Whenever United States politicians talk about this Bill, they say: "We really gave it to Canada that time". The Americans are getting all the best advantages—

Mr. McDermid: What about the wheat farmers?

Mr. Hovdebo: The Wheat Board is something I want to talk about but I will not talk about it at this time. The Wheat Board will be in trouble. It is already in trouble because of the free trade Bill and it will be in further trouble. We need to look at all of these things in the context of the boundaries of Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret that the Hon. Member's time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on motions numbered 1, 61 and 65, moved by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy). The purpose of these motions is to amend Bill C-130 at Clauses 2, 60 and 76 by adding the following:

> "Canada" means the territory to which Canadian customs laws apply, including any areas beyond the territorial seas of Canada within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, Canada may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and their natural resources;".

Mr. Speaker, I think it stands to reason we should define our terms and the purpose of this agreement.

Bill C-130 includes a definition of the United States under the section "Interpretation"on page 2, which reads as follows:

> Interpretation
>
> "United States" means
>
> (a) the customs territory of the United States, including the fifty states of the United States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico,
>
> (b) the foreign trade zones located in the United States and Puerto Rico, and
>
> (c) any areas beyond the territorial sea of the United States within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, the United States may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and the natural resources thereof.

Mr. Speaker, why does the Government refuse to define Canada, when it provides a clear and specific definition of the United States?

Mr. Speaker, Canada's experience with the United States has not been all sweetness and light with respect to our Canadian territory in the North. I am reminded of the *Polar Sea* incident. Did the Americans agree that the Arctic—our Canadian water, let's face it,—where this big ship wanted to go for a cruise, was within our territorial waters? No, they did not. It took a lot of pushing and persuading on the part of the Official Opposition to make the Government take a clear and definite position. And today we are not sure whether this response was sufficient. Since the Government is going to build

a super ice-breaker to patrol Canada's territorial waters in the North, why not define our territorial limits, once and for all?

In the debate we had with the United States—and I can name several incidents in the past few years when it was necessary to state in no uncertain terms exactly what Canada is, and I think this is particularly necessary when we are negotiating a trade agreement that will change Canada's way of trading with the world for many years to come . . . and yet, the Government refuses to tell us exactly what Canada is. They refuse to provide a clear and precise definition, but they have no trouble including a definition of the United States, including Puerto Rico, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, my point is that if the Government is prepared to define the territory, rights and powers of the United States, we should be just as willing and just as convinced of the need to define what the territory, rights and powers of Canadians are.

Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of amendments 1, 61 and 65, and that should be the focus of this debate.

Mr. Speaker, in the *Polar Sea* incident and the dispute about coastal fishing between Newfoundland and the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, the Americans and the French refused to go along with Canadian demands. We must therefore provide a clear definition of what constitutes our Canadian territory. In a treaty of this magnitude, I think it is extremely important to clearly define our position with respect to our territory.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that the history of the Mulroney-Reagan trade agreement is somewhat perplexing to the Official Opposition, because as you know, this Government has been negotiating with the Americans since 1985. And I hardly think I would be divulging a State secret if I said that today, we have a situation where 80 per cent of the goods that cross our borders do so duty-free, and that while 25 per cent of U.S. foreign trade depends on the Canadian consumer, here in Canada 75 per cent of our trade is dependent on the Americans. I do not think that I am saying anything new there. Everyone knows that in this country. They know that 25 cents of every dollar we spend comes from our skill as traders; we want to trade with the world and we want to increase trade by lowering barriers and customs duties imposed as protectionist measures.

Like many people, we have recognized that the United States have trade problems. We know that. Their deficit is increasing every year. If my figures are correct, the trade deficit went from $9.1 billion in 1982 to $140.6 billion in 1986, Mr. Speaker. So the Americans are becoming protectionist! They say that they have to protect their interests.

And that is why they want an agreement that will bind Canada forever. But that is no reason to accept blindly an agreement that was negotiated very often in secret, very often out of public view and which finally resulted in a bad agreement, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry to say so, but the agreement is bad for Canada.

I am not against free trade, Mr. Speaker; I am for free trade, but not the kind of free trade negotiated by this Government with the Americans. What does this whole business of giving away our natural resources have to do with free trade? What does it have to do with giving away our oil, our natural resources, our water, control of our financial institutions? What does this have to do with a free trade agreement? Nothing! Except that the Americans asked for it and Canada gave in.

But they did not have the courage to define what Canada is in the Bill, but the United States are defined, for example. Mr. Speaker, I tell you that it is not right to proceed this way. We should at least define our terms, define our territory, define our rights and what powers we want to keep and then proceed to negotiate seriously, Mr. Speaker.

• (1650)

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this free trade debate began with a commission. I think Canadians sometimes do not understand that we are at about the six year mark in a process. Six years ago the then Prime Minister started the process because the Canadian economy was in trouble as a result of too many consecutive years of Liberal-NDP policy which had ruined the economy of the country. In four short years, after some 17 years of bad policy, we have been able piece by piece to put good policy in place. Canadians are employed, our standard of living is starting to rise again, yet at the end what do we run into? A filibuster.

Earlier this day the coalition of the NDP and Liberal Party suggested that the report stage debate on this specific legislation go on for 150 sitting days, followed by 200 sitting days for third reading debate. Two more years of debate during which Parliament could do nothing else about pensions, nothing about widows, nothing about children, nothing about pornography. Just stay on the free trade debate for two more years. That is absurd.

We moved from that absurdity to the absurdity of the proposition in this amendment, that we have to define in this Bill what Canada is. This House passed some 225 pieces of legislation and sent them to the Senate, and did we feel compelled to take the word "Canada" out of those Bills? No, it is in every single one of them. In fact, on many pages in every single one of them. Yet do we have a definition of Canada in any of that legislation? No.

Did the Opposition lay these amendments down for members of the committee and the witnesses to consider? Was there wisdom in this definition? Is this the best definition of Canada for the Broadcasting Act? Is it the best definition of

Canada for the Companies Act? Is it the best definition of Canada for the Customs Act? All those Acts are amended by this Bill. In fact, some 27 different Acts of Parliament are amended by this Bill. Is this definition of Canada, laid out here at the eleventh hour, the best? No, it is a filibuster tactic, not a serious suggestion.

My hon. friend, the Whip for the Liberal Party, laughs. I served with him for hours and hours in committee on the importance to this country of a new language Bill and respect for English and French. I have helped provide budgetary money to the opposition Parties for researchers and staff and translators. Yet they brought in 102 amendments, every single one of them in

[*Translation*]

. . . in one official language only. All the amendments put forward by the Opposition on this legislation were in only one language, English, in English only.

[*English*]

Is that the Liberal view of Canada? Is that part of their definition, that Canada is a country of one language? Or is it two languages?

Mr. Gauthier: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I know the Parliamentary Secretary is a fair-minded individual. The Standing Orders require that any document circulated to Members be in both official languages. Any Member of this House, be it a unilingual Anglophone or a unilingual Francophone, can table a document in his or her language. Before it is circulated it has to be translated. That is the rule. If the hon. gentleman is trying to promote disunity by saying all Members must work in both official languages, he is full of nonsense.

Mr. Hopkins: So there.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): This is only Monday, the beginning of the week. The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary has the floor, and he has a minute before Private Members' Hour.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I am acquainted with the rules but as Members of this chamber and citizens of this country we know what Canada is. It is not a limited proposition like the one the Opposition is putting forward in this amendment. That is a very narrow definition of Canada. That is a definition for the Customs Act because for custom purposes you need to have a geographic definition. However, do we need a geographic sense of Canada for company policy and our laws dealing with companies? Do we need a geographic sense of Canada for our laws dealing with broadcasting policy or our cultural industries? Is a customs definition of Canada the definition we want to live with across those 27 Acts? I suggest it is not.

The only reason we have this amendment before us is to filibuster. It is nonsense and would be damaging to the country.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member will have three minutes in his debate when we recommence.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

• (1700)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS--BILLS

[*English*]

BLUE WATER BRIDGE AUTHORITY ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. John Oostrom (for Mr. Hardey) moved that Bill C-210, an Act to amend the Blue Water Bridge Authority Act, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee, be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Oostrom (for Mr. Hardey) moved that the Bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Ken James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to have an opportunity to speak on this Bill this afternoon. As my hon. colleagues are aware, I introduced Bill C-210 in this House in October of 1986. The Bill was drawn and brought forward for second reading in April of this year.

Coincidentally, a few hours before the time scheduled for debate on second reading of this Bill I had been sworn in as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Supply and Services. Due to this position I had discussions with my colleague, the Member for Kent (Mr. Hardey), whose constituency is right down the road from mine who agreed to take over sponsorship of this very important Bill. Unfortunately, the Hon. Member has pressing business in his constituency today, and he has asked me to speak on his behalf on this Bill.

I would like to take a moment to thank the many people who have contributed to this very important Bill. First, I would like to thank the Blue Water Bridge Authority for calling this problem to my attention and assisting me in detailing for my colleagues in the House the need for this amendment.

I want to thank my hon. colleague, the Member from Kent, for his efforts on behalf of this Bill. It goes without saying that we would not be debating it at third reading without his assistance and co-operation. As well, my colleagues who sat and heard testimony at the legislative committee hearing on

this Bill get my thanks for their interest, input, and assistance. An amendment to the Bill was passed in legislative committee which clarified the intent of the legislation.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Thacker) has been of invaluable help on this Bill, both in his advice and in the time he has spent liaising with the Transport Department.

Last, but certainly not least, I want to thank all Members opposite for their co-operation and interest in this Bill. I want especially to thank Members opposite for their support for the motion to move this Bill ahead to third reading. I would now like to thank them in advance for their support at the final vote.

Over the past few months I have had some experience with Private Members' Bills. I had the privilege of being appointed chairman of the legislative committee studying Bill C-204. All Members of that committee were very aware that we were entering new and uncharted waters. We have had Private Members' Bills passed in the House of Commons in the past, but they were few and far between.

In the past private Members were given one hour to debate their Bills. A Bill of any substance could not be handled properly in one hour and consequently Bills were virtually always talked out. On occasion a very persistent private Member could have a Bill passed dealing with a pet project if he or she were extremely persistent and re-introduced the Bill year after year.

There are many Hon. Members in this House who are more familiar with this subject than I. Members are aware that in recent Parliaments the only Private Members' Bills which were passed dealt in the main with the changing of the name of a Member's constituency. There were no Members in past Parliaments who attempted, as did my colleague, the Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald), to introduce legislation as important and necessary as Bill C-204. In the past any Member who attempted this would be virtually wasting his or her time.

As well, Bill C-210 would probably never have been passed in a previous Parliament. Bill C-210 needed to go to a legislative committee and be amended to provide the essential protection to members of the Bridge Authority who are trying to provide their services free. I have little doubt that Bill C-210 would not have passed without the reform of the House of Commons.

That I am standing here today speaking at third reading of this Bill is proof that House reform is working, concrete evidence that private Members are somebodies and that we can have an impact and make a difference in the Government of Canada. It is proof that a private Member can recognize a fault or a wrinkle, if you will, and address it through a Private Members' Bill. We now have optimism that Private Members' Bills can be fully debated and accepted by a majority of Members of this House.

I have no doubt that all Hon. Members will join me in recognizing the efforts of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) to make this possible for private Members. I would like to applaud and thank our Prime Minister on behalf of all Members of this House for his commitment to House reform and his continuing efforts to give all Members the opportunity to make important and timely decisions in the House of Commons.

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, the Blue Water Bridge is a very important international crossing. On behalf of the Official Opposition I would like to say that we are pleased to support the adoption of Bill C-210. We have facilitated the consideration and progress of this Bill in earlier stages.

There is no doubt that the current rules, which were adopted not as an initiative of one Party but as a joint effort of all Parties, do facilitate somewhat the consideration and disposition of Private Members' Business. However, the adoption of Private Members' Bills and resolutions is not quite as rare as my hon. friend suggested in his remarks. I can recall, for example, that a Private Members' Bill of a Liberal Member of Parliament in the early sixties brought about the adoption of the current name of our national airline. It was changed from Trans-Canada Air Lines to Air Canada. The Member of Parliament who introduced the Bill went on to have a very distinguished career in public life. He was none other than the Hon. Jean Chrétien.

I repeat that there is no doubt that it is easier for Private Members' Business to be considered and disposed of under the current rules, but the acceptance of a Bill offered by a private Member is not quite as rare as my hon. friend has suggested. Praise for this move forward should be shared equally by all Members of this House. Parliamentary reform should not be a partisan issue as it has not been in the past. To the extent that our present rules are working the praise, or for that matter the blame if there are problems, must be shared by all Members.

I would like to conclude by saying once again that on behalf of the Official Opposition I am pleased to accept the request of the commissioners of the Blue Water Bridge for the extra protection that this Bill will give them and to support third reading of this Bill.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the New Democrats in the House of Commons I, too, want to lend my voice in support for Bill C-210. As we all know, this is an extremely important crossing in Canada. There are a number of individuals who unselfishly devote their time, talents, and energies to this crossing. This Bill would remove any liability from these individuals. This is an appropriate initiative and it is encouraging, as my hon. friend has indicated, that a private Member was able to initiate this legislative change to provide this element of security to the people who devote their time to making our country a better place.

One of the highlights of this Parliament has been the fact that we have been experimenting with the variety of forms of parliamentary reform. The role given to back-benchers through the private Members' initiatives has been one of the major initiatives. We have a long way to go.

• (1710)

We have made progress with an important initiative in terms of recognizing the rights, obligations and responsibilities of those on the back-benches. We have provided an opportunity for private Members to initiate such actions as this. It will provide an element of security to those commissioners which they do not believe exists at this time. I believe they are probably protected legislatively, but if it provides them with more protection, security and encouragement to continue serving Canadians as they do, this is an appropriate private Members' initiative.

On behalf of New Democrats I am pleased to lend our enthusiastic support.

Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of Bill C-210, the Blue Water Bridge Authority Act. I served on the legislative committee on this Bill and listened to the presentations made by the board members who came forward to endorse what the Hon. Member for Sarnia—Lambton (Mr. James) has asked us to do. I was impressed with these people who have been asked to serve on the board, without renumeration as has been mentioned already.

I want to compliment the Member for Sarnia—Lambton for sponsoring this Bill and bringing it to this point today. I want to thank the Minister of Transport (Mr. Bouchard) and his officials for allowing us to put this piece of important legislation before the House this afternoon.

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the Blue Water Bridge Authority carries liability insurance coverage. Given the frequent use of this bridge to transport hazardous materials and the large liability judgments given by courts, the members of that authority were concerned that with a serious accident there was some possibility they could be held personally liable. That was never the intention of Parliament in passing that originally, but there was the possibility with the wording of the Bill.

Second, let me commend the Member for Sarnia—Lambton (Mr. James). As a new Member in 1984, it is amazing that already in his short career he has had a Bill passed by this Parliament. The last major Bill was passed in the early 1960s, over 20 years ago. Not many Bills were accepted over the years until the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) accepted the recommendation of all Parties.

The Prime Minister wanted to have parliamentary reform so that private Members could bring forward Bills irrespective of the fact that they might be highly embarrassing to a Prime Minister or the Cabinet of the day. Private Members in the House can have Bills come forward for a forced vote at least six times in each session. That is tremendous parliamentary reform and all Parties should preserve that power with a passion. Indeed, it should be expanded.

I want to thank the Member for Sarnia—Lambton for carrying on with this Bill. It is not easy to become a new Member of Parliament and learn all of these processes, in light of the demands we all have from our ridings with such matters as passport problems, immigration problems, income tax problems. There are many demands on our time, without arranging to have a Bill drafted, or even figure out the Notice Paper. With the able help of the Clerks, who do admirable service to all of us, we are able to do so.

The credit goes to the Member for Sarnia—Lambton. He had to be here for up to five hours. He had to arrange for Members to speak in support of the Bill and arrange for Members to show up at committee to ensure there was a quorum. That is a problem in itself, given the demands on Members' time to appear at other committees. He had to arrange for witnesses to be here and for the Bill to be returned to the House and have Members available to speak. It takes dedicated effort by Members to make that happen.

I am sure the electorate of my friend and colleague, the Member for Sarnia—Lambton, will realize the major legislative accomplishment he has achieved here today. I am glad the House will give it third reading.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The time provided for consideration of Private Members' Business is now expired.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. From the Government's perspective, the remaining time could be profitably spent on continuation of report stage of Bill C-130. There are some 102 amendments to be dealt with.

Under ordinary circumstances we might indeed suspend the sitting until six o'clock, but given the pressure in the Chamber for additional time and the Government's notice today that we will be moving time allocation, perhaps there could be unanimous consent to continue with report stage.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is there unanimous consent?

Mr. Gauthier: No.

Sitting Suspended

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I do not hear unanimous consent.

* * *

SITTING SUSPENDED

Mr. Speaker: It being 5.17 p.m., the House will suspend sitting until 6 p.m.

At 5.17 p.m. the sitting of the House was suspended.

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 6 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS--BILLS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Friday, August 12, consideration of Bill C-264, an Act to amend the Criminal Code (instruments and literature for illicit drug use), as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee; and the amendment of Mr. Horner:

That Bill C-264 be amended in Clause 1 by striking out lines 11 to 15 at page 1 and lines 1 to 5 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"ited pursuant to the Narcotic Control Act, controlled pursuant to Part III of the Food and Drugs Act or restricted pursuant to Part IV of the Food and Drugs Act;

"illicit drug use" means the importation, exportation, cultivation, sale or possession of a narcotic, drug or other substance contrary to the Narcotic Control Act or Part III or IV of the Food and Drugs Act or a regulation made thereunder;

"instrument for illicit drug use" means anything designed primarily or intended under the circumstances for consuming or to facilitate the consumption of an illicit drug, but does not include a "device" as that term is defined in section 2 of the Food and Drugs Act";

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being six o'clock, pursuant to Standing Order 13(5), the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division at the report stage of Bill C-264.

Call in the Members.

• (1810)

And the division bells having rung:

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I recommend that, in the spirit of reform once again, now that we are dealing with a Private Member's item here and contrary to our usual practice when we have a deferred division and a vote by Party lines, that on this matter we take a vote row by row instead of by Party lines.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Once again I should like to remind Hon. Members that the voting will begin with those Members who are in favour of the motion in the rows to my right rising by row and then Members in the rows to my left rising. Later, I will ask those Members who are opposed to the motion in the rows to my right to rise, and end with Members opposed to the motion in the rows to my left.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Horner) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 509*)

YEAS

Members

Belsher
Bernier
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Blouin
Bradley
Caccia
Caldwell
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Cochrane
Collins
Comeau
Crofton
Darling
Dewar
Domm
Dorin
Duguay
Duplessis
Epp (Provencher)
Fennell
Fretz
Friesen
Gauthier
Greenaway
Halliday
Hawkes
Hopkins
Horner
Hovdebo
Johnson (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Kilgour
Ladouceur
Langdon
Lewis
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacKay
McCain
McCurdy
McDermid
McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood)
McKenzie
Moore
Nickerson
Oostrom
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Price
Ravis
Ricard
Riis
Robichaud
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Sparrow
Stackhouse
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Vincent
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek)
Young—65

NAYS

Members

nil/none

• (1820)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Horner moved that the Bill as amended be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): When shall the Bill be read the third time? At the next sitting of the House?

Some Hon. Members: Now.

Mr. Horner: In view of the unanimous vote on this motion, would it be possible to move, without debate, to third reading at this time?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is there unanimous consent?

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to our moving to third reading, but I would hope that there would be no debate and that we will proceed to the vote right now.

Mr. Riis: I hate to bring up this point, but had I known that there would be a request to move directly to third reading debate, we would have been pleased to. However, our critic is not with us today and would like to participate in third reading debate. I am afraid that we will have to wait until the next opportunity to participate in the third reading debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): At the next sitting of the House.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-130, an Act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States of America, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee; and the amendments of Mr. Axworthy (p. 18275).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister has three minutes left in his debate.

Mr. Hawkes: *Merci, Monsieur le Président, trois minutes, ça suffit.*

Prior to breaking for Private Members' hour I had seven minutes left and one final point that I wished to make. In the arguments that we have heard from the other side in support of the amendment to define Canada in three places in the Bill, the Opposition has failed to tell Canadians, and Members of the House, when they draw the analogy of the need for defining the United States in the Bill, what we are defining is the customs territory of the United States. What the members of the NDP ignore is that the Canadian Customs Act today and in the future must define Canada's customs territory.

In terms of the implementation of the free trade agreement, what we are dealing with in this Bill is the need to define what we mean by the United States. Surely in each of our individual Acts where we feel it is necessary in some way to define Canada or the Canadian interest that is done Act by Act.

I wonder if those who are such strong proponents of these amendments have thought through the reality that any definition provides clarity, but it provides clarity through limitation. In proposing this amendment at this place in this particular piece of legislation there is a very limited view of Canada. It is a limited view that is appropriate because it has a geographic base, therefore it is appropriate to customs issues. However, is that view the appropriate view for broadcast issues? Is that view the appropriate view for cultural issues? Is that point of view and that definition appropriate for the 27 existing Acts of Parliament which are being amended by this piece of legislation?

I suggest to Members opposite that, upon a little more consideration of this issue, and if they had brought that forward to committee where it could have been thoroughly examined by Members whose task it was over several weeks to look at it, and by witnesses who came to testify, they might find that they are less happy with what they are proposing than might appear to them on the surface. Let us deal with the Customs Act and the necessary definition in the Customs Act, but let us not impose a Customs Act definition on all the other statutes that are involved in this.

I would urge Members simply to reject those amendments and quickly and, hopefully, on a voice vote, move on to others.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain on debate.

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has defined some of the things about which we have great concerns. When we are talking about not defining Canada and hearing that the United States is defined within the territory of the Customs Act, we believe that surely it would not have been too difficult for Canada to be defined in the same way within this Act that, as the Hon. Member has so clearly stated, amends 27 existing Acts of Parliament. It seems to me we should at least be explicit about what Canada is.

Certainly the Government has a very limited view of Canada. That is the very reason we are participating in this type of debate. When we are looking at amending 27 Acts that affect not only the economy but the whole sovereignty and identity of Canada, it seems to me that we should not be talking about closure, but that is what we have been talking about today. I heard a lot of criticism that the opposition Parties are asking for an extraordinary amount of time to discuss this Bill. If this is the Holy Grail which the Government keeps talking about with the future of Canada in sight, the Government should not begrudge the amount of time this House takes. The Government should have been willing to go to the Canadian people across the country to hear what they have to say.

• (1830)

Mr. McDermid: We did, three times.

Ms. Dewar: Instead of that, we got a limited amount of hearings. The Government went across the country before we had the Bill. We were talking in abstracts. The Government was saying that this is what might be there. But we did not have the specifics. We were told, "Don't worry. Trust us". That is a great way for a government to operate when this will be a totally new direction for neon years.

It gives me great concern when I see the Government is not only objecting totally to the amendments but to the kind of debate we want. We should be taking time in the House of Commons to look at the substantive issue of what the deal is all about. We need to take the Bill section by section and look very clearly at it. We want Canadians to understand what we are getting into. It would be a good exercise for Members of this House to get a good sense of what we are getting into.

When we talk about defining Canada, we are defining in this agreement the whole erosion of the Canadian identity. What will the Canadian economy be all about? We recognize that within this agreement now there are no limits to the kind of foreign investment we are getting into. People can holus-bolus buy our economy.

We know we have a branch plant economy, but we know that parent companies adjust prices and decide what kind of manufacturing takes place for their subsidiaries. Parent companies call the shots. Exports of branch plants go mainly to parent companies which control what kind of imports the subsidiaries have the ability to purchase. That is occurring in Canada now without this agreement. We are tying ourselves more deeply into that foreign-owned kind of economy where we will become totally dependent as far as our economy is concerned.

I hear Hon. Members telling me every day that 75 per cent of our trade takes place with the United States now. If we are doing so well, why do we have to give away any of the leverage we already have? But the Government is saying, "Welcome to Canada. We are open for business. Take our resources. Take any of our economy and have a ball with it. We are open and we do not care what you do with us." That is what we have been hearing consistently from the Government.

I think Canadians want to know more about this deal and understand it. As they start to understand this deal, questions come and they realize that this is not such a good deal. You hear government Members saying, "If you are not with us, you must be narrow-minded nationalists who want the status quo." If being a nationalist is saying you want to have some control over your own trade and you want to know in what directions your own economy will take, I do not apologize for being a nationalist. I think that is just fine. That is what being a citizen of a country is.

Look at what we had been doing before. We had so much foreign ownership that many times when Canadians could be adventurous and take risks, they could not always do it because the parent company would not allow it. Look at the number of deals that were struck at the World Bank. We know that we got very few contracts, not because we were not capable of getting contracts or competing with what was coming out of Third World countries and what the World Bank was financing, but because very often we were not able to bid on some of the contracts that were put forward because a parent company was not allowing it.

Mr. Kilgour: That is absolute nonsense.

Ms. Dewar: That is not nonsense. The statistics are there and you can look at them.

Mr. McDermid: Name one.

Ms. Dewar: You can see the amount of bidding that Japan did to get the bids it wanted.

Mr. McDermid: Name one.

Ms. Dewar: On the bids we made we got about 80 per cent on what we bid and we bid on about 5 per cent of the contracts. I have described that in detail.

If you look at what is happening in other countries, and I use Japan as an example because it is always being quoted, Japan might bid on 80 per cent or 90 per cent of contracts and might win about 25 per cent of that. Japan's share is greater than ours because Japan is constantly putting in bids and being adventurous. Canadian manufacturers and workers are quite capable of doing the same because any time they have been able to bid they have been successful.

Mr. McDermid: This is what this is all about.

Ms. Dewar: We are looking at this agreement. It says that we want to have more and more foreign control over our economy, that we want to make sure Canadians in the future, our sons, daughters and grandchildren, will no longer be able to take a direction in the economy that might be good for the Canada of the future. The Government says that there are two different visions of Canada. I hope there are. There is a vision of Canada that I have and I know my Party has where people count more than just the bottom line. People are not treated as commodities but with dignity as human beings. They are allowed to develop in their culture and environment in their own communities with a value system that is one of their choice and not one imposed upon them where they are not allowed to work because the jobs are not there and the economy is foreign owned, where the direction of the economy is not necessarily one they would choose but one that is directed south of the border.

I think Canada at this point, as we are maturing and growing up, is beginning to get its roots, is comfortable with its identity of two languages, and is comfortable with where we come from and who we are. It is not a time for us to fix ourselves so firmly economically only to one partner. I think it is time to branch out. It is time to be part of the actors who are going to the Pacific Rim. We can be part of that whole international liberalization of trade among countries. This kind

of agreement does not do itself any good in the eyes of the Third World, and certainly ties us firmly to the foreign policies of the United States.

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton—Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member who has just spoken knows that I have a great deal of respect for her. When she argued that Canada was not getting its share of the World Bank contracts because somehow foreign-owned companies were preventing Lavalin, Montreal engineers or engineering companies across Canada or other consultants from bidding on them, in my respectful submission she was giving us NDP whimsy rather than fact.

Mr. McDermid: She cannot even name one contact.

• (1840)

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, some of the great engineering companies in Canada have done business all over the world. In my experience, I have found that there are not enough companies bidding, and I agree with the Hon. Member that there should be more. But somehow to tie that to free trade is not serious debate. In my view, she is not dealing candidly with Canadians, unless she has better evidence than that which she offered today.

The reason that eight out of 10 provincial Governments, the Consumers' Association of Canada, medium-sized, small and large business people and young people, including the Quebec Young Liberals who just voted for the agreement yesterday, are in favour of the agreement is not that they want to see Canada downtrodden or lose its identity. The reason is that we know we are strong, capable and intelligent. We know that we can compete and create jobs and a better future for our children and our grandchildren.

Both opposition Parties are taking the view that somehow we are giving away our national soul. That is simply nonsense. A friend of mine recently came back from Ireland. He told me that the airwaves are full of talk about 1992 when Europe will have a fully integrated market. This deal does not provide for a fully integrated market. Opposition Members should know that. It simply tries to put some discipline into the trading relationship which is bigger than that between any two countries in history.

Let me take an example from my region. When a petrochemical product goes across the border at Coutts, Alberta, a 15 per cent or 16 per cent tariff is paid. We are trying to get rid of that tariff so that we can have the value-added jobs in Edmonton, Calgary or Windsor. Now those jobs tend to be in the United States because of that tariff. We are simply trying to recognize that we need to have some protection from the protectionism which is always present in the United States. I believe it was Congressman La Falce who said the other day that if this agreement does not get through, there will be a trade war such as we have not seen since the 1930s.

How can we put a bag over our heads and pretend that the world does not have regional trading blocs? Something like 40 or 50 countries are now involved in trading blocs, the Common Market of course being the best known. How can we pretend that 25 million Canadians, a population slightly smaller than that of California, need no protection or discipline in trading relationships? We can do that if we believe in a fully socialized economy, an economy with someone sitting in a building in Ottawa saying how many widgets will be produced in Windsor, how many chemicals will be produced in Edmonton. However, I believe that the vast majority of Canadians do not share that vision of Canada. That is a vision that would create the kind of unemployment that we have had in parts of Canada and one that we are now trying to get away from. I give the Government enormous credit for creating jobs across Canada, though I wish there were more jobs in my part of the country. I wish that fewer Albertans had to move to Toronto or Hamilton to find employment.

Two NDP Members from the Windsor area are here today. I suppose they will say that that is managed trade. Since 1968, the production minimums under the Auto Pact have never been applied, as I understand it, except for a few months in 1980 or 1981 when Chrysler was in trouble.

Mr. Langdon: That's false.

Mr. Kilgour: Let the Hon. Member give us the facts and figures on that because I have never seen it contradicted anywhere. We have had, for all intents and purposes, free trade in the auto industry since 1968 except for a brief period in 1981.

The Leader of the NDP (Mr. Broadbent) is from Oshawa. I believe Oshawa has one of the lowest rates of unemployment in Canada. We in western Canada, Atlantic Canada and northern Canada are simply saying that we want to have a little bit of the misery that the people of Oshawa are suffering from. We want to have a few of the advantages that the good people of Oshawa have been enjoying for many years, as have the people from Toronto, St. Catharines and parts of Quebec. Let us see if we cannot have a trading relationship which will create more jobs.

The Canada West Foundation has studied industries in western Canada on an industry-by-industry basis. It has said that these industries will benefit from free trade. It will be overwhelmingly favourable to people in our region. It is true that some will suffer. There will have to be adjustment and transition programs. No one will support those more strongly than you or I, Mr. Speaker.

We have to recognize that we are not living in the 1920s any longer. I remind NDP Members that back in the 1920s, Argentina and Canada had economies and standards of living that were roughly comparable. Argentina turned inward with protectionism and all kinds of regulations and controls. Now, as I am sure Hon. Members know, Argentina has something less than economic prosperity.

Canada has to look outward. Western Canada has always looked outward because our region was founded on trade with

Europe. We cannot pretend that the world that exists in some textbook that the Hon. Members from Windsor have read still exists. It does not.

Those who prosper in the world are the Japanese, the Swiss, the West Germans—

Mr. McCurdy: Real free trade economy is in Japan.

Mr. Kilgour: These are the people who know that producing high-quality goods with service to customers and intelligence is the way of the future. I remind Hon. Members that the average people in those countries are doing very well. As I think Canadians will show in the next election, Canadians know that that is the route we have to take.

The Hon. Member said a moment ago that Japan is not in a trade group. That is true, but which of the other OECD countries is not in a trade group except for Japan, Canada and the United States?

Mr. McCurdy: How much foreign ownership is there in Japan?

Mr. Kilgour: If we complete this agreement, as I very much hope we will, then Canada will be part of the largest, most prosperous trading community on earth, though some could argue that the Common Market is stronger. At least we will then be able to tell the people of Windsor, Edmonton, Toronto and St. Catharines to tool up because they can now sell to the entire North American market.

I will give an example of this. Unfortunately it is not an example from Edmonton but from Montreal. A man who makes children's winter garments in Montreal has to pay a 42 per cent tariff on costumes with ornaments on them when he ships them South. He is in favour of this agreement.

Mr. Langdon: He still will.

Mr. Kilgour: He will not. It will be phased out over 10 years, as the Hon. Member knows.

Mr. Langdon: Not for clothing.

Mr. Kilgour: If we can get rid of those tariffs and the non-tariff barriers, Canadians, whether they live in Newfoundland, northern Nova Scotia, northern Ontario, northern Quebec or western Canada, will have the same sort of benefits the people of southern Ontario have had, deserve to have and, I hope, will continue to have. That is why I very much hope that this agreement will go ahead.

I personally am looking forward to fighting an election on this issue. I think the Members who are asking us to look back 30 years will find that Canadians are not backward looking people. They believe in the future. They believe we can compete in North America. Once we have started to do that, they believe that we will be able to compete better in the Pacific Rim, in Europe and in other parts of the world.

I trust that allocation of time will be applied shortly and that before very long we will all be out looking our voters in the eyes, telling them, as *The Globe and Mail* has said, that if the deal is scuttled, the grass may not grow in Windsor but there are a lot of places where the grass will grow. I remind Hon. Members from Windsor that the agreement will enshrine the Auto Pact in it, and if the Americans want to rescind the Auto Pact, which they can do now very readily and quickly, they will have to rescind the entire trade agreement.

I appeal to the people of Canada who have benefited most from free trade in automobiles to let the rest of the Canadian people enjoy some of the things they have enjoyed.

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, the amazing thing about this debate this evening is that very few Members opposite are speaking to the amendment. We just heard a speech that was so totally off the amendment that the Hon. Member should have been called to order.

• (1850)

We heard the Parliamentary Secretary telling the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) that he should have moved his amendment in committee and discussed it there. What is the sense in moving amendments in a parliamentary committee where the Government, in the form of Members opposite, is totally dedicated to voting down those amendments?

Mr. McDermid: Not true.

Mr. Hopkins: Members opposite are talking in circles. They are trying to mislead the Canadian public into thinking that the committee was very meaningful. It was a good discussion but they certainly did not accept amendments.

Mr. McDermid: That is wrong.

Mr. Hopkins: You can look at any other piece of legislation that has gone through this House and you will see that the amendments which have been made would compare very favourably to the way this legislation, involving the greatest issue which has faced Parliament in decades, was handled. It was handled badly by the Government of Canada and its members who sat on that committee.

Mr. McDermid: You were not there, how would you know?

Mr. Hopkins: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Brampton always has his say, but I am used to that when I am up here speaking because I know that things I say get him very upset.

Let us get back to the amendments and the real issue here, which is the fact that in this Bill the geographic boundaries of the U.S. are outlined clearly—

Mr. McDermid: Why?

Mr. Hopkins: —but the boundaries of Canada are not.

Mr. McDermid: Why?

Mr. Hopkins: So the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry simply brings in the following amendment:

> That Bill C-130 be amended in Clause 2 by adding immediately after line 21 at page 2 the following:
>
> "Canada" means the territory to which Canadian customs laws apply, including areas beyond the territorial seas of Canada within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, Canada may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and their natural resources".

What is wrong with a government that would deny an amendment like this which adds clarity to a Bill? Is it afraid that something is going to happen down the road that will irritate Washington? Does it not have enough confidence in the future of Canada to put in its boundaries? The Government should be ashamed of itself.

What is it really thinking about here? It is so anxious to get a deal that it does not want to go back and clarify anything. It wants a deal at any price.

Mr. Kilgour: It cannot be changed.

Mr. Hopkins: You did not speak on the amendment so you do not really have a right to shout over here. I am on the business of today, you were not.

This is one simple amendment to Bill C-130.

Mr. McDermid: "Simple" is a good word.

Mr. Hopkins: The Parliamentary Secretary stood up and said Bill C-130 amends 27 pieces of legislation. If you are going to amend 27 pieces of legislation why can you not allow a simple amendment that speaks about the territorial boundaries of Canada?

Mr. McDermid: Because it is already there.

Mr. Hopkins: I know what is bothering Members opposite. The U.S. sent the *Polar Sea* through the North and they said they were doing it because it was international waters. The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) visited Washington and had a meeting with the State Department and they simply told him he might as well go back home and forget it, they were going to go through anyway.

Mr. McDermid: Do you think your amendment would have stopped the *Polar Sea* from going through?

Mr. Hopkins: The Government did not raise the issue until it was raised by the Official Opposition. Then Canadians woke up suddenly to find the Americans were passing through waters we claimed to be our own and there was nothing done to inhibit them. The Government, with the largest majority in Canada's history, did not stand up and speak for Canada. Today it is not standing up and speaking for Canada because it will not put the boundaries of Canada in the most major piece of legislation that has passed through this House in decades.

Mr. McDermid: It is already there.

Mr. Hopkins: Mr. Speaker, let us go back to another day here that relates to this. Canada argued in 1903 that we owned the headlands on the West Coast. The U.S. was claiming we did not. Britain was brought into the picture and it supported the U.S. in its case and we lost. That is why today you have the American Panhandle down Canada's West Coast. What is going to happen in the future if the Americans claim certain waters in the Arctic to be international waters, send their ships through on that basis, and we say they are not international waters? If this amendment goes on to outline the clear-cut boundaries of Canada for the future—

Mr. McDermid: It stops that?

Mr. Hopkins: —it gives strength to our position when it comes to international law and future court cases dealing with the boundaries of Canada because it is there.

Mr. McDermid: It is already there.

Mr. Hopkins: It is already there? Why did you not put it in and clarify it?

Mr. McDermid: It is in the Customs Act, that is what we are talking about.

Mr. Hopkins: He says it is in the Customs Act. Why not put it directly into Bill C-130, because Bill C-130 takes precedence over many pieces of Canadian legislation. He knows that.

Mr. McDermid: That is wrong, too. That section was taken out of the Bill.

Mr. Hopkins: I talked about Britain and the U.S. ganging up on Canada in 1903, and it is happening in 1988. Here we have a trade Bill that is slanted towards the U.S. The boundaries of the U.S. are outlined in the Bill, the Government will not outline the boundaries of Canada because it is afraid of irritating Washington and it might lose its trade Bill. You know, you must not interfere with poor Uncle Sam. Yet we have the British Prime Minister, not sitting down at a table in this case, but walking into the Canadian House of Commons and supporting this trade agreement. It was totally out of order, but she did it anyway. Here you have Britain moving into this debate between Canada and the U.S., taking the part of the Tory Government in Canada, which already has an overwhelming majority in this House, and trying to convince Canadians that this is indeed the route to go.

We heard the Hon. Member for Edmonton—Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour) saying that Switzerland and Japan were successful by themselves in the world market simply because of high quality products.

Mr. McDermid: And protectionism.

Mr. Hopkins: He also mentioned intelligence. Is the Hon. Member saying that Canadian goods are not of high quality?

Is he saying that Canadian manufacturers do not go about things in an intelligent manner? He is not saying that his Government has been so intent on getting this trade agreement with the U.S.—and I refuse to call it a free trade agreement—that it has put all its eggs in one basket, and our international trade percentages with other countries have been going down drastically since the Government started these negotiations with the U.S. The facts will show it.

• (1900)

I do not trust the Government to carry Canadian concerns. I do not trust the Government to say that Canadian boundaries should not be in Bill C-130, the trade deal. I say they should be in there in explicit form. If the Government of Canada had confidence in its own legislation and in the agreement it made, it would put that amendment in and clarify it once and for all. I do not trust the Government because it is refusing to do so.

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): I cannot describe my entry into this debate as a particular pleasure, particularly considering the substance of the debate which strikes me as being nearly trivial. It is fairly obvious to me that this long harangue could be reduced to a few minutes simply by the Government conceding what seems to me to be an obvious point. Unfortunately, we have had what has been described by my colleague from Windsor as a reduction of the debate to a level of plain meanness. Moments ago we listened to the Member for Edmonton—Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour) reduce the debate to a level of what must be described as intellectual dishonesty in the interests of regional bigotry.

First, as has so often happened in this debate, the Auto Pact has been referred to as one example of free trade by which southern Ontario, in an exploitative way—which is the implication of all that has been said—has benefited at the expense of the rest of the country. They ask why free trade should not be extended to the entire country.

First, the Auto Pact did not involve giving away the country. That is a minor observation at this stage of the debate. However, the Auto Pact is not a free trade deal of the sort that this deal between Mulroney and Reagan represents. It is not free trade, and anyone who suggests that it is is, as I said before, intellectually dishonest or absolutely committed to regional divisions in an unnecessary and exploitative way. The Auto Pact is an agreement by which ensured levels of production commensurate with sales in Canada were reached with the help of tariffs which represented the barrier that had to be overcome on the basis of which the Auto Pact was made to function.

It is true that the Auto Pact did provide jobs in southern Ontario. We are thankful for that. However, let us pause for a moment to consider what kinds of jobs were produced in southern Ontario. Yes, Windsor has benefited from a great many people working on the assembly lines in the plants there. However, with the Auto Pact, engineering went south. With the Auto Pact, management went south. To suggest that this negotiated trade agreement between Reagan and Mulroney does not at all affect the Auto Pact is just plain nonsense.

Mr. McDermid: Are you against the Auto Pact?

Mr. McCurdy: I find it really offensive that ignorance or mean-spiritedness continues to operate in this debate.

Mr. McDermid: Are you for it or against it?

Mr. McCurdy: The Auto Pact, even to the Parliamentary Secretary, should be recognized as a managed trade agreement and not a free trade agreement.

Mr. McDermid: Are you for it or against it?

Mr. McCurdy: Of course we are for it.

Mr. McDermid: What are you complaining about?

Mr. McCurdy: We are complaining about the attack on the Auto Pact in the interests of an agreement that has no relationship to the Auto Pact at all.

Second, the Hon. Member for Edmonton—Strathcona upbraided my colleague, the Member for Hamilton Mountain (Ms. Dewar), on the issue of Canadian contracts to the World Bank. She pointed out that we bid on about 3 per cent of such opportunities. The Member for Edmonton—Strathcona contested this suggesting that this was not in any way an argument that would portray Canada as being in a situation where its inability to bid is determined by foreign ownership.

I will give you one fact that my hon. colleague from Hamilton Mountain was unable to give, that is, that all of that 3 per cent represented companies that were Canadian-owned. None of them represented American-owned or foreign-owned companies. That may not send a clear message to the Member for Edmonton—Strathcona, but he is so totally committed to defending this deal on the basis of regional differences that he is completely unable to understand the argument in which we are supposed to be engaged right now, that being the question of whether or not this legislation should include a territorial definition of Canada.

We have heard a great deal of talk and nonsense, but the only thing we have heard in opposition to the acceptance of this amendment is that it already exists in the Customs Act. I cannot understand why that is a sufficient argument to involve us in two hours of debate when it would be very easy to include that definition in the legislation. If it is such a big deal and is so offensive, why does the Government include a definition of the territory of Canada in the agreement itself? There is a definition of United States territory and Canadian territory in the agreement. Why then do we have only a definition of that of the United States in the Act itself?

Mr. McDermid: To describe the customs area.

Mr. McCurdy: Well then why not also Canada?

Mr. McDermid: We have it in our Customs Act.

Mr. McCurdy: But why not in the legislation itself? That is not a sufficient argument to reject this amendment and to waste the time of the House in this fashion. One has to become just a little suspicious of all this haranguing, this pettiness, this meanness, and this intellectual dishonesty over a trivial amendment which, as the Parliamentary Secretary says, would change not a thing. One must get suspicious. Is it that there is a danger that providing a definition of Canada might somehow offend the Americans? Certainly this deal has been contrived in most ways not to offend the Americans.

This definition is not really what is at issue here. The definition suggested in the amendment comes essentially from the agreement which says: "—Canada, the territory to which its customs laws apply, including any areas beyond the territorial seas of Canada within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, Canada may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and their natural resources—".

This definition of Canada is not what is at issue here. There is a definition of Canada which, it seems to me, we ought to attend. Even this territorial definition draws attention to the fact that this agreement is an attack on the very definition of Canada as the people of this country understand. At issue here is not this customs definition of Canada but a definition of Canada as the most civilized, humane, and generous country in the world, a country that is not devoted to the market forces as the motivator of what we are and what we shall be but a country that recognizes that social justice is the very meat of our existence.

Nobody ever said that violence in Canada is as Canadian as maple sugar. We are a different country. We have vast resources that this deal would sell off. We have the highest percentage of foreign ownership which we would expand. We have considerable comparable advantages which we could exploit, but by this deal will not be able to. We are a country that can mobilize its financial resources to build a new future but we give even the control of our financial resources away.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would love to listen to the Hon. Member but his time has expired.

• (1910)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The question is on Motion No. 1 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next grouping is on Motions Nos. 5, 6 and 8.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry) moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-130 be amended by deleting Clause 3.

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-130 be amended by deleting Clause 4.

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-130 be amended by deleting Clause 6.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the 10 minutes which we are allowed at report stage is not sufficient time to do justice to these very important amendments on critical clauses of the Bill. I will use the 10 minutes to make two very crucial points.

The first concerns the stated purpose of the Bill.

The purpose we see in the legislation and the reason we are asking for its deletion has nothing to do with the Bill itself. The purpose outlined in Bill C-130 is not the reason why the Bill was introduced or why the trade agreement was started, and certainly has nothing to do with the kind of legislation before us.

This afternoon, the Member from Calgary said that this got started with a royal commission. Of course, that is not true. When one looks at the record, the proposal for the free trade agreement began in 1983 with some private meetings with the Ambassador from the United States in Ottawa, Mr. Robinson, and key members of the business community. They began to discuss why Canada should no longer be allowed to introduce such things as a National Energy Program or provide for policies that would conserve our own resources for our own purposes.

The real purpose of this Bill has very little to do with trade and is much more concerned with the economic agenda of the coalition of neo-conservative forces in this country who do not like the idea that Government itself can be a constructive contributor to making policies on behalf of Canadians.

What we are debating is the agenda of the republican party of the north. We are seeing the swan song of President Reagan

tonight in New Orleans. We are seeing the swan song of the neo-conservatives around the world. However, they want to leave a legacy of prohibition for any future progressive forces to introduce initiatives or policies on behalf of government that would overtake the kind of mean-spirited actions that we have seen so much of in the last five or six years.

When we recognize that this legislation limits the right of Canadians to make choices about the kind of investment they will have in Canada, we see that it has nothing to do with trade. It concerns the free flow of capital of the large companies and large corporations that do not want to recognize nationality or citizenship of Canadians. They simply want free rein to invest where and how they wish.

That is the real purpose of the Bill. It is to ensure that there will be this kind of open door investment policy. We have seen what will happen as a result. Last week, the Petroleum Monitoring Agency, an agency of the Government itself, indicated that the level of ownership in the energy field is falling drastically. Canadians are far less able to own their own energy resources this year than they were the year before or the year before that. The reason is the immense number of takeovers and acquisitions, $33 billion worth in the last four years under the Tory Government. There were 433 applications, not one of which was turned down. Yet the Government will loosen the rules even further. That is the purpose of the legislation.

It is stated that the purpose is somehow to try to use this agreement and the legislation as a way of encouraging more multilateral trade. That is bunkum. This legislation is creating a preferential North American discriminatory trade bloc that breaks every precedent and historical rule this country has attempted to follow in order to establish an international trading system that treats all nations the same and does not discriminate against nations, large or small. We have fought for that since 1948 and the inception of GATT. Various Liberal Governments have seen that the real interest of Canada lies in a system that is fair and equitable. This agreement does the opposite. It implements an agreement that discriminates against other countries.

Mr. Crofton: What about the Auto Pact?

Mr. Axworthy: Let us talk about the Auto Pact. According to the Auto Pact that we signed, other countries can join in. Under the agreement, they keep other countries out. A Korean or Japanese automobile manufacturer is grandfathered out of this agreement. They cannot get in under these tariff rearrangements. They are locking it up to preserve the status quo.

Members of the Conservative Party say that this represents great, open competition, except that an automobile manufacturer from Asia will not be allowed to have the same rules as those that apply to an automobile manufacturer owned by an American company.

This kind of discriminatory system is being created in North America in energy. We are giving the Americans full access to our resources, which is what they want. If we refer back to 1952 in President Eisenhower's days, and the Paley Commission report, the No. 1 strategic objective of the United States was to get secure access to Canadian resources. It took until 1988 and the Government of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) to get that. They had to wait until the election of 1984 of a republican Party in Canada to get that security of access. That is the hidden agenda and underlying objective of the Bill. It has nothing to do with opening up markets.

The fact is that it closes down markets in areas and allows that kind of discrimination. It will certainly be one of the most serious roadblocks on the way to important international development in making Canada an effective international trader. That is one reason for my amendment.

The second reason deals with the important Clause 6. It concerns the unilateral assertion by the Government to take over powers in provincial jurisdiction as a consequence of the trade agreement. We know that the Americans have made conditional on accepting the agreement with the letters they want to exchange on December 15, that the Government of Canada ensure that it can provide compliance with all parts of the agreement. In order to do that the Government needs a clause in the Bill that will give it a big stick against the provinces. That is the reason for Clause 6.

Clause 6 runs against the nature of federal-provincial relations as they have evolved since the mid 1930s. At that time there was an important decision in an international labour case whereby the judicial council decided that in any international agreement that affects a provincial jurisdiction, the provincial government has the right to ratify in those jurisdictions. That decision has been followed since that time. There have been countless Acts of the United Nations, charters, covenants on women's rights and labour rights in which provincial rights were affected and the provinces had the right to ratify. They did not become agreements until the provinces did so.

The present Government is asserting that that is no longer necessary. It is changing the fundamental premise of federal-provincial relations unilaterally. If that is what the Government wants to do, that is its business. Perhaps we could evolve constitutionally. But it should not be done as a consequence of a trade agreement with the United States. It should not be done simply by asserting so in federal legislation. It should be done by the proper Canadian means of consultation and discussion and negotiation with the province. In fact, what Clause 6 does is to provide a third partner at the constitutional table; the provinces, the federal Government of Canada, and the Government of the United States. That is what it really does.

• (1920)

An Hon. Member: What nonsense.

Mr. Axworthy: All of a sudden we are now being required, under Clause 6, to ensure compliance. As a result, we break those precedents.

That is why we believe that this is a clause which fundamentally undermines the basic kind of Canadian identity and integrity. When we argue that this is a debate about Canadian independence, Canadian integrity, Canadian rights-to-choose-for-themselves, there is no clearer case of this Government kowtowing, getting on its knees to the sacrifice of this agreement, than Clause 6, because they are prepared to overturn 50 years of precedent, to go against all the sacred precedents that the Prime Minister talked about, that we are going to have better relations with the provinces, that it is going to be cordial conciliation, time and to make this kind of assertion. That is why we think it is wrong.

We do not believe that the federal Government has the right, in legislation such as this, to make that kind of unilateral assertion of new power. If they want to make the case, fine. Go to a federal-provincial meeting, put your case out. Let us have it debated and discussed. Let us see what kind of reaction we get. Let us get an open kind of examination of these requirements. But let us not do it on the basis that simply because the federal Government says so, it is right. That is the full arrogance of the majority, the full arrogance of the abuse of power. It is the reason why we have a federal system, to provide some checks and balances in Canada.

This Government has compromised, appeased, in so many ways, at so many times, in so many essential ingredients of Canada, for the sake of getting this God-forsaken Bill through, it is impossible to count how many times. What it adds up to is once again the kind of fundamental surrender of Canadians' rights of ways of doing things the way we want to do them.

We are allowing ourselves to be taken over, to be guided by a whole new set of principles that may be acceptable to Americans—and that is their business—to make those choices, but they should not be incorporated, insinuated into Canada by this kind of legislation.

When Hon. Members say, "Well, this is just a little trade agreement, commercial arrangement", we point to Clauses 6 and 7. That is not a commercial arrangement. That is a whole new declaration of federal-provincial relations. It has no place in this Bill. If it is going to be done, it should be done in the proper, honourable, respectable, responsible way, and that is to do it in concert, in communion with provinces. That is the Canadian way of doing things, not the republican Party way of doing things. But unfortunately, we have the republican Party of the north in power for a short time. They do not understand the difference.

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I want to say first to this House that these are useful amendments which have been put before us, because they permit us to debate what the purpose of this whole exercise actually is. The first motion, Motion No. 5, would attempt to delete the clause in which the purpose of this Bill is outlined. It is exactly the same purpose which is in the free trade agreement itself. It is an outline of purposes which includes within it the falsehoods and statements which take us in a direction which this Government, before its election, never committed itself to, which this Government, in its own legislation, never committed this country to, and yet, these are the purposes for which this Bill is moved, that this agreement is entered into.

The first purpose is an easy one; it is to eliminate barriers to trade and goods and services between Canada and the United States, to get rid of tariffs, non-tariff barriers, if possible. But notice that it deals with services for the first time that any significant trade agreement has dealt with services. Notice, too, that the United States is far and away the most dominant and powerful exporter and monopolizer of the service sector in the world, so much so that in fact within GATT many Third World countries have very strongly resisted the United States push to make services part of the GATT arrangements among trade in the countries. But not us. We do not hesitate, despite a massive deficit with respect to services, despite the fact that the United States does far, far better exporting services to us than we do exporting services to them. We say, "No, open sesame, we are going to provide you free entry to the service sector of our country".

The second purpose is to believe that we are not facilitating conditions of fair competition within the free trade area established by the agreement, fair competition between a country which, on the one side, has committed itself to a social safety net which will protect its people, has committed itself to a broadening of that social safety net, as recently as the announcements made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp), with respect to day care, and yet, on the other side, we have a country where things that we take completely for granted, like medicare, are considered by the present President of the United States to be so out of bounds that they make the advocacy of medicare by Michael Dukakis a danger to the future of the United States.

At the same time, this country with which we are entering into fair competition has dozens of states with right-to-work laws, laws that, under that label, effectively make it almost impossible for trade unions to operate effectively; a country in which it is possible to import goods duty free, from the Maquiladora free trade zone in Mexico in which people receive as wages under a dollar a day, and to have those included as part of the American product which is sold throughout the United States, that is the fair competition which we will face. Minimum wages, far, far lower than the minimum wages that we have here in our country, that is the fair competition that we will face.

• (1930)

It is no wonder that the workers, the companies, the communities in my constituency look at this trade deal and say: "We will be hosed in that kind of unfair competition".

Thus in fact the purpose of this measure is not to establish conditions of fair competition.

At least the next clause is honest. It states that we will liberalize significantly conditions for investment in that free trade area. I say to Hon. Members, watch here, too, that we are not talking just about trade. We are not talking just about tariffs, as the Government likes to pretend. We are talking here about investment, investment which not we but the Conservative Government felt in its Investment Canada Act had to be protected from takeover by American companies. Any Canadian company which has assets over $5 million has to go through a review process. In that review process it can be asked to make a commitment to the community in which it is taking over a company.

I warn Conservative back-benchers what they will face. What will happen under this trade deal is what has begun to happen already in various towns and cities which are starting to gear up for the trade deal. Canadian companies will be taken over. They will be shut down. Jobs will be lost. We in Canada will be served as a market by the United States parent company which will buy out the Canadian firm and shut it down. It has begun to happen already. It will happen on a far broader basis in the future. The consequence for Canadians will be catastrophic.

Finally, there is the suggestion that this measure will lay the foundation for multilateral co-operation to expand and enhance the benefits of the agreement. I have to say to Members of the House that those people to whom I talked at the start of this GATT round in Punta del Este, Uruguay, in 1986 were, without exception when they could speak off the record, terrified of what was happening in North America. They were terrified by the fact that we are leading ourselves in the direction of yet another powerful trade bloc which would discriminate against the rest of the world.

I think that the motion on purposes should be rejected. I think, too, that the motion with respect to the unilateral right of the federal Government to take action to enforce its commitment to the agreement on the provinces should be eliminated, otherwise we will not have a federal system. We will have a system in which the provinces and the federal Government will have a fair share in this country of ours.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Motion No. 6 which would delete Clause 4 one is guided by a number of observations and conclusions that have been made in the course of the last few months, particularly those made in committee. In choosing between the wealth of analyses and studies that have been conducted, very few documents have struck me so much for their relevance and precision as well as their objective source as the document which I will use in the next few minutes. I refer to the one produced by the Attorney General for Ontario dated May, 1988. It is entitled: "The Impact of the Canada-U.S. Trade Agreement, a Legal Analysis". This is the kind of document which will require a thorough study also on the part of the Tory back-benchers as they approach the next election because they will have to do some pretty hard homework to defend this agreement when they are on the hustings throughout Ontario.

This is what in essence and in very short terms the analysis states. I read from this paper. This paper was not prepared by a member of the Opposition. It was prepared by one of the 10 provincial Governments of Canada, evidently one that has its industrial and economic future at heart, as it should.

It states that under the agreement the United States becomes a third party at the constitutional bargaining table empowered to influence a wide range of vital public policies. This point was made earlier by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) when he said that there is a third party, a comment which was ridiculed by a member opposite. This is a very important observation that comes from a government body. Thus we will have now a third party at the constitutional table from the moment this agreement comes into effect.

Second, the analysis goes on to state that the new role of the United States in the making of Canadian public policy threatens the traditional patterns of compromise that have characterized Canadian federalism. This point does not need to be elaborated upon. We all know what has been the nature until now of federal-provincial relations and how it will be affected from now on after this agreement comes into effect. We will see its impact in future federal-provincial gatherings.

Third, the analysis concludes that the agreement will significantly alter the ability of the provinces to shape their economic and social policies. This is a corner-stone point because it affects not just Ontario but every province in the country. It is central to the nature and the evolution of the country until now. After the agreement comes into effect this alteration and the ability of the provinces to shape their economic and social policies will be felt. We do not know yet to what extent and in what way but we certainly know that it is coming.

Fourth, the analysis observes that the impairment of the policy flexibility of the provinces is so profound that it gives the agreement a constitutional dimension. This is the assessment that was made by the Attorney General for Ontario in May of this year.

Fifth, this analysis observes that provincial matters can be subjected to review and ultimately to United States retaliation without any certain right under the agreement for provinces or private sector interests to be heard or to participate in any way. This also explains why in recent weeks and months we have heard what was originally a very weak and feeble voice. We have heard more and more the voice of small business. This explains why we have heard that voice becoming stronger. It is because somehow the word has gone around. Somehow small business has realized that the agreement has a potential impact on their capacity to continue to survive.

The next point that is being made is to the effect that the agreement impairs provincial policy-making through the undertaking of the federal Government to ensure that all necessary measures are taken to ensure the observance of the agreement, including by the provinces and the municipalities. Enough has been said on that point by colleagues in my Party who have stressed this very point in an eloquent manner.

• (1940)

Following that point, reference is made to the national treatment rule. In general, that rule requires that American business interests be accorded treatment equivalent to that granted to Canadians. Many things are likely to change under this national treatment rule. When there is such a difference in the proportion and relation of strength and size between the United States and Canada, evidently the national treatment rule will go to the advantage of the economy that can muster the largest economic units and the largest economic corporations and, therefore, will be able to enter the neighbouring market with a much greater impact and success than we will be able. We all know of this relationship of roughly one to ten.

The analysis by the Attorney General of Ontario is also interesting because it also goes into the study of the most severe effects on provincial activity. It concludes that provincial activities—and I submit that this will not only be the case for Ontario—will ultimately be felt in a number of areas. The first one raised here is energy. The point is made very briefly. The scope of two-price energy policies as a provincial tool for economic development will be restricted.

We have been saying this, we have heard this from witnesses in committee, and here we see it confirmed through an analysis by the office of the provincial Attorney General. It means the restriction of advantages that we have enjoyed until now as a nation to use the edge that we have through energy prices whereby in the 1970s and until recently we used lower prices for our own domestic purposes. Therefore, we will lose this advantage which was understandably one that we had to use considering the geographic disadvantages in trying to keep an economy such as ours together over such a large geographic area, and also climatically. Sooner or later we were bound to initiate a policy of price differentials on energy. All of a sudden as a result of the weak, short-sighted attitude of the Government we are giving up the natural, highly desirable, and almost essential tool that we have been able to utilize until now.

Second, the impact on provincial activities will be felt on natural resources which, under the agreement, are subject to compulsory sharing. I repeat the word "compulsory" sharing. This is something that has somehow become lost in the perception on the part of the public. They are subject to compulsory sharing with the United States in times of shortage and for which licensing for commercial use and access must be accorded equally to Canadians and Americans. No comment is needed since this is self-explanatory. The fact is that now we are going to share. We will be forced to share regardless of our long-term interests and regardless of our environmental approach to our natural resources which we may want to have, keeping in mind not only the next generation, but the second or third generation. This will be a very serious restriction on our ability to move.

I notice that you are becoming impatient with my time allocation, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I am never impatient with the Hon. Member, but his time has expired.

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, this is the most abhorrent piece of legislation that I have ever had the misfortune to have to speak on in the House. The three amendments before us are very fundamental ones. If these amendments were passed, they would take out the guts of Bill C-130, the Act to implement the free trade deal with the United States. I have no hope whatsoever that Members of the Government who are supporting the trade deal will accept these very reasonable amendments. They are reasonable in the sense of the life of our country and in the sense of what we need to be doing. I do not have much optimism, and I am directing my remarks through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Canadian people.

Here we are in August. We are debating late at night at a time when the House is normally suspended in order that we can spend time in our constituencies. We are debating an issue which the Government has no mandate to be dealing with, an issue which is complex, which is disturbing Canadians, which Canadians want to have an election on, and which Canadians want to understand. Some Canadians are very open to the idea. They are very open to the principles of the trade deal because they want to see lower tariffs and what they consider to be economic rationality.

However, the actual details of the Bill and the substance of the agreement are not well known because the Government has deceived the people of Canada by putting out a glossy PR approach on the subject and by making it look a purely economic matter when in fact it is a constitutional change that will change the life of our country forever if it is allowed to go through. It is a constitutional amendment because it is binding on future Governments. Some of the very clauses that are up for amendment are binding on the future.

First, I wish to deal with Clause 3. The purpose of the amendment is that the whole clause be deleted. It is the general purpose clause of the Bill and it states:

> 3. The purpose of this Act is to implement the Agreement, the objectives of which are to
>
> (a) eliminate barriers to trade in goods and services between Canada and the United States;

Precious little study was done of services before the deal was hastily rushed through by a government with no mandate whatsoever. We have not seen any Conservative bolting on this issue. People who, before the last election, were against trade, people who never said a word against their Prime Minister

(Mr. Mulroney) when he was against trade, are suddenly standing up in the House and defending a deal on which they never talked to the voters of Canada and for which they did not get elected themselves.

Clause 3(b) states:

> (b) facilitate conditions of fair competition within the free-trade area established by the Agreement;

What is fair competition? This is absolutely central to the whole issue. What is fair and what is unfair, and to what extent will Canada be exempt? We know that Canada will not be exempt from unfair trade practice complaints in the United States. What is fair in terms of our social programs? Constantly we have been told that social programs were not on the bargaining table, and yet there is a section in the deal that states that subsidies are one thing that will be negotiated in the next five to seven years. We could then find out, far too late, that our social programs have been negotiated away because they are going to be treated as unfair subsidies.

This clause talks about "fair competition". What about our programs to promote regional development and create jobs in any particular region? We talk about facilitating conditions of fair competition, but we do not have definitions as to what is fair competition. It is not clear whether or not regional programs will be included. That has been left for negotiations later.

The Government is selling out the country, and some of the worst aspects of the deal are the unknown aspects. It is being left up to a process in which we have very little chance to be successful, and leaving it up to a process where two countries will be negotiating, one ten times the size of the other. At a later stage it would be very hard to pull out of it if there is going to be retaliation after we get well into this deal.

• (1950)

We have these crucial decisions left until later. There is talk about fair competition, Mr. Speaker. But there is no definition as to what constitutes fair competition. The question as to what competition will be fair is begged entirely in this deal. What is fair when you have a system with large multinational corporations in the United States that are well established, for whom it would be a very simple matter to extend their production to fill the entire Canadian market? They already have established brand names and dealerships. It will be very easy for them to add a night shift on Tuesday night through which they could fill the entire Canadian market. Our Conservative colleagues say, "Canadians can do the same thing. Canadian corporations will have fair competition and can enter the United States". But you have a company that is very much smaller that does not have a well known international brand name, that does not have a system of dealerships, that would require enormous capital to begin to advertise and do the kind of research and development necessary to hit that new market. This is totally naive.

Mr. McDermid: What a wimpish attitude. You are knocking Canadian entrepreneurs.

Ms. McDonald: This is a Government that does not look at how these decisions are made. Canadian entrepreneurship is not being knocked here. What is being knocked is a deal that is a sell-out. If the Hon. Member were a real believer in the trade deal, why didn't he say so in the last election? Why wasn't he honest about all the aspects of this deal? Why didn't he admit to Canadians that water was in the deal?

Mr. McDermid: It is not in the deal, that is why.

Ms. McDonald: What about our cultural independence? We all know that water is in the deal by virtue of being a good under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The Government itself is beginning to admit that it has deceived Canadians by raising this totally false statement that it is only bottled water that is in the deal and not our fresh water. We are committed in this deal to share our most precious natural resource, water.

Mr. McDermid: That is not true. Tell the truth.

Ms. McDonald: It is indeed true.

Mrs. Sparrow: It is not true.

Ms. McDonald: It is very clear in the agreement that water is a good under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and all goods are included in the requirement to export.

Mr. McDermid: Totally wrong.

Ms. McDonald: This is a totally new kind of agreement. Nothing in the world gives away that much in any kind of arrangement which is sold as being a trading arrangement.

Mr. McDermid: Your credibility is falling.

Ms. McDonald: This is not a trading arrangement but a sell-out of our most precious natural resources, including water and our non-renewable resources of oil and gas. This is a shameful sell out of Canadian sovereignty and Canadian natural resources by a Government and a Party that is looking at the cheapest of short-term advantages, advantages from corporations that are making money off the top but are not interested in the long-term development of the country and not interested in long-term job creation or stewardship of the environment or in keeping any of these resources for ongoing use for other people.

In clause 3(d), we read:

> establish effective procedures for the joint administration of the Agreement and the resolution of disputes

What a laugh those effective procedures are! There will be a dispute settlement mechanism. Ultimately a dispute will go to a commission which is made up of the United States and Canada trade ministers. They will work on the basis of consensus. What kind of consensus will it be when there are

two partners, one of which is ten times the size of the other? What a preposterous suggestion that we will have any kind of fair or effective dispute settlement mechanism.

I have one minute in which to finish dealing with the substance of an extremely important matter, a matter on which Canadians want the Government to level with them, want to understand and want to know what is happening.

Let me refer to clause 3(e) which reads:

> lay the foundation for further bilateral and multilateral co-operation to expand and enhance the benefits of the Agreement

The benefits for whom? This is a one-sided agreement. It is a sell-out agreement. The Government wants further co-operation to sell out the few areas which have so far not been exempted, the cultural area, the investment area and so forth. This is a travesty, Mr. Speaker. The Government ought to be ashamed of itself. I can assure you that we will continue to be speaking to these amendments to this trade deal which is a sell-out of our country.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to speak on these three amendments, Motions Nos. 5, 6 and 8. I want to concentrate especially on Motion No. 8 which proposes to eliminate Clause 6 in the Bill.

The Tories when they were in opposition always talked about the importance of respecting the rights and responsibility of provincial Governments. They waxed eloquent about it in the 1980 and 1984 elections and about how the resources belonged to the provinces. Yet clause 6 in the Bill is designed for the federal Government to override all kinds of provincial jurisdiction. The Government will have a chance to do this with legislation which has been brought into the Ontario Legislature which will be passed and which provides for adjustment for the wine industry over a twelve-year period. We will see if this Bill is ever implemented, and I do not believe it will be—but if it were to be implemented at some time in the future, the Government of Canada will have to write regulations to override the power of the provincial Government to implement its schedules, costs and pricing of provincial wines. We will see Clause 6 eventually before the Supreme Court of Canada if this Bill ever becomes the law of the land.

If we look at what the Government has done to the grape and wine industry, it is so typical of the whole trade deal because the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said in 1983 that he was not in favour of free trade, that you would hear no more from him about it, yet here we have the most massive sell-out of our country in this trade deal in 100 years. It is interesting that about three weeks before the deal was signed in early October, 1987, the then Minister of International Trade—we have been through about three of them and I understand we are getting ready for another one fairly soon because the current Minister is not impressing anybody with his lack of knowledge of the deal—sent a letter to the grape producers in British Columbia saying that the Government realized the grape and wine industry, if it were ever to be brought under the purview of this Prime Minister's trade deal, would require a 10 or 12 year adjustment period. Yet three weeks after that letter was sent, a deal was signed. Essentially the industry is put out of business because 50 per cent of the advantageous pricing is wiped out in the first 12 months of the deal, that is, January 1, 1989 to January 1, 1990.

This comes only three or four months after the Minister had given us a pledge and signed a letter that she realized there would have to be a 10 or 12 year adjustment period. The Ontario Government is providing an adjustment period. However, the B.C. Government has jumped on the bandwagon. Its Premier loves to jump on any bandwagon that is going through town, and B.C. is wiping out the advantages to B.C. wine growers almost immediately.

We have Clause 6 which will eventually, if this agreement is ever implemented, result in regulations being written against the Province of Ontario and against any other province. We hear some of the western Tory Premiers saying, "It is okay. We want the deal in". It is interesting to hear the Premier of Saskatchewan say that. Most of his province does not want the deal. He has spent millions of dollars running around the Province saying what a wonderful deal this is and holding public information meetings. Yet the recent Environics poll showed that Saskatchewan has the strongest opposition of any province in the country to the deal.

• (2000)

Some 50 per cent are opposed and very strongly opposed to it. Less than 30 per cent are in favour of the deal. I predict that if Clause 6 were ever implemented and regulations were written to override provincial jurisdictions, whether in the service sector, the energy sector or any other sector the Government would negotiate during the five or six-year negotiation period, then we would hear the screams, yells and catcalls from people like the Premier of Saskatchewan and the Premier of Alberta.

This is a very Draconian measure. The Government wanted to go ahead with this. Obviously it was a deal made at the Québec summit between the Prime Minister and the President. The President of the United States had made a deal with the grape growers and wine producers of California to allow their low priced grapes into Canada.

The Prime Minister seems to delight in pleasing the President of the United States, whether by sacrificing the grape growers and wine producers or by satisfying rich bagmen in the drug industry. He says: "If you want our energy, come and get it. We will guarantee it to you for all times, in perpetuity, and at our prices. We will guarantee you the share you have had for the last three years, so get your share up to 50 per cent. Regardless of what happens, if we have shortages, we will tough it out because that is what the deal says". It is a deal made in heaven for the United States. It has been trying to get our resources for years and years.

We believe in selling resources on a trade basis. We have lumber to sell, although we have to put an export tax on it. That is another cave-in the Government agreed to. That one almost slipped my mind. Why can we not do this on a trade basis? We will process resources to their highest limit and then sell them at an agreed on price. However, under this deal, we do not agree to sell electricity to New York at New York prices. We agree to sell electricity to New York at the Canadian price. It is an incredible arrangement.

I hope there will be an election so that we can talk to the Canadian people. There has been no opportunity for public hearings. I had the opportunity to go across the country for five days and to visit five provinces last December before the deal was signed, and I do not think Canadians will buy it. As a matter of fact, the most recent Environics poll showed that some 40 per cent were opposed to it and only 38 per cent in favour. Of those who are in favour of it, only 8 per cent or 10 per cent are strongly in favour of it, whereas those who are opposed are strongly opposed to it because it is a bad deal.

I do not think anyone in the House is opposed to reducing tariffs. That has been happening for the last 40 years. That is what will happen during the Uruguay Round in Geneva or through other arrangements. It is the giving away of resources and of control over foreign investment that is so repulsive about this deal.

Clause 6 provides the hammer that will make sure that provincial Governments comply with the deal and with the federal Government's wishes, whether they want to or not. That is why we propose to eliminate it.

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, these amendments go to the heart of what this agreement is all about. These amendments, if passed, would give us some control over what will happen in the future.

National treatment and its implications could be the real sleeper in this agreement. If we read the agreement carefully, we will recognize that it has gone further than the European Common Market has been able to go in the past 28 years. From now on, Canadians will have to treat Americans the same way they treat each other, and vice versa. In many ways, that can be a positive thing and I would like to take a moment to see what is positive about it and what is negative about it.

It is good to attempt to treat each other in the same way we would like to be treated, but I do not think it is good that another country would force its value system on us. That is where my concerns lie.

For many years, we have made major investments to attempt to focus on an east-west country. Certainly most of our population resides in a strip along the southern part of Canada. We have worked against natural forces to develop our trade and our two founding cultures. We have struggled hard in a geographically northern society to make a country that I would like to think we are all proud of.

If we limit our ability to have provincial and national economic strategies, as this agreement does, we would weaken our ability to strengthen ourselves from the East to the West. I have been involved in economic development committees over the years that have looked at increasing Canadian content with conditions we felt were good for the communities in which we were working. We did this with some success right across Canada. This Bill is now giving the federal Government the power to override many of the things the provinces would choose to do, things that the provinces, with their knowledge of their own communities, will not be able to do any longer. I think that is a real tragedy.

Going into the 21st century, we should not attempt to do things individually. I do not think that Government, labour or business should attempt to go it alone. We need to have a collective of co-operation if we really want to strengthen the economy and the future of Canada.

I do not think we have done a particularly good job in economic planning, but more and more, as we have matured, we have recognized that there are certain things we do well on which we want to build and there are certain skills we want to develop. As the Hon. Member who spoke previously said, we have these riches which are God-given riches. We have done nothing to obtain them, they happen to be part of the country in which we live. We should use those resources with respect to ecology and without using them as a trading element. Our resources are not things another country can help itself to.

Something many people have not said in the debate on the trade agreement is that the stronger we become as a country, the stronger our friendship with the United States will be. The resentments will not grow. With Clause 8, we will be able to pass laws that will tell the provinces what they cannot do if it is not in concert with the trade agreement with the United States. What you do is build up an awful lot of resentment.

• (2010)

A lot of people feel if only they had some power to take control over their own economy, their own future, they would be able to do things differently. This is not necessarily always right. Sometimes it is perception rather than reality. However, as soon as you take from people the ability to make their own decisions, then their creativity and productivity, all those things that bring people together to make for a strong community, are diminished. I have not heard people discussing that but it is very real.

We have heard about the polarization of the East and West and the centre of Canada. If you want to see polarization in the future, get this agreement on its way. I think some of the Premiers are swallowing hard as they say we have to do this to get the agreement. It seems to me that agreements made on these terms are not good agreements. If we want a good agreement, it has to be discussed, not rushed through. We need to have a sense of confidence in our nationhood, where we are

going and what we are doing. Certainly that is not happening here.

People on the street are saying they would like to know more about it. Certainly the politicians have diverse views about it. They have very different concepts of what it will do to this country. Most of all, there is a lack of trust out there. I think it is a real disgrace that the American people have had an opportunity to discuss and go through this agreement in its final form but we have not. I do not think that is the kind of agreement that we want to enter into.

The amendments in front of us now would help get rid of many of the things in this agreement which make us subservient to another nation.

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this amendment because it is a very crucial one with respect to federal-provincial relations. Motion No. 8 would eliminate Clause 6 in the Bill which says:

> For greater certainty, nothing in this Act, by specific mention or omission, limits in any manner the right of Parliament to enact legislation to implement any provision of the Agreement or fulfil any of the obligations of the Government of Canada under the Agreement.

What this really means is that the Conservative Government is attempting to grab all present and future federal authority necessary to carry out this agreement. That would upset, and this is the key, the traditional federal-provincial government balance deliberately developed in Canada.

I want to put a little bit of history on the record tonight because I think it is important at this time that Members opposite understand what happened prior to the 1926 election. There was a great debate at that time because the King Government brought in a Bill which would have put in place the first old age pension. The Bill passed this House under the Liberal Government and went to the Senate. It is rather interesting to learn what happened to it in the Senate in view of the great cries and screams from Conservative Members of Parliament across this country about the Senate and its interference with Bill C-130.

Do you know what happened to that Bill after passing this House of elected Members representing people across the country? The Conservative dominated Senate of the day defeated the first old age pension Bill ever introduced in Parliament. Today they are saying what a horrendous thing it is that the Senate should interfere with the trade Bill. The Senate is not interfering with it. It is not going to defeat it as the Tory dominated Senate defeated the first old age pension Bill prior to the 1926 election. The Senate will pass it on to the people of Canada and let them decide in a national election.

There is a big difference, but all we heard is this bleating and crying from the government benches about what a horrendous thing it is that the Senate is even thinking about not passing this Bill. They should remember history. It was a Tory dominated Senate at that time and they did not let it go to the people to decide. They defeated the first old age pension Bill ever introduced and passed by this House.

Mr. McDermid: What scoundrels.

Mr. Hopkins: Let the Tory Members opposite remember that as they travel around the country bleating and crying about what may very well happen to their trade Bill.

Just imagine, isn't it terrible that the people of Canada are going to have a say in the future of their country? Isn't it terrible to think that this trade Bill should go to the people of Canada where they can decide because they have lost confidence in the Government to decide for them?

At the time that old age pension Bill was introduced the cry in the Senate was, number one, the country could not afford it. Interesting enough, they also said it interfered with provincial jurisdiction. What we are doing here in eliminating Clause 6 is eliminating the interference with provincial jurisdiction. I say to my Tory friends across the way, if it was right for your Tory friends to say that about federal-provincial jurisdiction in 1926, how come you are denying the Senate that right today? How come you are denying the provinces their jurisdiction today by passing this Bill?

Mr. McDermid: We are not.

Mr. Hopkins: You are doing it in tax measures with respect to the wine growers in various provinces.

Mr. McDermid: That is wrong, too.

Mr. Hopkins: In addition, the U.S. wants our resources. There is no question about that. The Government is willing to give away anything to get an agreement, but everyone in this House and across the country fully realizes that many of our resources are under the jurisdiction of the provinces. That does not bother the Government. It will trample over federal-provincial relations. As the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) said a few minutes ago, we well remember when we were sitting in government listening to the screaming and shouting from the opposition benches, from the very Members who are sitting over in the Government today, saying that the Government of the day was interfering with provincial jurisdiction. Well, people change their minds when they cross the floor.

• (2020)

They are not only interested in giving away our resources. They are giving away our sovereignty through this legislation. They are giving away our energy, a major resource of this country, and giving away foreign investment. There is no question that the Government is giving away foreign investment rights. In fact, it gave them away before it even introduced this legislation because it destroyed the foreign investment review legislation.

The Government is not worrying about provincial jurisdiction. It is going to try to buy off the provinces in the best way

it can, but many of the provinces are not going to go along with that. Tory Governments are more interested in dollars than they are in Canadians.

It is very revealing that the Government wants to ram this legislation through both Houses of Parliament. It will make every effort possible to do so but never wants this trade package to go to the Canadian people for a vote. What is wrong with the Government? Is it afraid of democracy? Why all the crying and worrying about the Senate not passing the Bill? If the Senate does not pass it, it will go the country and we will have an election on it.

Government Members ask how we can do that when dealing with provincial jurisdiction. That is very easy for Tory mentality. Do you know what happened after Mackenzie King won the 1926 election?

Mr. McDermid: Remind us.

Mr. Hopkins: I am not reminding the Member, I am teaching him because he obviously does not know what he is talking about. The fact is that for some strange reason it suddenly did not become provincial jurisdiction and the Tory-dominated Senate voted in favour of the old age pension Bill after 1926. It was introduced again by Mackenzie King and went through the House of Commons and the Senate. If that was a constitutional inaccuracy in 1925 why was it not so in 1926? That is so because we have Tory governments that are only interested in their interests of the moment. They do not look at the long-term interests of the country. As my friend, the Hon. Member for Algoma said, they are interested in giving the country away.

They do not want to do anything to make any disturbance in Washington. My goodness, that would be terrible, that would ruin the Prime Minister's (Mr. Mulroney) record. His friend is about to leave the American scene and he is about to leave the Canadian scene, so what is the difference? We will then be back to a state of sanity. In that situation the true democracy of this country will come forward and the Canadian people will have an opportunity to vote on issues. Let the people decide.

Mrs. Sparrow: How much voting did we do on the energy Bill?

Mr. McDermid: Remember wage and price controls.

Mr. Hopkins: I love this, Mr. Speaker. I am getting my message across. The Prime Minister was so much against this deal in 1983. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) laughed at the present Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) because the Minister for International Trade was in favour of this in 1983. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance laughed at him during the leadership race, but he was the only one who was telling the truth. The only thing is that not only Tories but every Canadian in the country is now laughing at the Minister for International Trade. He never read the agreement to start with.

Let us start protecting the Constitution of Canada and recognizing that this legislation does in fact affect provincial jurisdiction. Let the old age pension Bill prior to the 1926 election and after be a history lesson to my hon. friends opposite. They defeated the first old age pension Bill in Canada. They are now saying that they were elected to do this. They were not elected to bring in a trade deal such as this because it was not in their platform during the last election campaign. They do not have a mandate from the Canadian people to do this.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chance to participate at this stage of the debate. We are now debating Motion No. 5 which identifies a number of clauses in the trade deal which we believe ought to be abandoned. At the top of the list is the fact that this trade deal allows almost unrestricted foreign investment from the United States in Canada.

I want to begin by posing a couple of questions. Do Members realize that the western industrialized nation with more foreign ownership and more foreign control of its economy than virtually any other is Canada? Canada has more foreign ownership and more foreign control of its economy than any western industrialized nation with the exception of Belgium.

To what extent does that foreign ownership exist? Fifty per cent of the industrial sector of our economy is foreign controlled or foreign owned. If you take out the financial sector, Canadian banks, you find that 35 per cent of our economy is foreign owned and foreign controlled. Should that cause us any concern?

We know that the Japanese are worried about the amount of foreign ownership of their economy. Three per cent of the Japanese economy is foreign owned and that causes them concern in a number of sectors. They believe that it is bad to have too much foreign investment because there are then people outside the country making decisions about their future.

More and more decisions regarding the future of our children and our children's children are being made not in Vancouver, Toronto, Calgary, or Montreal, but in Tokyo, Dallas, Amarillo, Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, and Hamburg. That must cause Canadians some concern.

What about our friends in the United States on the other side of the trade equation we are debating tonight? Four per cent of the American economy is foreign owned. The United States Congress had a special debate a few weeks ago about the serious concerns in the United States because foreign ownership has reached 4 per cent. If there was 35 per cent foreign ownership of the economy of the United States there would be a major revolt in the country.

Yet the response of the Government of Canada, realizing that 50 per cent of our industrial sector is foreign owned and 35 per cent of our entire economy is foreign owned, is to ask for more foreign ownership. In fact, the Government wants to open the floodgates and tell the United States that Canada is

open season, that Americans can come into Canada and buy anything they want. As a matter of fact, the Government will only ask questions when the deal is worth more than $150 million.

Investment Canada is supposed to be keeping an eye on foreign investment coming into Canada. Yet, the Government has not turned down a single request for investment. People say that a country needs foreign investment. However, what has foreign investment done in the four years that this Government has been in power? Has it developed new plants, new factories, new mines, or new mills? No, 95 per cent of all the foreign investment that has come into Canada in the last four years has been to take over existing Canadian companies. Over 3,000 companies that were Canadian companies before the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) came into office are now owned and operated by foreigners.

• (2030)

That must be of concern to us. Yet the Conservatives want even more foreign ownership of our economy and more foreign ownership of Canadian companies. Ninety-five per cent of the takeovers were not for new plant or new jobs. Let us talk about new jobs.

Mr. McDermid: Tell us about Oshawa.

Mr. Riis: A recent study by Statistics Canada asked how many jobs are created from a billion dollars in profits by Canadian companies versus American companies. The results are absolutely staggering. After a billion dollars in profits from Canadian corporations, the number of jobs created on average are 5,700. How about American companies? With a billion dollars in profits generated by American companies, 17 jobs are created. That is 17 jobs versus 5,700, and we wonder why there are still problems with unemployment in our country.

The Government wants more foreign control and foreign ownership. It wants more and more of the decisions about our future in Canada to be made in Dallas, Texas. I say that is wrong for the best interests of our country.

It has also been stated that this agreement will be good for consumers. According to the *Canadian Consumer* magazine, the price of a Plymouth Caravel four-door basic car in Canada is $13,740. In the United States, that same car is priced at $10,659. If the exchange rate of $1.20 is added, it adds $2,132 to the price. When one adds the 12 per cent federal sales tax, it comes to $1,535. The U.S. car now costs $14,326 in Canadian funds. That same car, north of the border compared to south of the border, is actually more expensive when one factors in the exchange rate and 12 per cent federal tax. Yet I have heard cabinet Ministers state that consumers will benefit from this deal. There is the evidence, and anyone can stand up to refute it, if they want, but it is plain that in terms of benefits coming to consumers, the Government is again in error.

This is a good motion because we must provide some limitation to the amount of foreign control of our economy. Our country, with the exception of Belgium, has more foreign control and ownership of its economy than any other in the industrialized world. We should be doing something about that.

We should be doing something to build in more Canadian ownership so that Canadians make the decisions about our country's future, not foreigners. But the Government's answer to the amount of foreign ownership is to open the floodgates and tell American investors that they can come into Canada to buy any Canadian business they want with no questions asked, no expectations, no requirements, nothing. That is not what we want in Canada's future. That is not we want in this trade deal. That is why we have offered Motion No. 5 as a way to deal with the situation.

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with debate on Motions Nos. 5, 6 and 8, which will be all the object of separate votes.

Motion No. 5 seeks to delete Clause 3, which states the purpose of the Bill. That is particularly interesting because it misstates the purpose of the Bill completely. I will deal with clause 3(a)(b)(c)(d) and (e) separately, but 3(d) and 3(e) are especially inaccurate and misleading. The agreement would not establish effective bilateral dispute resolution and administrative procedures and does not lay the foundation for further bilateral and multilateral co-operation. Instead, it will perpetuate the creation of regional trading blocs around the world, which will only reduce over-all world trade.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take each of these arguments in turn. Starting with clause 3 of the Bill, I read:

> The purpose of this Act is to implement the Agreement, the objectives of which are to
>
> (a) eliminate barriers to trade in goods and services between Canada and the United States;

Mr. Speaker, we know that we gave a lot to get very little. The dual objective that the Mulroney Government set of facilitating Canadian access to the American market in future will be reached, if at all, at the cost of Canada's sovereignty over its own institutions. I have in front of me a quote from former Finance and External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp, who said, and I quote, "By signing this bilateral agreement, we would be telling the whole world that we no longer intend to resist this continental attraction and we would thereby bring about the Americanization of Canada."

Mr. Speaker, paragraph (a) says

> eliminate barriers to trade in goods and services . . .

Mr. Speaker, for both goods and services, I tell you that it is misleading to claim that the purpose of the Bill is to eliminate barriers, because nothing in it guarantees that they will be eliminated. As for services, I did a little research and this may be one of the biggest concessions that could have been made, the long-term consequences of which may have been the most overlooked in this debate. No studies were ever done on this

aspect, either by the Macdonald Commission on the Canadian Economy or by the present Government, at least studies that it would have made public and that we could have gone over. And since the service sector is the most important in our economy—70 per cent of jobs and two thirds of our gross national product come from Canadian services sold abroad—leaving our services in this Agreement is disastrous, as I said before, because it is inconceivable that the Government went ahead without knowing what might happen, without knowing the consequences of this.

The whole data processing sector, for example, is involved. According to the Independent Computer Services Association of Canada, this major Canadian organization, 360,000 jobs in data processing could be affected and maybe even eliminated by American competition which, as it knows, will have a free hand here in Canada. So in the service sectors, Mr. Speaker, we will lose, and in trade in goods, we will also lose.

I come back to paragraph (b):

> facilitate conditions of fair competition within the free-trade area established by the Agreement;

Mr. Speaker, that presupposes that appropriate dispute-settlement mechanisms will be in place. No, U.S. law will still be ever-present to prevent us from being able to compete in that market and the only purpose of the dispute-settlement mechanism is to see that American law has been properly applied. There is nothing there to benefit us. Americans will still have the right to impose excessive tariffs on goods exported to the U.S. market and they will also see to it that tariff provisions are in place to encourage their own industries and discourage ours.

Mr. Speaker, I fail to see how we can convince Canadians that the purpose of this agreement is to:

> b) facilitate conditions of fair competition within the free-trade area established by the Agreement;

Liberalize significantly conditions for investment within that free-trade area.

I read carefully what they say about investment. We are told there will be a free flow of investment. Furthermore, Canada has agreed not to introduce policies requiring companies that are the subject of foreign takeovers to remain Canadian-owned. We spoke earlier about the screening mechanism we have in this country to control foreign takeovers in our industry, trade and services.

Mr. Speaker, we all know the Tories got rid of FIRA, the Foreign Investment Review Agency. We have no more room to manoeuvre, we have no more control, and on top of that, this Government welcomes foreign takeovers in the financial sector. Foreigners can buy whatever they want in this country, including our advanced energy sectors, like any other industry in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the same rights and privileges enjoyed by Canadian companies will therefore be available or more readily available to American companies. American banks will have full access to Canada, while Canadian banks will be subject to State banking laws, and as we know, Mr. Speaker, all fifty States have their own legislation in this area. It will be practically impossible or at least very difficult for our banks to break into the U.S. market, while Americans will be able to come to Canada with no difficulty whatsoever and do as they please in the banking sector. A double standard if there ever was one! We will be hard pressed to break into the American market, and meanwhile, they get the red carpet treatment!

Mr. Speaker, the clause goes on:

> d) establish effective procedures for the joint administration of the Agreement and the resolution of disputes;

Mr. Speaker, I referred to this earlier, and I don't think we can take this seriously. As far as I can see, the dispute settlement procedure will not consider or protect our Canadian interests.

Mr. Speaker, finally, Clause 3 says, and I quote:

> e) lay the foundations for further bilateral and multilateral cooperation to expand and enhance the benefits of the Agreement;

Mr. Speaker, what did we get? Not much, as I said before. Just that from now on, Americans may find it easier to come here than they did under the previous Government, to take advantage of our immense resources, our financial sector and our industries . . . When all is said and done, Mr. Speaker, we caved in, and we are about to pass legislation that will literally sell out this country for a pittance. If we analyse the situation, it is clear that very little in the way of trade is involved. Today, only 20 per cent of our goods are not traded freely. Today, 80 per cent of the goods between our two countries are duty free. To reduce the duty on the remaining 20 per cent, and we agree with the decision to reduce customs duty on these goods, this Government has sold out our industry, our energy sector, our mines, our resources and it may have compromised what constitutes the foundation of this country, the future of Canadians and handed over our sovereignty to another country. To me, Mr. Speaker, that is not a good thing.

• (2040)

[*English*]

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, this series of amendments is very important to those people who have concerns about the authority and the ability which they have to control their own destiny in Canada. Clause 3 states the objectives of the agreement, and I will speak about those a little later. Clause 4 makes the legislation binding on Her Majesty's Government. Clause 6 gives the federal Government authority to pass legislation that it thinks is required to implement this Bill, legislation very much like Bill C-130.

It is amazing that the same provincial Premiers who supported and applauded the Meech Lake Accord, because it gave them more autonomy and more provincial power, are in many cases from provinces like Saskatchewan, British Columbia and Québec. Those who applauded and supported

the Meech Lake approach are from the same provinces which are supporting the free trade deal.

It is ironic, because what they do in this particular case is give up some of the sovereignty which they had before, as well as any possible sovereignty that they might have gained in the Meech Lake Accord. I am talking about provincial sovereignty this time. I know that, federally, the sovereignty is being given up as well. It is being given up to the panel that is going to make the decisions as far as trade problems are concerned between Canada and the United States, if this agreement is accepted and this law is passed.

The federal Government gives up sovereignty to U.S. laws. What this agreement does is guarantee that the U.S. laws will be the laws which govern trade as far as they are concerned. We cannot be sure that the Canadian laws are going to govern trade as far as we are concerned. That is not part of the deal. U.S. laws are guaranteed, but ours are not. The federal Government gives up a certain amount of sovereignty just by signing this agreement, by saying that they will do the things which they have committed themselves to do in this agreement. That is the sovereignty that the federal Government is giving up in this Bill. Provincial Governments as well are giving up a considerable amount of sovereignty. They are giving it up in every way that the federal Government gives it up, and they are giving it up in other ways as well.

Many years ago—1934, I think it was—the provincial Governments in the West, Alberta and Saskatchewan, were given control over their resources. That was when the gas and oil and other resources in the western provinces—in the two prairie provinces anyway—became the responsibility of the provincial Government. Now, under this agreement, these provinces, as well as the other provinces which had those mineral and natural resources controls before that time, are being asked or being told or being required to give that control back. At this time, it is not necessarily back to the federal Government where it came from originally, but back to a panel that is going to make decisions, back to an agreement which is going to decide how much you can charge for these natural resources.

• (2050)

These natural resources are oil and gas and water. They make up the basic strength and power of the economy of the western provinces. Under this agreement, partially under Clause 6 in particular, we are being told that we must give up that authority because when we sell our resources we cannot establish a price provincially that is higher than the price at which we would sell those resources to other people. That is the type of sovereignty that the provinces are giving up. They are not only giving up the rights they had under their control of natural resources but they are giving up rights with respect to the amount that they can expect to get back from those natural resources.

Part of that particular clause and a couple of others which we will be coming to later will have a tremendous effect on the type of control that the provincial Governments have on their own economies, the control which some of them were so happy to get under the Meech Lake Accord. That of course is Motion No. 8 which would delete Clause 6.

Besides that there is a general clause, Clause 3, some parts of which I will read. It is very important that we know exactly what this agreement is supposed to do and then recognize what it does and what it does not do. It states:

> The purpose of this Act is to implement the Agreement, the objectives of which are to
>
> (a) eliminate barriers to trade in goods and services between Canada and the United States;

Over the years we have eliminated 80 per cent of these barriers. I suppose in another seven years with or without the trade deal we would probably eliminate another 17 per cent or so. But that is one of the directions of the Bill. The barriers were put into place for a particular reason. In many cases they were put in place to protect jobs in Canada. What we might possibly do by eliminating these barriers—although if we look at many of the effects of the trade agreement we cannot see a great deal of saving for consumers—is we might save a little bit in consumer goods, we are told. However, the barriers will move those jobs to the places where those goods can be produced the cheapest, which is not always in Canada. In fact, not very often are those jobs in Canada because through our social structure we provide services which the United States does not accept or recognize as services. I refer to services such as medicare, old age pensions and UIC. Those are services which we have in Canada which increase the cost of our products to some extent.

Therefore those barriers were put in place to allow us to have the type of social services that we need. Once we eliminate those social services we become a country very much like the United States where 36 million people do not have any medical coverage at all.

The clause goes on to state:

> (b) facilitate conditions of fair competition within the free-trade area established by the Agreement;
>
> (c) liberalize significantly conditions for investment within that free-trade area;
>
> (d) establish effective procedures for the joint administration of the Agreement and the resolution of disputes; and
>
> (e) lay the foundation for further bilateral and multilateral co-operation to expand and enhance the benefits of the Agreement.

I could spend a bit of time on each of these but I will make just one comment about the last one. Our other trading partners in the world have a great concern that this bilateral agreement will make us fortress North America and that they will not be able to be a part of our trading economy as they have been in the past.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, I want to address the three motions which are presently before the House which would attempt to show Canadians exactly what this so-called free trade deal is all about. As you know, Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 5 would strike out the stated purpose in the Bill, which is in Clause 3. It would strike out that clause because it is patently misleading. It states that the objectives of the agreement are to eliminate barriers to trade in goods and services between Canada and the United States.

Anybody who makes a close reading of the agreement will see that it does not do that. To begin with you should know, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time without this agreement 80 per cent of all goods and services between Canada and the United States are without tariff. That situation has been brought about as a result of liberal policies for freer trade in the multilateral arena under GATT and under other arrangements since the end of the Second World War. By pursuing those types of policies, we have been able to bring Canada to a situation in which 80 per cent of all trade in goods and services between Canada and the United States is without tariff.

In addition, through those types of policies, the remaining tariff on the balance of 20 per cent is about 5 per cent whereas it was in the range of 30 per cent to 40 per cent when the multilateral process started in the 1940s.

Clause 3 of the Bill states that the purpose of the agreement is to eliminate barriers to trade in goods and services between Canada and the United States. Some 80 per cent of that had been accomplished already with respect to tariffs. With respect to the rate of tariff, that had declined substantially as well. Why this clause is misleading is because it gives the impression that the agreement assures access for Canadian businesses to the U.S. market. That is not the case.

The principal barriers to trade between the United States and Canada are countervail and anti-dumping. These are the procedures used by Americans against our softwood lumber, or east coast fish, our potash, our steel and our shakes and shingles, cases with which all Canadians are familiar. This agreement between the United States and Canada does not deal with those barriers at all. That is despite the fact that when the Conservative Government started its negotiations with the United States its principal goal was to get an agreement on countervail and anti-dumping. It was not able to do that. The only accomplishment that it had as a result of these negotiations as enshrined in this agreement was to eliminate the small tariffs which are left on 20 per cent of the goods and services which are still subject to any kind of tariff with the United States.

It achieved that, but in return it sold out Canadian independence and sovereignty with respect to energy, investment policy, financial institutions, services, agriculture, regional development policy and a large number of other things. This is the price that the Conservative Government paid to eliminate the tariffs on 20 per cent of goods and services between Canada and the United States but with nothing done whatsoever with respect to anti-dumping and countervail.

• (2100)

We would argue as Liberals that we have an alternative. The alternative is to pursue freer trade through the same processes that we have been pursuing since the Second World War. Anyone who is honest and examines the record of that period will see that we had prosperous times during that period. Trade increased between Canada and the United States without sacrificing our independence, sovereignty, and identity. When it states in this Bill that "the purpose of this Act is to . . . eliminate barriers to trade in goods and services between Canada and the United States", that is not true. The agreement does not eliminate barriers to trade in goods and services: to wit it accepts the barriers that I have just mentioned, barriers that are a result of anti-dumping and countervail, the biggest type of harassment that presently exists for Canadian businesses attempting to carry on commerce in the United States. We have moved to eliminate that article because it is misleading and it gives a false impression of what the so-called free trade agreement is attempting to accomplish.

Clause 3 of the Bill also states:

> (c) liberalize significantly conditions for investment within that free-trade area;

The agreement eliminates all possibility of Canada screening investments from the United States and screening takeovers of Canadian cultural, manufacturing, and service industries. As a result of the agreement between Canada and the United States Americans will be free to come in and buy out any industry that pleases them. American businesses will be given national status in Canada. That means that they will be treated just like Canadian businesses.

Here we are a country of 25 million people concluding a bilateral trade agreement with the United States, a country of 250 million people, a country ten times larger than Canada, the most powerful economic nation in the world, and one of the most powerful industrialized nations in the world. We are putting ourselves into a bilateral trade agreement and giving national status to American businesses in Canada. That means that they should be treated in Canada just like a Canadian business.

It means that we cannot give any advantage to Canadian business, we cannot have a "buy Canada" policy, we cannot favour small Canadian businesses, and for all intents and purposes it means our programs of regional development are through because under those programs we try to assist and encourage small Canadian businesses in those parts of the country that were slow-growth regions, for example, Atlantic Canada, parts of the North, the north and east of Quebec, and so on. This agreement will prevent us from favouring those Canadian businesses at the expense of American businesses. We say that that should be eliminated and that it is not a proper purpose for a trade agreement between Canada and the

United States. We are moving to eliminate that and provide for a more honest situation with respect to this agreement.

Motion No. 8 has been grouped with Motions Nos. 5 and 6. Those motions would eliminate Clause 6 of the Bill which allows the federal Government to intervene into provincial areas of jurisdiction in order that the federal Government can implement this agreement and this Bill despite the feelings of provincial Governments.

The Conservative Government came to power boasting that it was going to improve federal-provincial relations. As a matter of fact, in some areas it has made some headway. It has put a clause in this Bill which will allow the federal Government to run rough-shod over provincial jurisdiction to implement the terms of this agreement and the terms of this Bill.

Unfortunately, not enough provincial Governments have given serious enough attention to this issue, particularly the long-term effect of a clause such as this. When the Bill was first tabled several provincial Governments, including those provincial Governments in favour of the agreement, were extremely upset with this clause and indicated that they were going to attack it in the courts.

We are moving that this clause be struck from the Bill. We hope that good sense will prevail and the Government will finally take this clause out of the Bill as it finally took out Clause 8. For weeks we stated that the original Clause 8 was wrong and that it gave powers that should never be given in Canada. Finally, the Minister, after denying those accusations for weeks withdrew that clause. Let us hope that he sees good sense and also withdraws Clause 6.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak on Motions Nos. 5, 6, and 8 which have been grouped for debate this evening. As some Members know, Motion No. 5 aims to delete Clause 3 which sets out the broad purpose of the Bill. Motion No. 6 will delete Clause 4 which makes the Bill binding on Canada. Motion No. 8 will delete Clause 6 which is the clause that gives the federal Government the right to pass laws implementing various parts of the agreement.

In dealing with these rather broad motions and the clauses to which they apply, one cannot overlook recent Canadian history and how we got to where we are today. We cannot forget that, a scant four years ago, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) took the opportunity to tell Canadians that he was flatly opposed to a free trade agreement with the United States and would never—

Mr. McDermid: It's over five years ago.

Mr. Fulton: I am corrected from across the floor, between four and five years ago he was flatly opposed, and there was no attempt by the Prime Minister, or by anyone sitting on the front benches, to push for a so-called free trade agreement with the United States during the last election campaign.

We must ask where this thing came from. I represent a constituency that is more than one-quarter of British Columbia. I campaigned when there was a Conservative running in that seat, there was the *PC Campaign Handbook*, all types of information was available, and journalists came through the constituency. No one in my constituency from Prince Rupert, the Queen Charlottes, Terrace, Kitimat, Smithers, Hazelton, Atlin, or Telegraph Creek came to me, the Tory candidate, the Liberal candidate, or the media and said: "We need some type of broad, far-reaching trade agreement with the United States".

I have asked my colleagues, the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon), the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis), the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy), and Members from around the House, and I have not been able to find any Member in the House who was promoting a free trade agreement with the United States during the 1984 campaign. We must ask ourselves: "Where did this come from?" I look up to the gallery. Did anyone in the gallery hear of a free trade agreement while the campaign was going on? One person in the whole gallery heard about the free trade agreement during the 1984 election campaign. Therefore, we must ask ourselves: "Where did it come from?" We find our first clue when we look and see who Mr. Mulroney asked to be the negotiator.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. The Hon. Member knows that it is the Prime Minister, or the Right Hon. the Prime Minister, and he should call him the Right Hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. Fulton: Where has the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) been in this debate? This is the most fundamental and most important part of an election campaign and the Prime Minister is nowhere to be seen. As we were reminded only last Friday, the Prime Minister gave his maiden speech on a Bill in Parliament, four years into a Parliament. That is a preposterous state of affairs.

Let us do a little more investigation. Who is selling the free trade deal? The Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). Let us scamper back into history. When Newfoundland was joining Canada, although this happened just before I was born, but I studied it in school, the Crosbie family was trying to lead Newfoundlanders into joining the United States rather than Canada. They all wore black arm bands on the day Newfoundland joined Canada rather than joining the United States. Here we have a little piece of history pulling itself together. We have the same person, the Minister for International Trade, flying across Canada. This is the fellow who has not read the deal. Everyone in the gallery knows that. He used to sell encyclopaedias. He didn't read them either. He used to sell vacuum cleaners and couldn't make them run. He was trying to read the instructions.

• (2110)

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Fulton: Let us look for more clues. This is a game of Clue to find out where the FTA came from. And what do we find? We find Simon Reisman. What was Simon doing just prior to being asked to be the negotiator? Mr. Reisman was working to flog the Grand Canal to build this mud dam across the bottom of Hudson Bay. You know what Hudson Bay looks like, Mr. Speaker. It is a big hoop with James Bay at the bottom. They were going to build this mud dam across the bottom of James Bay and make that a big pond, then put a bunch of nuclear reactors in to pump the water into the United States. I am coming to Motions Nos. 5, 6 and 8, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would appreciate that.

Mr. Fulton: I knew you had a feeling, Mr. Speaker. I know you enjoy my speeches. And you wanted to know how my remarks related to Motions Nos. 5, 6 and 8. I am just about to tell you. Motions Nos. 5, 6 and 8 are the secret Reisman clauses. I spent a week with Mr. Reisman in his lovely condominium down in Miami.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Fulton: I knew that would get your attention, Mr. Speaker. He thought he could convert me into selling Canadian water to the United States, but I would have none of it so I moved out quickly.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Fulton: The secret ingredient to this whole deal is water. Water on golf courses, I hear someone say. There will be none left. Water is the secret ingredient in this deal. Many Members in this House are aware of that. As a fellow who met with us and who is very knowledgeable in these affairs pointed out, it is the covert underpinnings that are in the deal that are the problem. Everyone was told the Parliamentary Secretary, the Minister and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said, "Don't let water out of the bag. Don't let Canadians know that water is the secret deal."

I was interested. I thought to myself it was not too long ago that the head of the Department of the Interior of Water Management in the United States went public and pointed out that the United States has lots of water. Some of the aquifers are down, the Mississippi is low, but they have lots of water. The problem is rivers like the Hudson catch fire, they are so polluted. Did you know that, Mr. Speaker? From Edmonton, you probably didn't know that. If someone drives across the Hudson and flips a cigarette butt—he or she shouldn't have been smoking—out of the side of the car which lands in the river, the river catches fire because there is so much toxic butyl material, petroleum waste, on the surface of the river.

The Americans have long wanted water. They are looking at B.C. We have not forgotten the NAWAPA scheme and all of the other ones. We know that is the hidden agenda.

Let me tell you how this pathetic Government got dragged into something it was opposed to before and during the election. No Canadians were pushing for it but we had the gang of 500, Alcan, American Express and all these corporations saying, "Come on, John. Come on, Brian. We have to have this deal". What is the deal? Let us take a look inside. Let us not forget wood. I am a little biased because I come from the great western kingdom of British Columbia where we grow a lot of good wood, cedar and spruce.

An Hon. Member: There is a lot of wood between the ears of the Premier.

Mr. Fulton: There is a lot of wood between the ears of the Premier, that is true, but let us not forget that a scant five years ago, count them, there was a *diminimus* finding from the United States. The Americans wanted to bring a countervail against Canada based on the same forest laws we have right now. All of a sudden we have the Hon. Member for Vancouver Centre, now the President of the Treasury Board (Miss Carney), scampering to Washington saying, "I will make you a 10 per cent one-time only offer. Penalize us. Give us a $600 million a year fine." This is the big, tough Tory Government with the biggest majority in Canadian history saying to the biggest industry, "Penalize us, penalize us." We could have won the case, and we should have. On water there are the covert underpinnings to the deal. That is what it is secretly all about, giving over our social services and medicare.

Some Hon. Members: Not true!

Mr. Fulton: Oh, oh, oh! Members over there say that cannot be true. But 36 million Americans have no medical coverage. Who here wants to take out their medicare card and tear it up tonight? Under the FTA you have to tear it up.

Mr. McDermid: So I suppose free trade will cause haemorrhoids as well!

Mr. Fulton: What about fish? What kind of negotiators did we have? There is a little bit of wording supposedly to protect Newfoundland, supposedly to protect P.E.I., supposedly to protect Nova Scotia, supposedly to protect New Brunswick. You would not cut me off, Mr. Speaker, I am just getting rolling.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Fulton: And Québec, supposedly. What about British Columbia? It was taken to the cleaners on wood and taken to the cleaners on fish.

Let me tell you about GATT. I have to tell you how GATT figures in the fish ruling. It is very important for Canadians to understand why when B.C. falls on fish the other five provinces tumble one after the other. I think there is unanimous consent for me to carry on.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I don't see unanimous consent, neither do I hear unanimous consent. The Hon. Member is a great debater and we appreciate him very much. I must, however, recognize the Hon. Member for Humber—Port-au-Port—St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) on debate.

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I have to confess that I was enjoying the speech as much as I know particular Conservative Members have, and if colleagues are willing to give unanimous consent, I will surely allow my colleague from Skeena to continue his comments and finish them with respect to the fishery.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: Is there unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. McDermid: No. I want to hear you.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: You see what happens, Mr. Speaker. Even to discuss the economic union agreement, we already have the Hon. Member for Brampton (Mr. McDermid) doing a pale imitation of Uncle Sam by saying, "I want to hear you".

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: Give him a stovepipe hat, the stars and stripes and let him grow a set of whiskers and we would have a real Yankee Doodle Dandy.

I hope as Members sit here this evening discussing this historic Bill, and those few Canadians who have managed to sit long enough to watch this important debate on television networks across the country will stop and remind themselves where this whole process began. It really began just about four years ago when a brand new Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), with the biggest majority in the history of Canadian politics, brand new to the job, stood up and spoke of the American protectionist sentiment that was beginning to boil and fester in Washington and of the new angry mood that was directed primarily at Japan. I can remember his words, "You can bet your bottom dollar that when the winds of protectionism blow out of Congress they won't be blowing at Canada because we have a special relationship with the United States".

That was the profound, marked in stone, etched for all time, for all Canadians to see and the beginning of our modern day discussion of our trading relationship with the United States. A brand of cocky assurance that we had no problem because we had a Prime Minister with a big majority.

Ms. McDonald: What about Bourassa?

Mr. Tobin: "We are good friends," he said. What happened? We woke up to cedar shakes and shingles because of that special relationship attitude built on the role of Butch and Spike rather than two mature nations with respect for each other's boundaries. We woke up to trade action on B.C. lumber, Atlantic fish, pork, steel and other products. All of the time that trade action was being taken, Canada was giving, giving and giving some more.

• (2120)

Mr. Benjamin: Even on raspberries.

Mr. Tobin: Yes, even on raspberries. Canada was giving on investment policy long in advance of any discussion of trade. We were giving on film policy and in a dozen other areas long before any discussions on trade.

Uncle Sam understood that there was a very pliant, placid, passive Government north of the border in the Conservative administration. So the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said, "Well, I made a mistake, so the protectionist winds are blowing at us and being Mr. Nice Guy doesn't help, but don't worry, I've got a solution. We're going to negotiate free trade. When I'm finished negotiating free trade, we're going to have an exemption. U.S. trade law won't apply to Canada".

In fact, the Prime Minister told *The New York Times*, when the negotiations began, that U.S. trade law cannot apply to Canada, period. No problem. The Prime Minister set the bottom line. We have to remind ourselves of that as we look at this document tonight.

The bottom line was that we would have a relationship in which they would be free to come to our country with their products and we in Canada would be guaranteed access to their country's market with our products. That is what free trade means, is it not?

Tonight we are contemplating a Bill that enshrines in a treaty the right of the U.S. Congress forever to make existing trade law, past trade law and future trade law including retaliation measures and negative, harmful trade action against Canada apply. We have co-signed the right of the United States to take that kind of action.

The Prime Minister's bottom line, not our bottom line, not the New Democratic Party's bottom line, but the Prime Minister's bottom line was guaranteed access. What we have guaranteed in writing and have put our signature to is the right of the United States, with whatever future trade law that might be conjured up in Congress in whatever mood exists on whatever day in whatever political environment, to continue forever to take trade action against Canada. That is the bottom line.

That is the bottom line of the trade deal we have signed in exchange for a dispute mechanism. It almost sounds like "sacred trust". We have a dispute tribunal that will look at U.S. trade actions to see if they are consistent with U.S. law. The Americans can pass a new law tomorrow that is contrary to the spirit of the so-called free trade agreement.

This is not free trade, this is an economic union. The President of the United States said that we now have an

economic constitution for North America and that this is the first step in binding our nations together.

I am a democrat. I believe in democratic institutions and I believe in democracy. If we put in place an economic union agreement between Canada and the United States, it is as sure as night follows day that in time, the people who live in this part of North America will say that if decisions will be made that affect their lives, they want to vote for the people who make those decisions. In this agreement, the decisions being made that will affect Canada in future will be made in Washington.

Mr. McDermid: What a crock.

Mr. Tobin: That is not a crock, my friend. It may be enough for the Tory mentality to sell your soul, your sovereignty, your right to set your own course and your right to captain your own ship to the United States, but it is not enough for a democrat. It is not enough for someone who believes in democratic institutions or for someone who believes in Canada and in the right of self-determination.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: There is a philosophy opposite that is so driven and blinded by the notion of the market-place and the free movement of capital, no matter for what purpose, that it sees the northern half of this continent, that part we call Canada and that part that is a reflection of the collective wisdom, blood, sweat, tears and history of Canada, that sense of Canadian sovereignty, that fabric that has been woven together into the country we call Canada, as nothing more than an irritant to free market forces. Suddenly we have an agreement that sets up, from the point of view of those who are the biggest players in the North American market-place, those who occupy the boardrooms in the glass, steel and concrete towers of the major financial centres south of the border, something called free trade.

There is no free trade here. What we have is economic union, a sell-out of Canada.

What does Clause 6, the clause we want deleted, do? Clause 6 provides that the treaty we have signed with the United States, forever and a day, will take precedence over any act of a provincial legislature anywhere in Canada.

Mr. McDermid: No, that's wrong.

Mr. Tobin: No provincial Government in Canada will ever again be able to take measures within its own jurisdiction and within its own right as defined under the British North America Act, the Constitution of Canada, to set priorities, policies or programs for that province if, in any way, shape or form, Washington determines that the programs are inconsistent with the treaty signed between the United States and the Government of Canada.

Mr. McDermid: That's a lie.

Mr. Tobin: That isn't a lie, that's the truth. Obviously it bites right to the Hon. Member's marrow.

As I stand here in the Parliament of Canada, that Chamber that represents the voice and the views of all of the people of Canada who are concerned about the national interest and not just the narrow interests of any one of our constituencies, I find it passing strange that all those great champions of provincial rights, those Premiers who have talked so often about the rights of provinces to independence, about this being a Confederation, an association of various jurisdictions, have been muted. The Premier of Newfoundland, Mr. Brian Peckford, the fighting Newfoundlander, has found himself muted and swallowed up under the weight of the patronage and pork-barrelling tactics of the Hon. Member for St. John's West. His nose is so deep in the spout that he cannot see that the fundamental interests of Newfoundland, the newest Province of Canada, the proudest Province of Canada, are being sold out by a piece of legislation and by a Government that would sacrifice nationhood on the altar of unbridled capitalism. This Bill is a shame.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, much has been said tonight about the origins of the free trade agreement. Quite rightly, the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) pointed out the biographical detail that a great many Canadians perhaps do not know but that is pertinent to the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie). He pointed out the fact that the Minister and his family, going all the way back to 1949, have sought to become a part of the United States. Our only wish is that the Crosbie family would have found a way to become a part of the United States without taking the rest of Canada with them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blaikie: Perhaps it has something to do with the rather selective nature of American immigration laws that the Minister for International Trade has never been admitted to what he obviously regards as the promised land.

The Hon. Member also spoke of the origins of the clauses in the agreement which have to do with what the Hon. Member said were the secret underpinnings of the agreement. That, of course, is the whole question of Canadian water, something which the trade negotiator, Mr. Reisman himself, referred to once as Canada's ace in the hole with respect to any agreement with the United States of the sort that he then went on to negotiate. It would be a mistake to imagine that Mr. Reisman either exists now or existed then in a political vacuum.

The fact is, and this is something that some Liberals may find uncomfortable, that the Grand Canal project has its origins amidst a group of very high-powered Liberals in Canada. I speak, for example, of the Desmarais brothers. I know that when Lou Desmarais was a Member of Parliament prior to the election of 1984 he actively lobbied Members of

Parliament to give their support to the Grand Canal project. That project involved the export of Canadian water to the U.S. As the Hon. Member for Skeena pointed out, it was a ridiculous and environmentally disastrous megaproject that would have James Bay dammed and turned into a freshwater lake from which water would be pumped to the American Midwest using something in the neighbourhood of 11 nuclear reactors.

• (2130)

This is not something that exists only in the mind of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney). We know he was also a backer of the project at one point until he learned the value of silence with respect to these things. It was backed by the Liberal Premier of Quebec, Mr. Bourassa. We have no reason to believe he ever repudiated his support of that project. He is an active supporter of the free trade agreement, again an embarrassment, I am sure, to many Liberals.

For those reasons, we need to see this water issue and the rhetorical extravaganza that we are sometimes treated to by certain Liberal Members with respect to the export of Canadian water as ambiguous on their part because we know there were a number of very high powered Liberals behind this project long before the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement was negotiated. That is something Canadians should know about because they might have the impression, if they were to take words at their face value, that the Liberal Party was united in its opposition to massive water exports and diversions to the U.S. when in fact they are not. Some of the biggest movers and shakers in the Liberal Party of Canada have actually been active backers of the scheme. Let that be on the record for those Canadians who may be listening tonight and who may have a genuine concern about exporting Canadian water to the U.S. Let them know that they cannot rely on the Liberal Party of Canada to oppose that kind of diversion of Canadian water to the U.S.

With respect to the origins, the momentum, shall we say, for free trade and its counterpart deregulation, we must look to the Liberal Party of Canada and a Liberal Government. It was begun in fact by a Liberal Government. Early conversations about negotiating some kind of free trade agreement with the U.S., albeit sometimes the talk had to do with sectoral arrangements, go back to the presence here in Canada of the former American ambassador, Mr. Robinson. This is where these kinds of talks had their origin.

It is no coincidence that we then had a royal commission on economic development in Canada chaired by the now High Commissioner to London, Donald Macdonald, a high profile Liberal who went on to recommend free trade as a leap of faith with the U.S. I would say a leap of blind faith. To be fair to Mr. Macdonald, he did not recommend all the things now in this agreement. In fact, one of the things he did not recommend at all was the section with respect to services. The Macdonald Commission did not even do a study on services, so when it comes to services it is not just a leap of faith, it is a leap of blind faith. No work has been done on this at all and Canada is asked to be a guinea pig in a completely asymmetric relationship that will make us, when we look back, the laughing stock of the world with respect to what this Government has led us into on free trade in services.

There has been a lot of what I would call anxious reflection on the part of Canadians who are against this agreement. They are asking themselves how they should vote. Who should they trust with respect to actually getting rid of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement? I submit to them that, in spite of the sincerity of some members of the Liberal caucus with respect to the agreement, Canadians who are opposed to this agreement, who see it as a threat to the kind of Canada we have already built and to the kind of Canada we could build in the future, the only choice in this respect, the only Party that has been on record from day one as being against this kind of arrangement, has been the New Democratic Party. That is the message we will be taking out to the people of Canada in the election when the Prime Minister gets up his nerve and calls it.

If there is one thing that all Canadians are unanimous about, I think even some who are for this agreement, it is that this kind of thing can only be done by a government which has sought a mandate to make such a significant historical change in the destiny of Canada. So we hope at some point the Prime Minister, the Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp), and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade (Mr. McDermid), will have an attack of democratic ethics and call an election. They will say, "This is not the kind of thing we can do in the fourth year of our mandate, especially given the fact that when we sought that mandate we never even mentioned the fact we were about to negotiate such an agreement. In fact, we gave the impression we would not negotiate such a thing at all."

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, this has been a rather interesting and amusing evening sitting listening to the political rhetoric and the clown-like method with which it was presented by some Hon. Members opposite. There were many points raised tonight too numerous to talk about in the ten minutes allotted me in this particular period, but I would like to touch on a few of the subjects raised.

First, my friend, the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis), stood up and talked about how terrible foreign investment is. He went on at some length about what a terrible thing foreign investment in Canada is. Yet at the same time, the Leader of his Party, the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), is sitting on the platform of General Motors when they invest billions of dollars in his riding. He welcomes that kind of investment.

Bob White, the national Vice-President of the NDP and President of the Canadian Auto Workers, where was he recently? In Japan, welcoming and encouraging Japanese investment in Canada. Bob White, President of the Canadian Auto Workers, but more importantly Vice-President of the NDP, was in Japan encouraging Japanese investment in

Canada. Isn't that something? The socialists love to stand up here and knock foreign investment out of one side of their mouths, and on the other side they are over there begging for it in their ridings. Invest here, create employment, create economic activity here.

I tell you, when American Motors decided to build their new plant in Brampton, I did not say, "That is terrible, take your foreign money somewhere else. Do not put it in Brampton. For heaven's sake, that is terrible". No. It created some 1500 jobs, and that will probably be 3,000 jobs eventually. That is what is important to the community and the economic growth of this country.

Then I listened to my hon. friend from Prince Albert. He talked about social programs. He said our social programs cost our manufacturers just a little more money. They increased the cost of our goods. They make them a little more expensive because we have these social services. That is out of one side of his mouth. Then, out of the other side of his mouth he says that the Americans will be saying that our social programs are an unfair trade practice and they cannot compete with Canadians. How can you have it both ways? That is the NDP's argument. That is the debate they are having.

• (2140)

Then I listened to the Liberals, the moaning, the weeping, and the gnashing of teeth going on over there. As one example, I listened to my friend, the Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster), who I think is still their agricultural critic. Sometimes one must wonder, but I think he is. He talks about the wine industry, the grape growing industry of the country. For the record, I would like to refer to an article on one winery in Ontario with which I am familiar, Hillebrand. The article reads:

> Hillebrand's president . . . John Swan, puts the case succinctly, "Without GATT and the FTA, the industry would have died a lingering death. This has been a useful jolt. We can produce world-class grapes here".
>
> World-class grapes are the key to success, but it takes five years on average to produce a mature vine. Currently, Hillebrand produces two main kinds of wine: house wines, which are a blend of grapes, and varietals, which are made exclusively from one kind of grape from one grower's farm . . .
>
> Only 30 per cent of Hillebrand's production is varietal, but the plan is to increase production as new vines mature. Varietals such as Chardonnay and Riesling command a higher price commensurate with their higher quality.
>
> Hillebrand gets its grapes from 80 independent growers in the Niagara region who annually produce 3,300 tons of grapes on 600 acres to yield 230,000 cases of wine . . . Two years ago Hillebrand began a program of signing 10-year contracts with the producers of their best varietals in exchange for control over the way in which the growers tend their vines.
>
> Clearly, there is a lesson here for the other grape growers of Niagara. If they switch growing high-quality European varietals and can survive the five-year maturing period for the vines, they have a great future in the brave new world of free trade.
>
> There are signs that the growers are getting the message. In the past two months, 200,000 new vines have been planted in Niagara.

The message, very clearly, is that they can survive under free trade, that they want to survive under free trade, and that they are working toward that end rather than the doom and gloom that my friend from Algoma is always crying the blues about and moaning and groaning about here in the House. He says that everything is so terrible in this country and we are going to hell in a hand-basket. Hemorrhoids and all the social ills are caused by free trade. This free trade is a terrible thing, my God, look out, here it comes.

Let us talk about the proposed amendments for a few moments. The first amendment that the Opposition has brought forward is to delete Article 102 of the free trade agreement which contains the objectives of the agreement. I find it amazing that the Opposition wants to eliminate the objectives of the agreement. Opposition members always talk about supporting the elimination of barriers to goods and services. The agreement facilitates conditions of fair competition within a free trade area which is what we want, fair trade.

No one will question that we want fair trade. That is what it is all about. We want liberalized conditions for investment within the free trade area. It is amazing to note that more Canadian investment went into the United States last year than American investment came into Canada. Imagine, Canadians investing offshore. Holy smokes, what is the world coming to? Well, that is happening and we want to ensure that our investors are treated as fairly as are any other investors. That is exactly what is happening.

Through Motion No. 6 our friends would eliminate Clause 4 from Bill C-130. This is a legal matter. At common law the Crown was bound by statute either if the statute so stated expressly or if, on a fair reading of the statute, the intention to have it applied to the Crown was necessarily implied. However, Section 16 of the federal Interpretation Act provides that Her Majesty is not bound by a statute unless therein mentioned or referred to. Two recent Supreme Court of Canada decisions raise serious doubts as to whether a clear implication that the statute is intended to bind the Crown is insufficient in light of the wording of Section 16. Therefore, we had to put Clause 4 into the Act to ensure that we were following the rules.

The Opposition wants to eliminate Clause 6 from the Free Trade Agreement. I get a big charge out of this because they say that the provincial Governments have nothing to do now. They say that through Clause 6 we have taken away all their powers. Can you imagine? The federal Government has taken away all the powers of the provinces.

Let us get one thing very clear. Clause 6 makes very clear that the federal Government has the right to implement an international treaty signed by two sovereign nations, and that is exactly what we are doing through this clause. The clause is an important interpretative aid but it does not, as my hon. friends would try to have you believe, change the existing division of powers in Canada. It is impossible for Parliament to give itself constitutional authority that it does not already possess. Hon. Members know that, yet they put up all these bogeymen that the provinces are having their powers taken away from them.

Alberta and Quebec protect their rights very strongly and probably talk about provincial rights more than any others. Both of those provinces support the free trade agreement very strongly. If they thought provincial rights were at all diminished by this free trade agreement they would be the first knocking on our doors worried about this clause. Yet, they are not.

On May 4, 1988, the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs in its wisdom reported on the constitutional jurisdiction pertaining to the free trade agreement. It said that it was perfectly within the power of the federal Government to implement the free trade agreement. All Clause 6 says is that we can implement the free trade agreement. That is exactly what we are doing and that is what we will be doing when the free trade agreement is passed by the House of Commons.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to take part in this debate in support of Motion Nos. 5, 6, and 8. I hope you will note that I have mentioned them and I will try to get to them again.

Motion No. 5 is to strike out certain clauses. Clause 5 says it is to facilitate conditions of fair competition. Well, we have been running into these conditions of fair competition ever since the legislation to deregulate transportation which was started by the Liberals, as my colleague reminds me. Let us not be under any illusions. Deregulation, privatization, and the trade deal are all part and parcel of the same operation. They are the three essential parts.

We find that the so-called fair competition under the new National Transportation Act and the free trade agreement is a farce. In fact, it increases unfair competition from the American side. Let me illustrate. The National Transportation Act provided for competitive line rates. That means that a railroad or a trucking company, but particularly a railroad in the United States, could negotiate a rate with International Nickel in Sudbury or a forest product company in Thunder Bay or British Columbia. The Canadian railroad has to haul that commodity only for its share of the competitive line rate, from its origin to the U.S. border. That would be acceptable if the free trade agreement allowed us to do the same in the United States, but it does not. Competitive line rates are prohibited in the United States so that what American railroads can do to us here, we cannot do to American railroads there. There should be a clause in the agreement stating: "We shall do unto you what you do unto us".

• (2150)

When we proposed such an amendment to the National Transportation Act, the Tories turned it down. They state that they have an agreement to facilitate conditions of fair competition. I want any Conservative to tell me what is fair about competitive line rates that are allowed in Canada but disallowed in the United States. While I am not noted as a great fan of the CPR, they are correct, for once, that $300 million of their revenue in transborder traffic is jeopardized under the National Transportation Act and the free trade agreement. Canadian National states that up to $500 million of its revenue is jeopardized.

I have a copy of a freight waybill in my office that was sent to me in a plain brown envelope. It is a confidential contract with a competitive line rate. It concerns a carload of plywood manufactured just outside New Westminster that is to travel some 25 miles south, across the U.S. border to the Burlington Northern line. It travels on the Burlington Northern line from about Seattle to Minneapolis, then travels on Conrail from Minneapolis to Port Huron. The last 30 miles is to Kitchener, Ontario, on the CNR. There is no weight of the carload lot on the waybill. There are no freight charges, just a note saying, "Destination railway, weigh the car for your own revenue". Canadian National had to weigh the car itself to get its freight charges for the last 30 miles. The belt line railroad for the originating 25 miles is jointly owned by Burlington Northern and a collection of railroads.

Historically, such a load would travel CN or CP east-west across Canada. Instead, it went south, then east, then back into Canada. The Tories want to tell me about fair competition. They do not know what they are talking about.

I regret to say that our good neighbours to the south do not have a very good record, if not one of the worst, of living up to agreements. The history of our contracts, deals and treaties with them since 1812 is replete with violations. The same thing applies to this present Government. I always understood that when a treaty is signed or an agreement is made, one's word is one's bond. I cannot help but remark on how the Government has broken the agreement between the Government of Saskatchewan and the federal Government and the native people of our province reached in 1976. It has refused to implement it. It is not only the Americans, the Government's word is no good. The Conservatives will not live up to the bond of the federal Government in power prior to their coming into existence. I was always under the impression that governments honoured the agreements and treaties of predecessor governments.

The Government talks about deliberalizing significantly conditions of investment. I had a long phone conversation with the Canadian Truckers Association last week. As a result of the free trade agreement and the new National Transportation Act, and deregulation, trucking companies will now establish profit centres in the United States because of taxation laws that will allow them to write off a tractor and trailer in three years rather than the 10 years it takes up here.

We do not come anywhere near the tax breaks that exist there. The competition is not fair and, therefore, Canadian investment is leaving Canada for the United States as a result of the policies of the Government. It calls it free trade, but I call it unfair trade. I call it a decimation of Canadian sovereignty and Canadian independence.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton—Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, I was amazed that the Members who made representations from Atlantic Canada found it so difficult to accept the present trade agreement. The history and museums of Atlantic Canada will prove that Atlantic Canada prospered when it could trade by water both eastward and southward.

We have reached a point of great prosperity along the eastern seaboard, with greater and cheaper transportation access, contrary to the assertion of our friend, the stubble-jumper from the West. The assertion we heard by those Atlantic Canadian Members is not in agreement with the needs of the forest industry, the fishing industry, the mining industry or the potential steel industry in that part of Canada. The trade in these industries must go either eastward across water or southward by land or water into the New England market.

I have said in the House previously that one can stand on the Empire State building and see an area that contains a population greater than all of Canada.

May I call it 10 o'clock?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being 10 p.m., pursuant to Order made June 20, 1988, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, August 16, 1988

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

NATIONAL REVENUE

TABLING OF TRIBAL CLASS UPDATE AND MODERNIZATION PROJECT REMISSION ORDER

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour today, on behalf of the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. MacKay), to table in the House the Tribal Class Update and Modernization Project, or TRUMP, Remission Order.

This order remits the customs duties and a portion of the federal sales tax paid or payable on goods imported between January 1, 1987 and December 31, 1993, for use in the updating and modernization of four Tribal Class destroyers for the Canadian Navy. It is estimated that the order will remit $28 million in customs duties and $3.5 million in federal sales tax.

• (1110)

The tabling of this order is in line with the Government's commitment to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts to increase accountability and openness with respect to the use of the remission orders.

* * *

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to Petition Nos. 332-4867 and 332-4939, and, Mr. Speaker, I move:

That this House do now proceed to Orders of the Day.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

• (1120)

(Division No. 510)

YEAS

Members

Belsher
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Blouin
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Bradley
Cadieux
Champagne (Champlain)
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cochrane
Comeau
Cook
Corbett
Crofton
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Daubney
de Cotret
Domm
Dorin
Duguay
Duplessis
Epp (Provencher)
Fennell
Fretz
Friesen
Girard
Gormley
Halliday
Harvey
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
Howie
James
Jepson
Johnson (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Kilgour
Landry
Lanthier
Lawrence
Layton
Lewis
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacKay
Mantha
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McKenzie
McKnight
Moore
Nickerson
Nowlan
Oostrom
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Price
Ravis
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Sparrow
Stackhouse
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Turner (Ottawa—Carleton)
Vézina
Vincent
Wenman
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Winegard—78

NAYS

Members

Benjamin
Blaikie
Boudria
Caccia
Cassidy
de Corneille
Dewar
Finestone
Foster

Fulton	Kaplan	Prud'homme
Gauthier	Killens	Riis
Gray	Langdon	Robichaud—25
(Windsor West)	Marchi	
Heap	McCurdy	
Hopkins	McDonald	
Hovdebo	(Broadview—	
Isabelle	Greenwood)	

• (1150)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Orders of the Day.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if there might be unanimous consent from the House to permit the Chairman of the Human Rights Committee to deposit a report from the committee immediately prior to entering into debate on Bill C-130.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. At first glance one would wonder why the Members of the House who are not supporters of the Government should help the Government out of a difficulty that it has created for itself by its arbitrary and abusive approach to the proceedings of the House. The Government has created this problem by moving in a pre-emptory and arbitrary manner that the House proceed to Orders of the Day before the stage could be reached—

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of State has put a proposition to the House. I know that the Hon. Member for Windsor West would want to give the Chair some indication of whether or not that proposition has support. Perhaps a number of Members in the House might very well want to make certain commentary on many things, but I would ask the Hon. Member to assist the Chair.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): The issue is, while we are always ready to assist the Chair, should we be assisting the Government out of a difficulty that it created for itself. I am ready to say that we will give consent because the report in question is a report of the Human Rights Committee. I understand that it deals with important issues involving the plight of older workers in the country. I want to ensure that the country realizes that if there is a problem that we now have with respect to tabling the report of the Human Rights Committee, it was created by the Government for itself and for the majority of Conservative Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member. The Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap.

Mr. Riis: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the Day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Monday, August 15, consideration of Bill C-130, an Act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States of America, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee; and the amendments of Mr. Axworthy:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-130 be amended by deleting Clause 3.

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-130 be amended by deleting Clause 4.

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-130 be amended by deleting Clause 6.

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move a motion under Standing Order 117. I move:

"That, in relation to Bill C-130, an Act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States of America, not more than two further sitting days shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage, and two sitting days to the consideration of the third reading stage of the Bill; and

That fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business on the second day allotted to report stage consideration and on the second day allotted to third reading stage consideration of the said Bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required, for the purpose of this order and, in turn, every question necessary in order to dispose of the stage of the Bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment."

Mr. Speaker: I will hear the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) on a point of order, and then I will hear the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis).

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, the motion made by the Hon. Deputy Government House Leader is out of order and cannot be received by you and be put to the House. Why do I say this, Mr. Speaker? In attempting to move a motion for time allocation under Standing Order 117, the Deputy Government House Leader is doing something from which he is precluded because a majority of representatives of the Parties in this House has reached agreement for allocation of time under Standing Order 116.

The Standing Orders have three provisions for the allocation of time. Standing Order 115 applies when all three Parties, or whatever number of Parties there are in the House, have reached agreement. This is clearly not the case here. Standing Order 116 applies when a majority of representatives of the Parties of the House have reached agreement. Standing Order 117 applies when an agreement cannot be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 115 or 116.

It is very clear from a letter read into the record yesterday by the Deputy Government House Leader that an agreement was reached and continues to be in place among and on the part of representatives of a majority of the Parties of the House. Therefore, the requirements for Standing Order 117 have not been met, and that Standing Order cannot be used as long as the agreement to which I have referred is in place.

What the Minister on behalf of the Government can and should do is to make a motion to give effect to the agreement between the representatives of a majority of Parties in the House. The Minister, as a Minister of the Crown, has already met the basic requirement for the application of Standing Order 116 because yesterday he rose in the House and stated that a majority of representatives of the several Parties had come to an agreement with respect to the allocation of time. The Minister may not have intended to do this, he may not have realized that he was doing it, but in fact he did so when he rose and read into the record the letter signed by myself and the House Leader for the NDP. I say to Members of the House that it could well be argued that it is the obligation of the Deputy Government House Leader to rise and move a motion to give effect to that agreement reached by the representatives of a majority of the Parties in the House.

• (1200)

He may say that Standing Order 116 states only that the Minister may propose a motion without notice, but I submit that this is one of those occasions well recognized in the parliamentary and the general law when "may" can only mean "shall". Otherwise, the Standing Order would have little sense or purpose or effect because it starts out by saying, and I think I have already made this point:

> "116. When a Minister of the Crown, from his or her place in the House, states that a majority of the representatives of the several parties have come to an agreement in respect of a proposed allotment of days or hours for the proceedings at any stage of the passing of a public bill, the Minister may propose a motion, without notice, during proceedings under Government Orders, setting forth the terms of the said proposed allocation;"

And so on. I have already said, and the record is clear, that the Minister from his place in the House did state yesterday that a majority of the representatives of the several Parties had come to an agreement with respect to the allocation of time for the Bill in question. Therefore, the subsequent words of the Standing Order can only have meaning if the word "may" in this case is interpreted to mean "shall". There is therefore an obligation on the part of the Deputy Government House Leader to move a motion, to give effect to the agreement which was reached between the representatives or a majority of the representatives of the several Parties in this House.

The Deputy Government House Leader may say that the real meaning of Standing Order 116 is that a representative of the government Party has to be part of this majority. I say that this should not be the interpretation—and it is clearly not the interpretation—because Standing Order 116 provides that once the motion is put there has to be a debate for up to two hours in which anybody who wants to can speak for up to 10 minutes, and then there is a vote. It would seem to me that this was clearly intended to provide a safety valve so that representatives of the Government—even if a Minister on the government side moved a motion—could get up and argue against it, and there could then be a vote. If there is this safety valve, the fact that a representative of the government Party is not one of the majority of representatives should not preclude the motion from being properly put.

In any event, even if Your Honour should find that the motion cannot be put unless the Minister of the Crown wishes to do so, I submit that the motion the Deputy Government House Leader wants to put under Standing Order 117 cannot be put, because his opportunity to do so has been pre-empted by the agreement reached by a majority of representatives of the several Parties in this House, pursuant to Standing Order 116.

Therefore, on the basis of what I have just put to you, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Minister's motion is completely out of order. I think we also mentioned yesterday that the notice of that motion was defective because it did not state the number of days the Government proposed to allocate for the report stage and third reading of the Bill. However, quite apart from that, on the basis of the arguments I have just given, I submit that it is completely out of order for the Deputy Government House Leader to move the motion under Standing Order 117. He is precluded from doing so, so long as the agreement reached between the majority of the representatives of the several Parties in this House remains in place. Therefore, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot accept the motion, the motion cannot be put, in an effort by the Government to obtain the order that it wants with respect to the allocation of time for the remaining stages of Bill C-130. The motion, for the reason I have given, is out of order and I hope, in the interest of parliamentary democracy, Your Honour will accept my arguments and in fact formally rule that the motion is in fact out of order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to lend support to the points made by my hon. colleague, the House Leader for the Official Opposition by suggesting that the motion put forward by the Deputy Government House Leader under Standing Order 117 is out of order. Standing Order 117 reads:

> "117. A Minister of the Crown who from his or her place in the House, at a previous sitting, has stated that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Orders 115 or 116 in respect of proceedings at the stage at which a public bill was then under consideration either in the House or in any committee,"

And so on. First of all, I want to deal with the particular motion put forward by the Deputy Government House Leader. Your Honour will remember that not long ago under Standing Order 115 the House used 115 when we were dealing with Bill C-72, the official languages Bill, because at that time there was agreement between the representatives of all Parties involved. At the moment, of course, that would be representatives from each of the three federal political Parties.

When the Deputy Government House Leader indicates that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 115 or 116, I simply want to submit that half of that is correct; that under Standing Order 115, no, there was not unanimous agreement among the representatives of the three Parties, but such is not the case under Standing Order 116. Standing Order 116 says:

> "116. When a Minister of the Crown, from his or her place in the House, states that a majority of the representatives of the several parties have come to an agreement in respect of a proposed allotment of days or hours for the proceedings at any stage of the passing of a public bill,"

And so on and so forth. Such is not the case. As my hon. colleague, the House Leader for the Official Opposition, has indicated there was an agreement. I understand that there is some question about the appropriateness of the agreement in terms of the necessity for this length of time, but I want to indicate that the Deputy Government House Leader thought it was appropriate to read into the record yesterday so it was perfectly clear that there was an agreement between two of the three representatives of the Parties represented in the House of Commons.

It says, simply, "we wish to inform you that our respective parties are prepared to agree on an allocation of a further" number of days.

There was an agreement between two of the three representatives of the political Parties of Canada, that we were prepared to agree on an allotment of time at both report stage and at third reading stage.

I also wish to submit that under Standing Order 117 there is obviously an obligation for the Minister introducing that motion to point out the appropriate time that would be allocated at each stage. I want to submit that, as I read *Hansard*, that certainly was not the case yesterday. It would make, if we like, another reason for considering this initiative by the Deputy Government House Leader to be out of order at this time.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I want to thank both the Hon. Member for Windsor West and the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap. I will now hear the Hon. Minister of State.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be brief, just to review the history of this matter. There have been several delays in getting to report stage and third reading of Bill C-130 which have been outlined to the House on previous occasions, so I will not repeat them. I made a serious effort yesterday to negotiate time with the representatives of the opposition Parties, or the coalition Party, and the House will know—and I will not repeat it because I read it into the record—that the coalition has been formed to review this matter. Normally I would table this letter, but there are some things that one comes upon in one's parliamentary career that one wishes to hold. For that reason I would prefer to keep the original copy of this letter, myself, for my personal records, and it may perhaps be of interest. I can provide copies to anybody who wants one.

• (1210)

Here we have a coalition of the opposition Parties, a coalition Party, suggesting that the House take 150 days at report stage and 200 days at third reading stage to consider Bill C-130. I will speak to the substance of that at an appropriate time.

Today I want to deal with two things. First, I want to deal with the argument of my hon. friend that the notice must specify the number of days that will be spelled out for report stage and third reading. I would refer my hon. friend to page 287 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition which sets out the appropriate wording for a notice of motion for time allocation under Standing Order 75C as it then was. It reads as follows:

> "That an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing 75A or 75B with respect to an allocation of time to the *(stage of Bill)* of Bill C- . . . . . , An Act . . . ., and, under the provisions of Standing Order 75C, I give notice of my intention to move a time allocation motion at the next sitting of the House for the purpose of allotting a specified number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at that stage of the Bill."

I submit it is very clear that the form spelled out in Beauchesne's does not require that the number of days or hours be stated. It is simply the notice and that notice has been met by reading right from Beauchesne's, substituting the appropriate Bill number and title. I submit that the allegation of my colleagues opposite that the notice must contain the specified number of days or hours is incorrect. We have complied with that part of the requirements.

Second, I would review very briefly to the second argument made which is an interesting argument, but I do not think it has any substance whatsoever. My hon. colleagues are claiming that they have met the provisions of Standing Order 116 by having, as it states in the letter, a majority of the Parties agreed. Yesterday, when my hon. colleague made this point, you very appropriately made it clear that the wording is a majority of the representatives of the several Parties.

I would submit that in arguing this point my colleague has continually referred to a majority of the Parties. That is not a majority of the representatives of the Parties. It is an interesting argument but I do not think it has any substance whatsoever if it is to be read correctly.

I submit that we have met the provisions of Standing Order 117 and that we are in a position to move an order for time allocation, the motion which I have in fact moved. I do not think we need to prolong this argument any further. I think the points have been made. If in fact Your Honour wishes to reserve judgment on this and spend some time reviewing it, the Government is perfectly content with that and would simply call Bill C-130 and enable the debate to continue on the amendments that are before the House.

I submit that both arguments made by my hon colleagues opposite fail. The first argument fails because Beauchesne's sets out the notice and we are within the terms of that wording. The second argument fails because the exact wording of Standing Order 116 refers to a majority of the representatives and my hon. colleagues opposite have misread it, though I am sure the misreading of it was well intentioned. I submit that we have met the notice requirements and that the motion is in order to be presented and proceeded with at this time.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a small point of clarification. In dealing with the matter of whether or not the notice he gave yesterday for a motion under Standing Order 117 was in order, my hon. friend made reference to Beauchesne's. I would like to draw to your attention that the edition of Beauchesne's that we use predates by a number of years the adoption of the Standing Orders on time allocation. I respectfully submit that whatever Beauchesne's said about a notice or the form of a notice, it could not possibly apply by way of a precedent to these Standing Orders because they were not in effect at the time this edition of Beauchesne's was prepared.

Second, I am informed that in every case to date since the Standing Orders went into effect, the notice required under Standing Order 117 did include the details of the time allocation to be sought in the motion for which the notice was a foundation. I wanted to make that small point of clarification.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate very much the Hon. Member for Windsor West's continuing assistance to the Chair on these sometimes difficult issues. I will look at Beauchesne's, but it seems to me that the latest edition of Beauchesne's may have come out after the change in the rules. I think I am right on that, but I will have a look at that and I will take into account the other point the Hon. Member made.

I have listened very carefully as well to the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) who is always of assistance to the Chair in these matters. I will give his remarks considerable consideration.

I think the Hon. Minister of State has divined my sense of this and has indicated that the Government will not be surprised if I reserve for a few hours to give this the consideration it needs. I want Hon. Members to know that I have done some considerable work on this, but I will return at three o'clock to make a ruling. In the meantime, we will proceed with the Orders of the Day.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have just checked the date of publication of the Fifth Edition of Beauchesne's. I think you are right. It did come out after the Standing Orders, but again, I am told that all the precedents involving the use of Standing Order 117 did give the details of the motion to be sought. I had wanted to say immediately that you are quite right in what you said about the edition of Beauchesne's and its timing.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member for Windsor West. The question of when the edition came out takes nothing away from the argument, and I want the Hon. Member to know that I will give it the consideration that I ought to give it as I will give to all of the arguments that have been made.

Resuming debate.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton—Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, the arguments which have been placed before the public of Canada in respect to free trade do not really conform with reality. I think they should be referred to more as scare tactics with political motivations. They involve the pursuit of power rather than the pursuit of truth and the pursuit of what is in the best interests of Canada.

I am in particular disagreement with the concept that in any way, shape, or form the culture of Canada will be altered by virtue of a free trade agreement. Culture is something which government cannot legislate. We have tried on occasion to legislate morality in conformity with the faith the majority of the House has supported. We have tried to create legal structures which would implement our belief in the morality we would like to see sustained in this nation, and we have failed. We cannot, no matter how hard we try, legislate culture. That is something which is always in a state of transition and always in a state of change.

While historians may depict a reason why there has been a change in the culture of any particular area of the world, I do not think they have ever pinned it down to a particular piece of legislation, particularly as it relates to trade.

• (1220)

Culture is something which prospers in prosperity. It never advances in a period of recession. This Bill in intended to create prosperity in this land and I believe that it will. Any argument, political or otherwise, to the contrary certainly will be negated by the study of history as to when culture thrived, be it art or whatever, and when it failed to develop. It needed money and sponsors, which is what I hope a prosperous Canada will generate, in order that culture may indeed thrive.

We have heard representations that our entertainment industry may not thrive. I say, as I have said before, that at such point in time as the entertainment industry of Canada chooses to present the entertainment which Canadians enjoy, it shall then prosper. As long as there is an alternative to what is produced in Canada it shall be in competition with the listening audience, the viewing audience, or the reading audience in this land as it is elsewhere.

If one wishes to look at the independence of Canada, every nation in the world has, to one degree or another, committed itself to trade arrangements. No other nation in the world has accused itself or its Government of surrendering independence by virtue of pursuit of better business for more people in the jurisdiction in which the trade pact has been made.

The Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) and I have been in accord on a number of subjects, particularly in respect to transportation. However, as to his remarks and his complaints about the transportation system, particularly as it relates to rail in Canada, until such time as both the Crown corporation and the publicly held corporation decide that they want to be competitive in the transportation industry, we shall be poorly served.

Unfortunately, the rates which go north and south are usually more beneficial to Canadian traders than are the rates which go east and west. That is the difficulty that both eastern and western Canada have in trade locked into an East-West pattern for this nation. It is fine for the centre, but it is not applicable to the best prosperity which we could obtain in either eastern or western Canada.

I am amazed that one who is so dependent upon the livestock industry of the West, as is the hon. gentleman from Regina, would hold such a position in respect of this item because north-south is a way for the fringes of Canada to trade.

There will be certain industries in this land which may not prosper as well as they have under this structure. However, I submit that the natural resource industries, in particular, and the technical industries now have a market which they can reach and that there is a challenge to Canadian government to ensure that the taxation system of Canada is competitive with that of our trading partners.

We must keep that competitive. If our taxes exceed the taxes which entrepreneurs or labourers would experience in other jurisdictions, we cannot provide the world market with our goods and services. We must recognize that there is an international competitive world in which we trade. Whether it be with the Pacific Rim, the United States, or the European Economic Community, we are in a world of trade, not in a nation isolated in an igloo, and we cannot prosper under that perception of our trading responsibilities.

It has been stated that the American law in respect to trade will still apply. It has been ignored that the Canadian law in respect to our trade with the United States will also still apply, and this is important. The other facet is that there is to be an international tribunal. Our fate is no longer to be decided by a single political thrust from our neighbour to the south. Rather, an international tribunal will discuss the difficulties which we may experience in whatever item of trade may be concerned. In our experience, particularly in lumber and potatoes, we have been the subject of a political decision rather than a legal or a trade agreement schedule. That is wrong.

Surely we have responsibility. I said that government must not tax excessively. We must have beneficent, ambitious, and competent management in the industrial life of this country. We must be in pursuit of markets. It is said that we should seek the Pacific Rim. We have been seeking markets in the Pacific Rim and we have been expanding, but in no way have they ever accommodated the degree and volume of trade which this nation needs for its prosperity.

We have been and shall continue to be in pursuit of all markets, but if we do not give notice to the world that we, as the European Economic Community, as Australia and New Zealand, and as, to some degree at least, the Pacific Rim, are a unit of trade; that we are a market of trade; that we are in pursuit of fair trade and equitable trade, then we will find ourselves in the same position as all those trade agreements which have been made by the coalition, which has actually been in existence for quite some time, whereby all the laws of the United States apply to GATT and all the laws of the United States apply to Canadian trade. They have and, yes, they still do, but future law cannot amend the treaty. That can only be amended by negotiation. That has been the traditional international structure in which we have traded by treaty for a good many years.

Mr. Langdon: That's not true.

Mr. McCain: I hear a little chirp over there. I would like to quote the Right Hon. Winston Churchill in his response to some remarks. I think this is very applicable to the type of remarks which have been emanating from both opposition Parties. "The Hon. Member is never lucky in the coincidence of his facts with the truth". In another situation of a comparable nature Sir Winston Churchill said: "I should think it hardly possible to state the opposite of the truth with more precision".

With that, Mr. Speaker, I leave this subject matter because never has the opposite of the truth been presented to the Canadian public by its political representatives with more precision than it has been done by both opposition Parties. That is a disgrace to both of them and it is not the leadership which Canada needs from either.

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I will enter the debate by taking up the point made by my hon. friend who has just spoken and for whom I have very great respect. The remarks he made illustrate one of the main reasons it is essential that there be more debate, more discussion, and more exposure of the terms of the free trade agreement which is dealt with by the legislation before us.

My friend said that we should not be worried about future law because from the time the trade agreement was signed future law does not apply to it. He referred with some affection and pride to the binational dispute settlement mechanism which is pioneered in this particular agreement and, of course, validated in the legislation.

I would like to challenge him on his assertion. I regret that I do not have a copy of the free trade agreement with me in the House, but I know the article number by heart because I have read it frequently at meetings that I have attended. I refer my friend to Article 1902 of the free trade agreement which provides categorically—

• (1230)

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Perhaps I could supply the words to the Hon. Member:

> "Each Party reserves the right to change or modify its antidumping law or countervailing duty law, provided that in the case of an amendment to a Party's antidumping or countervailing duty statute—"

There is notification that the party is so included.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, fortunately or perhaps unfortunately, I only have a copy of the Agreement in French, but since the Parliamentary Secretary has asked me, I would be happy to read it for him. Part one of article 1902 reads as follows, in English:

> "1. Each Party reserves the right to apply its antidumping law and countervailing duty law to goods imported from the territory of the other Party. Antidumping law and countervailing duty law include, as appropriate for each Party, relevant statutes, legislative history, regulations, administrative pratice, and judicial precedents".

[*English*]

As the Member for New Brunswick who spoke before me said, that makes it very clear that the existing law of each country applies. The Government achieved absolutely no success in eliminating or reducing or moderating existing countervail and anti-dumping law.

Mr. McDermid: Go on and read about the GATT.

Mr. Kaplan: I am coming to the future.

Mr. McDermid: Read the whole section. Be honest.

Mr. Kaplan: I am delighted to accommodate, as I always do, my friend, the Parliamentary Secretary. However, I would like to do it in my own way. I look forward to what he has to say.

Subsequent to the signing of this agreement, the United States Congress passed very far-reaching additional protective legislation, protective of American trade from competition from abroad.

The Government made no secret of the fact, and we know that the Canadian Government and its very competent ambassador in Washington tried extremely hard to exempt Canada from that new legislation, because the new legislation gives additional powers to the President of the United States to punish the trading partners of the United States who, in the American view, violate their standards of fair trading. The Government tried to exempt Canada from that law and was unsuccessful.

If my friend, the Member from New Brunswick who just spoke, was right, why would the Canadian Government have worried about that legislation because it was passed after the trade agreement was signed? The answer is found in Clause 2 of Article 1902, a clause which makes it clear that legislation passed after the signing of this agreement affects this agreement. Therefore we as a country did not manage to achieve any reduction of countervailing and anti-dumping legislation in the United States at the time this agreement was signed.

Mr. McDermid: Neither did they.

Mr. Kaplan: But we also did not manage to get ourselves exempted from future measures like the one I just described even though a very valiant effort, made which was certainly supported by all Members of the House was made to try to get us exempted.

[*Translation*]

Part two of the article in question, which I have here in French, reads as follows, in English:

> "2. Each Party reserves the right to change or modify its antidumping law or countervailing duty law . . . "

[*English*]

In other words, the United States can add anti-dumping and protective measures additional to those in effect when this agreement was signed, provided conditions are met, and when those measures are passed they apply to the Canada-U.S. trade—

Mr. McDermid: Is one of those to apply to GATT?

Mr. Kaplan: Yes.

Mr. McDermid: Do you support the GATT?

Mr. Kaplan: I support the GATT.

Mr. McDermid: The protection is there. Get serious.

Mr. Kaplan: My friend is telling me that the protection is there. If the protection is there, how did the Americans get away with the legislation—

Mr. McDermid: Tell them about the binational dispute settlement mechanism.

Mr. Kaplan: Now I will come to the binational dispute mechanism. This dispute mechanism—

Mr. McDermid: You have not read all the conditions yet.

Mr. Kaplan: They are here. I only have another minute. I can see that there are conditions, but these conditions do not prevent the United States from imposing what, in its opinion, are valid countervail and anti-dumping measures against us.

Mr. McDermid: Not inconsistent with GATT, and you support the GATT.

Mr. Kaplan: We do support the GATT.

Mr. McDermid: You are arguing against yourself.

Mr. Kaplan: I am not arguing against myself. I think I should take the floor and continue to make my points. The final reason why these motions ought to be accepted is that the binational dispute settlement mechanism does not open the United States to free Canadian trade.

The impression that the Government wants to give to Canadians about this agreement is that a business in my riding will be able to go into an American city or anywhere in the United States, make sales, deliver and so on, in the same way that it can any place in our country. That observation is not valid because countervail and anti-dumping legislation do not apply when my constituent makes sales in Winnipeg and in Windsor.

Mr. McDermid: Is your constituent a fair trader?

Mr. Kaplan: My constituent will trade in the United States the best he can. The point the Parliamentary Secretary is trying to make and achieve great satisfaction from is that the binational dispute settlement mechanism somehow or other will carry my constituent through the objections that can be raised on an American countervail and anti-dumping basis. This is not the case.

I would ask him to be big enough to admit that all that mechanism does is assure that American law and Canadian law will be applied objectively and impartially. I am prepared to say that that never bothered me because I always respected American jurists in the same way that I respect Canadian jurists.

These are two countries characterized by fair arbitrations, by fair court procedures. The binational mechanism is interesting. It is a world model because it does provide for impartiality and objectivity, but I took those for granted. I think most Canadian traders did.

What we do not take for granted is countervail and anti-dumping which is a tool available for American interests to protect themselves from people in my riding who want to do business in the United States because they think the Government has won for them protected, unlimited and equal access to the American market as they have in Canada. These motions become even more important. I commend them to the House.

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak to Motions Nos. 5, 6, and 8 which would delete Clauses 3, 4, and 6. I will attend only Clause 3 which states the general purposes of Bill C-130.

The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary has referred previously to Clause 3 which sets out the purposes of the Bill. It is interesting to note that among all the purposes cited there is nothing here about creating more jobs for Canadians. If our Party had been foolish enough to enter this kind of deal, among the purposes of this Bill and the agreement that it seeks to implement would have been the purpose to increase the availability of jobs and the opportunities for Canadians to assure a secure future, to ensure that the comparative advantages and the resources that we have would be used to enhance, as I cited yesterday, what most Canadians consider as a definition of Canada not only for the present but for the future. One of the worst aspects of the statement of purposes is the identification within the statement of failures of the trade agreement to achieve the purposes which are cited.

• (1240)

Let us examine those. The first purpose is as an objective to:

> "(a) eliminate barriers to trade in goods and services between Canada and the United States."

I see nothing in the free trade agreement that would do anything about the barriers to softwood lumber, to shakes and shingles, to hogs, to specialty steels, to the impediments that are presented to the free trade of goods and services represented by the new trade legislation, which other speakers have indicated will apply to Canada and from which we have not achieved any exemption. Clause 3 goes on to state:

> "(b) facilitate conditions of fair competition within the free trade area established by the Agreement."

Will this free trade agreement make level the field that is made unlevel by the 20 per cent higher costs in energy that Canadians have to pay? Will it eliminate the great transportation costs that we face when in this country? Will it eliminate the barriers to conditions of free competition which are imposed upon regions of the country, victims of past failures, to achieve economic development, the kind of economic development that is now substantially prevented by this legislation through concessions made by the Government to the Americans? The clause goes on to say:

> "(c) liberalize significantly conditions for investment within that free trade area."

This is one area of purpose that has been achieved. It certainly does liberalize investment and the acquisition of Canada by the Americans that not only makes it possible for them to accumulate our industry and our services, it permits them to control the means of investment through the provisions with respect to financial institutions. I have to concede, Mr. Speaker, that purpose (c) will be substantially achieved to the detriment of Canada and its future.

Let me come to subparagraph (d) which reads:

> "—establish effective procedures for the joint administration of the Agreement and the resolution of disputes."

Nobody really believes the dispute settlement mechanism will achieve that. As a matter of fact, we can look forward to

even further opportunities for harassment of Canadian traders. By the time the disputes are settled, the victims will already have suffered the effects of American countervail and anti-dumping provisions.

Mr. McDermid: You should have heard testimony at committee.

Mr. McCurdy: Finally, subparagraph (e) reads:

"—lay the foundation for further bilateral and multilateral co-operation to expand and enhance the benefits of the Agreement."

Nobody believes that; no outside observer believes that. Probably what we have done with respect to the service area has created an opportunity for the use of this area of investment for a new kind of colonialism of which Canada is the first victim.

It is shameful that this piece of legislation has to be rushed through the House by virtue of closure. There have been observations made about this kind of activity on the part of the Government. Let me read an interesting quote. Imposed upon us is that:

"—we have to hold our noses and pass whatever this government brings to the House, and pass it quickly. This comes from a closure-crazed government, a government which suffers from the crime of parliamentary bestiality. It cannot wait to force these kinds of things through the House."

Who said that, Mr. Speaker? Who went on to say:

"It is a betrayal of the parliamentary system to add to the betrayal of the people of Canada, who have been betrayed in gasoline prices. They have been betrayed in heating oil prices. They have been betrayed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

They have been betrayed by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde). Now they have been betrayed by the House leader of the government."

This same, up until now, anonymous commentator who has been so right about the circumstances which face us now went on to say:

"Today we have a parliamentary system of government without any checks and balances and without the separation of powers. The Prime Minister has a group of docile sheep in his caucus who keep him in power, no matter what he is doing. They just say, "Baaa, sir, baaa, sir, pass it through the House, sir".

As long as they do that, he has absolute power. This Prime Minister has absolute power as long as the majority in his caucus give him that unlimited power. They are so busy with their noses in the patronage trough and the power trough that they neither know nor care what happens to this Parliament, and we can expect nothing from them."

He goes on to say, and this is relevant in the present circumstances, this very erudite and observant commentator:

"Where are the people with the grapes in their district?"

Finally, he said:

"Where are all the defenders of the people on the other side of the House? They are going to come out of their trough in a few minutes. They will hear the bell and will have to break away from whatever trough they have their noses in at the moment. They will have to come into this House and say "Oink, oink".

They will have to say "Aye, aye". They will have to say "Yes" to the stampeding of Parliament, to rushing this bill through the House. They will have to say "Yes" to the gutting of Parliament. They will have to do the dirty work that the parliamentary assistants, assassins and eunuchs have asked them to do."

That was the Minister of International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) who identified what this Government is doing with its imposition of closure in an attempt to hide from the Canadian people the rape of Canada.

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, these three amendments before us in this group on the trade bill, Bill C-130, enable us to point out some of the very serious dangers in this Bill. Motion No. 5 would delete Clause 3 in the Bill. That would have the effect of deleting the statement of purposes. That would be a distinct improvement if it were done, but I want to mention particularly two of the purposes that seem to me quite misleading or misworded as they stand.

In Clause 3(b) it says one of the purposes is to:

"—facilitate conditions of fair competition within the free trade area established by the Agreement."

We have heard a great deal in the past about the need for having a dispute settlement mechanism. We now find that we do not have one, not of the sort promised to us by this Government. We do not have one that protects us against non-tariff trade barriers, against countervail, and against anti-dumping laws passed by the United States in the past or in the future. All the dispute mechanism does is tell us, if it is carried through, whether an American law was fairly applied. We could have a two, three or four year process of dispute while Canadian exporters to the United States go down the drain and find at the end of the judgment that the American law, while we might think it an unfair law, nevertheless was fairly applied, that is, applied in the way it was intended and, therefore, we have no complaint and no remedy.

There are many manufacturers in Spadina in the clothing industry who are seriously worried about this Bill, particularly because of this aspect of the Bill. They have spoken out against it, including some who originally favoured the negotiations, took part in the negotiations, and at first said that it was a good deal. They then found it was a bad deal. They are threatened, for example, by the prospect of restriction of Canadian imports into the United States depending on where the Canadian manufacturer buys its fabric. That has been objected to strongly by Mr. Nygard who was the chairman of the SAGIT and who took part in these negotiations. He even recommended that his industry, not his company but the whole clothing manufacturing industry, be removed from the free trade agreement for that reason, but of course his recommendation to the Government was ignored.

• (1250)

The result of that sort of failure in the negotiations with the United States was illustrated some months ago when a clothing producer in Ontario was negotiating a loan with a bank, had gone through all the stages up to the point where he was told: "Okay, go and see the manager next week and he will

sign the loan". He went, but in the meantime the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) had been on television talking about winners and losers and mentioning the clothing manufacturing industry among the losers. When he got to the bank manager the bank manager said: "Did you hear the Prime Minister Sunday night on television?" "Yes," he said. "Then you don't get the loan". In other words, the bank manager believed the Prime Minister at that point in saying that the clothing manufacturing industry would be a loser and therefore of course not fit for that banker to lend money to.

There are other industries in Spadina which are worried about this deal as well because the trouble in it goes far beyond the clothing industry. We have a very large set of service industries. The service industries have been opened up to foreign takeover according to purpose number(c) of Clause 3 to liberalize significantly conditions for investment in that free trade area.

In other words, American firms can come to buy up Canadian firms. They can come and buy up large chunks of Canadian banks, much larger than they could before. It should be said that Canadians can go buy up Americans which is still small comfort, still small protection for those Canadians who do not happen to be extremely wealthy. In fact, there have been thousands of sales already by those who believe that this deal is a certainty, people who have decided if you can't lick them, join them. Instead of moving bodily to the United States they have simply transferred their assets to the United States to be protected from the people who would take them over, to surrender instead of resisting. We do not intend to surrender.

In the analysis done by the Bank of Nova Scotia we are shown that industries can be classified according to that bank's predictions as to which ones are likely to gain and which ones are likely to lose. In its general classification it states that the resource industries which employ between 300,000 and 400,000 people have a favourable risk factor of four. They are at the top of the list. They will do better than anybody else by this deal. The manufacturing industry which employs 2.25 million people has an unfavourable risk factor of minus one. In other words, they stand to lose. Agriculture, likewise, which employs nearly 500,000 people has an unfavourable risk factor of minus one. They stand to lose. The service industries employing 7,710,000 people in Canada have a risk factor of minus two. That is a lot of service jobs that can go down the drain.

We have many, many services, whether it is computer processing, whether it is management of hospitals, management of other health facilities, funded by the public through a health insurance system much better than the United States health insurance system, covering all the people instead of only some of the people. The management of this, according to the trade deal, can be taken over by the American hospital management corporations that have a record for cutting services and cutting staff in order to increase their profits. Those are the people that this trade deal invites to come to take over key sections of the Canadian health system as the process of privatization is led by this Government and by other Conservative Governments, and perhaps by other Liberal Governments in Canada.

These are not the only industries that are at risk. There are some that worry us very much in Spadina where we have the hospitals, many other health care institutions, and the garment industry.

The Bank of Nova Scotia has done a much more comprehensive job. It has also pointed out that industries rated at extreme risk, minus four, include light cotton apparel, foundation garments, automotive heavy truck assemblers, automotive small parts producers, food processing of fruits and vegetables, railway freight car assembly.

This is the judgment of a bank which will be controlling a significant share of investment in these industries. These are the ones that this bank in its own interest finds vulnerable and put in danger by this Bill.

Therefore I would urge the adoption of these amendments.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would like to bring to the attention of Hon. Members that Motions Nos. 5, 6, and 8 have been grouped for debate and will be voted on separately.

The question is on Motion No. 5, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 6, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 8, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

LA VERENDRYE WILDLIFE RESERVE—OPPOSITION TO HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane—Superior): Mr. Speaker, the Algonquin Indian people of Barriere Lake in the Province of Quebec are vigorously protesting a hydroelectric project designed to encourage further development activity in the La Verendrye Wildlife Reserve.

The Algonquins of Barriere Lake, some 450 persons, have a 59-acre reserve located in the middle of the La Verendrye Park. Clear-cutting of timber is already devastating this sanctuary.

To add insult to injury the Minister of Indian Affairs (Mr. McKnight) has offered to advance nearly $4 million of the band's capital funds to Hydro Québec for this project. The Barriere Lake band says: "No". The Minister of Indian Affairs says: "Get out of my way".

How long will we go on imposing our will on the first citizens of this country? We must cease trampling on peoples' rights simply because they are few in number, terribly poor, and without any political power or influence.

* * *

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

ERRORS IN CREDIT CARD STATEMENTS

Mr. Reginald Stackhouse (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, if you, I say with respect, any Member of the House, or any citizen of this country habitually pays your credit card bill scarcely thinking about it, break the habit, stop, check your statement. Two per cent of all credit card statements are wrong through human error, computer glitches, and fraud.

Customers are well advised to check their statements against their receipts because of such errors as billing for charges that were not made, incorrectly identified charges, charges for items that were returned or were not accepted, and late billings.

In view of the large number of people affected and the large amount of funds involved, I intend to bring in legislation that will limit the liability of customers and ensure that genuine complaints are honoured.

S. O. 21

EMPLOYMENT

CLOSURE OF GLACE BAY, N.S., FISH PLANT—EFFECT ON WORKERS

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, a group of people from Glace Bay who work for Highland Fisheries recently occupied the offices of the Premier of Nova Scotia. They occupied those offices because they are worried about their jobs, and no one will give them a straight answer.

Clearwater Fine Foods, which owns the plant, closed it on June 21. It said at the time that the move was necessary because it did not have enough quota. The federal Fisheries Minister went to Glace Bay to meet with union and community officials. He told them he would meet with the President of Clearwater Foods, John Risley, and that he would try to get the plant opened by August 1. The Fisheries Minister also said repeatedly in the House of Commons that Clearwater had plenty of quota.

August 1 has come and gone and the plant is still closed. John Risley is still saying that Clearwater does not have quota. He even said that present groundfish management plans have clouded the future of the plant.

The people of Glace Bay want to meet with John Risley and the Fisheries Minister at the same time. They want some straight answers, and they want their jobs. Glace Bay has already lost important jobs in the mines and heavy water plants. People deserve some straight answers from their last major employer, Highland Fisheries.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAIT—DUMPING OF PULP MILL WASTES

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, every day the Scott Maritimes Limited Pulp and Paper Mill in Pictou County dumps millions of gallons of waste into Boat Harbour in Northumberland Strait. The wastes are only treated mechanically before being discharged. The result is that waters in Boat Harbour have been virtually deprived of oxygen and are contaminated by polluting by-products of pulp and paper production. The Canso Chemicals Chlor-Alkali Plant, operated by C.I.L., Scott and Domtar, is a source of mercury pollution here too.

• (1405)

During the past 22 years 12 studies have been conducted by the federal and provincial Governments, but no action has been taken to stop the pollution. The people of Pictou County do not want any more studies or tests; they now want action.

We urge the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) and the Minister of Fisheries and Ocean (Mr. Siddon) to use Section 33 of the Fisheries Act and prosecute Scott Maritimes Limited whenever a violation occurs. The Government must start to practise what it preaches.

* * *

NATIONAL PARKS

PRINCE ALBERT NATIONAL PARK—WILDER FAMILY DONATION

Mr. Don Ravis (Saskatoon East): Mr. Speaker, last week I had the pleasure of representing the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) at the Prince Albert National Park to unveil a plaque to honour the Wilder family from Washington State.

The park preserves the memory of one of Canada's most famous conservationists—Grey Owl. Recently Edwin and Margery Wilder bequeathed to the Prince Albert National Park real estate valued at more than a half a million dollars, the largest donation ever made by private citizens to a Canadian national park.

This money will be used to maintain and preserve the Grey Owl wilderness area in perpetuity, thereby ensuring that the Grey Owl legacy continues to enrich future generations.

I am hopeful that more citizens will follow this example and join in the preservation of Canada's natural resources by supporting our national parks.

* * *

FINANCE

PROPOSED NATIONAL SALES TAX

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) has not made it clear to the people of Canada that after the next general election he plans to introduce a national sales tax, probably something in the 15 per cent range, so that after the next election, when people go out and buy school supplies, they will be paying this new federal sales tax; when they buy their children's toys, they will be paying the new federal sales tax; when they buy their kid's bike, they will be paying the federal sales tax; when they go out to a restaurant, they will be paying a tax on the restaurant meal; when they buy hockey tickets, they will be paying this new federal sales tax.

They will be paying a new federal sales tax every time they buy a new home or pay for home repairs. When they go bowling, they will pay the new federal sales tax; when they have their hair done, they will pay the new federal sales tax; when they go to a movie, they will pay this new federal sales tax; when they pay their child care, they will pay this new federal sales tax.

Ms. Copps: Isn't anything free?

Mr. Riis: When they pay for their legal fees, they will pay the new federal sales tax; when they fill out a will, they will pay the new federal sales tax; when they have their tax return completed, they will have to pay a federal sales tax on top of that; when they go to the dentist, they will have to pay a federal sales tax; when they have their oil changed and their spark plugs changed, they will have to pay a new federal sales tax; when they have a music lesson, their children will have to pay a national sales tax. It goes on and on and on. You can plainly see that there is a national sales tax on every business service in the country.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

ESTABLISHMENT OF ROUGE VALLEY HERITAGE PARK URGED

Mr. W. Paul McCrossan (York—Scarborough): Mr. Speaker, the Rouge Valley system, located in York—Scarborough, is the last significant wildlife area remaining near Toronto. The area has a rich and diverse ecology, supporting a wide variety of birds, fish, mammals and reptiles. Regionally, rare plants and several important archaeological sites are also found in the valley.

Most of the land in the Rouge Valley is publicly owned. However, both the conservation authority and the provincial Government have indicated that they want to sell the land to private developers for luxury housing, and Metro Toronto has indicated it thinks the Rouge Valley would be the ideal site for a new dump.

Environmentalists in Canada and around the world have recognized the importance of the Rouge Valley ecosystem. Since local and provincial authorities appear unwilling to preserve the last remaining wildlife area near Toronto, it is time for the federal Government to indicate that it would be prepared to manage the area as our first Canadian heritage park.

* * *

FISHERIES

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR INSHORE FISHERY

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, Newfoundlanders, no matter where they lived, were shocked and angered by the response of the Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), Newfoundland's sole representative in the federal Cabinet, to questions raised in this House about the disastrous inshore fishery in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador this year.

The Member for St. John's West calmly informed the House that he had toured St. John's West and found no evidence of an inshore fishery within that primarily city riding and, therefore, there was no problem in the entire Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

The fishermen and fishermen's families in Newfoundland, whether they are in Burin—St. Georges, represented by the Minister's colleague, whether they are in Bonavista—Trinity—Conception, in western Newfoundland, Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe, whether they are in Labrador, know that there is hunger in their communities today and that fishermen's families are reeling from the double bang of low prices and an absence of fish in many communities.

They want a compassionate, caring, and sober response to the reality that besets them. Just as we properly and rightly responded to the need of farmers, primary producers, we must respond to the fishermen of Atlantic Canada today.

* * *

• (1410)

WESTERN DIVERSIFICATION PROGRAM

GOVERNMENT COMMITMENT TO WESTERN CANADA

Mr. William G. Lesick (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, let there be no question about it. The Western Diversification Program introduced in August of 1987 has been a resounding success in its first fiscal year of operation. Western Canada has made great strides forward in diversifying its economy as a result of this federal government program.

To date there have been 503 projects approved with over $345 million being allocated to the western economy. These results represent jobs and prosperity for all regions of the West. This program has also demonstrated the commitment of the Conservative Government to the economy and the people of western Canada.

* * *

AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

LOCATION OF PROPOSED SPACE AGENCY

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, once again the Conservatives are playing politics with the decision about where to locate the headquarters of the new Canadian space agency. Having gutted the National Research Council by spending cuts in 1985 and having ignored his election promises to expand research and development in Canada, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) is now trying to attract votes in Quebec by promising that the space agency will go to Montreal at the same time as he tries to hang on to votes in the Ottawa area by endlessly deferring the final decision.

The fact is that, while the Government has delayed this announcement, the work of the space agency has been taking place in the national capital area for the last two years. As an Ottawa Member, I think that the space agency should be located in the national capital region because this is where the work has been taking place. I also think that a competent Government would have made this decision two years ago rather than used it as a political football.

S. O. 21

People in Montreal and in Ottawa threw the Liberals out over the issues of favouritism and patronage in 1984, and I do not think they want the Conservative Government doing the same thing in 1988.

* * *

POLITICAL PARTIES

CHILD CARE AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE—POLICY OF NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. Léo Duguay (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Broadbent) outlined his policy on child care and criticized ours as "scatter-gun", "spending money in all kinds of ways", and said "it's all quite irrelevant". He promised to save Canadians $4.1 billion, and to change maternity benefits from 15 weeks to 28 weeks. However, he could not elaborate on either the savings or the costs of these changes. The Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell) quickly added that the maternity benefit changes would cost the Government nothing since they would be paid for by the employees and employers.

As the parliamentary task force of which she and I were members concluded, her "nothing" happens to be $1.8 billion over the next five years. His "irrelevant" includes $2.3 billion of tax savings for Canadians.

That is the NDP for you, Mr. Speaker. A $1.8 billion expenditure is nothing and a $2.3 billion tax saving is irrelevant. That is how NDP Members are going to help ordinary Canadians. They will label all expenditures irrelevant and all savings nothing. With them in control, as Manitobans well know, ordinary Canadians quickly become less than ordinary and a lot poorer.

* * *

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

TRIBUTE TO MID-EAST PEACEKEEPING CONTINGENT

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, hats off to the personnel in the Canadian Armed Forces who have worked so hard to put the United Nations Iraq-Iran military observer group together over a period of just a few days. Our professionals in the military community have once again proven that they can put a team together in short order, and they will once again display Canadian good-will and effectiveness at peacekeeping to the world at large.

The 495-person UN peacekeeping contingent was put together at Canadian Forces Base Petawawa and includes about 350 from that base, about 50 from Calgary, approximately 20 from CFB Kingston, and about 40 from reserve units across Canada.

Canadian peacekeeping had its beginning under the wise guidance and initiative of the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson, Canada's Foreign Affairs Minister when the Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent was Prime Minister of Canada. Our Canadian service people will once again display their diplomacy, their professional soldier qualities and their ability to handle political problems and difficult challenges.

Canada and the world will be well served by the Canadian Armed Forces as they proceed to take over their observer and communications UN peacekeeping duties in Iraq and Iran, and this Parliament of Canada wishes them well as we express our appreciation to them.

* * *

POLITICAL PARTIES

LIBERAL PARTY—RESERVED QUEBEC RIDING NOMINATIONS

Mr. John Oostrom (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party of Canada claims to be open to all who wish to join and participate. However, it is evident that this is a shallow and hollow claim. Let us examine the present situation in Quebec.

In that province a small clique determines who may and who may not seek a nomination. Ridings are reserved for different ethnic groups and candidates. Presently, Dr. Déry, who has signed up 1,400 members, is being denied the opportunity to seek the nomination in the riding of St. Laurent because it has been reserved for an as yet unknown parachute candidate.

The Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Turner) continually states that the Party is open to grassroots participation. However, the present situation in that province contradicts him. It is very apparent that democracy is only empty rhetoric to the Liberal Party and the reality is that only chosen friends need apply.

* * *

• (1415)

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—NIAGARA GRAPE GROWERS

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, at least in the Liberal Party there are people who want to run for nominations in Toronto.

I have here a four-quart basket of sour grapes that unfortunately the rules prevent me from delivering personally to every single Conservative on the Government side. However, I do have some farmers here from the Niagara Peninsula who know that the Government has victimized the grape and wine industry as a result of the trade deal, but for heaven's sake do not wait for the election to deliver on a pay-out package to those farmers who are hungry, who are going bankrupt, who are losing their jobs, and facing marital stress as a result of the Government's sell-out on the trade deal.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) promised those farmers would be compensated. They are here in the gallery today. They want to know where their compensation is. Or, are all they are going to get from this Government is another bunch of sour grapes?

* * *

POLITICAL PARTIES

LIBERAL PARTY—RESERVED QUEBEC RIDING NOMINATIONS

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, contrast if you would, Sir, the disgraceful and undignified free for all in Toronto with the much more genteel way of choosing Liberal candidates in Quebec. In the latter case special reserved places are held for the chosen few, carefully selected by the high party brass, while the common Liberal yobs are told to shut up and keep quiet. The only common thread between the two situations is the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Turner) complete impotency in dealing effectively with either.

Is it any wonder, Sir, that electors in both Quebec and Toronto will be turning out in record numbers to vote Conservative in the next election?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

MANITOBA ALUMINUM SMELTER PROJECT

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. As we all know by now, last weekend the Prime Minister met with the Premier of Quebec and at the end of the meeting came out with a statement giving a guarantee of federal funding for an aluminum smelting project in his own riding. We now learn from a letter written by the Premier of Manitoba to the Prime Minister that the Premier of Manitoba also had a meeting three weeks ago with the Prime Minister and an aluminum smelter was discussed at that time, but with a

difference. The Premier of Manitoba came out empty handed, no guarantee, no assurance, no support.

Mr. Masse: How do you know that?

Mr. Axworthy: Because Mr. Filmon says so.

Mr. Mazankowski: Nonsense.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, the question is one of fairness.

Mr. McDermid: What did you do with Alcan?

Mr. Axworthy: Even though poor Mr. Filmon could not get an answer, I wonder if we can get an answer today from the Government to our request.

Is the Government prepared to say today that it will offer a guarantee for the exact amount of support and funding for an aluminum smelter in Manitoba as it offered for the same smelter in the Prime Minister's riding in Quebec?

Mr. Holtmann: Naturally.

Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say first that what we have here is a level playing field.

Ms. Copps: A what?

Mr. de Cotret: A level playing field. If we have a project in one region of the country or the other, we will deal with the project on an equal and equitable basis, whether it be Manitoba or Quebec. I would like to quote from the statement of the Prime Minister who said:

> "Yesterday in Montreal, I met with Premier Bourassa and we discussed the proposal to build an aluminum smelter that is now under study by an international consortium. Of course, the final decision will be made by the investors but the Premier and I agreed to promote Sept-Iles as the site for the proposed smelter. The federal government is monitoring this project's progress with great interest. This project, being studied by international investors of solid reputation would create many jobs and have a considerable economic impact on Sept-Iles, on the North Shore and on all of Québec. This is another example of how a stable political climate and open markets attract private investment."

That is in no way suggesting that we would not consider a similar project for Manitoba. Obviously we would.

• (1420)

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, this is the same Minister who, when asked similar questions about a year and a half ago about the CF-18 project, gave us assurances that there was no political interference. Yet every document since then has pointed out that the Prime Minister's hand was in that area.

REQUEST FOR FEDERAL FINANCIAL COMMITMENT

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, in a statement which was printed today the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro said that in order to ensure that the private investment for the aluminum smelter would take place in Manitoba the Government of Manitoba has requested up to $150 million of subsidies.

Mr. Crosbie: Better luck next time.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Conservative Minister for Manitoba is contradicting the Conservative appointed Chairman of the Manitoba Hydro Board.

Mr. Epp (Provencher): That is not what I said.

Mr. Axworthy: It is too bad that the Conservatives cannot get together and agree on these simple facts.

Mr. Ransom has said that it would take up to $150 million. Is the Government prepared to answer that question? Are you going to give the commitment that there would be that kind of funding?

Mr. Speaker: I would ask Hon. Members to address their questions through the Chair. I hesitate very much to interrupt, but that is the rule. The Hon. Minister.

Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it very clear that we are working with a level playing field. We will look at any request from Manitoba in the same way as we would look at a request from any other province or any other region in this country. There is no difference in that respect. I do not understand why the Hon. Member keeps on insisting that we have a request that we do not have, and that we are not prepared to look at it. We will look at that request in a very serious manner.

In a letter sent by the Deputy Prime Minister very recently we stated very clearly—

Some Hon. Members: When?

Mr. de Cotret: Following questions on the issue. We said again that we will look at the project. There is no problem there. It is a level playing field for anybody. It is the same for everyone.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister says we are working with a level playing field. The rules of that level playing field apply very differently to the people in Manitoba than to people in another part of Canada. We have the CF-18 case before us and we know how biased the rules are on that level playing field.

PRIME MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, the Minister says the Government will look at a project in Manitoba but the Prime Minister gave a guarantee for the project in his own riding. I want to know why the difference. Why the guarantee for a project in his own riding and only an offer to look at the project in Manitoba? Why the difference? Why do you not play fair with the people of Manitoba?

Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, the premise of the question is totally false. I will quote again: "Of course the final decision will be made by the investors but the Premier and I agreed to promote Sept-Iles". The final decision will be made by the investors. That is what the Prime Minister said.

If there is a request made in the case of Manitoba, that request will be analyzed and decided upon according to the same rules that apply throughout the country from Newfoundland to British Columbia.

Mr. Axworthy: The same rules as on the CF-18?

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—NIAGARA GRAPE GROWERS

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister for International Trade and concerns the impact that the Prime Minister's trade deal has had on the grape growers of the Niagara area of the country.

Over 16,000 jobs are dependant on this industry. Farmers were promised operating loans which they have not been able to get. Land values have dropped precipitously since last December. Grape growers are forecasting about 50 per cent of the price they got last year for their grapes. The industry and the whole region are in chaos.

Can the Minister for International Trade tell these grape growers when he is going to announce a program to compensate them for the loss of the industry?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the grape growing industry of Ontario had problems long before the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement was negotiated. It had a problem because of the finding of a panel of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade which Members of the House know was made earlier this year.

• (1425)

That industry have had problems for a number of years because there has been a surplus of lower quality grapes produced in Ontario every year that has required a program of government assistance to get rid of the surplus. These problems are present in the Ontario industry.

The Government has entered into an agreement with the Government of British Columbia for a grape adjustment assistance program in that province. There are negotiations under way at the present time between the Government of Ontario and our Government to try to devise a similarly satisfactory agreement for the grape industry in Ontario.

These matters are proceeding. It takes the two Governments to reach a satisfactory adjustment program, which we hope will be accomplished. We are doing our share.

Ms. Copps: Bull.

Mr. Crosbie: We are taking the initiative and we hope a generous and adequate program will come out of the consultations between these two Governments.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE—TAX QUERY

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Government does not know what it is doing on this adjustment program. The Minister of Agriculture admitted last week that he did not even know whether the adjustment program would be subject to income tax. That is a pretty important issue for these producers.

More important, the producers in Niagara want to know if the Government is prepared to give at least the $156 million of assistance that was forecast to be their losses to cover even half which is forecast to be taken out of the industry, plus assistance for the other half. Will the Minister give a commitment that at least $156 million will be provided to take 11,000 acres out of production and state whether or not that assistance will be taxable? Will he give at least that amount of information today?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I would only hope that the hon. gentleman would make some representations to the Government of Ontario—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gauthier: Pass the buck.

Mr. Foster: Whose trade deal is this?

Ms. Copps: It is your trade deal.

Mr. Crosbie: —a government to which he is very close, to encourage that Government to do the right thing and be as generous in this approach as the Government of Canada.

Mr. Foster: It is your trade deal.

Mr. Crosbie: The basic problems afflicting the Ontario grape industry are as a result of the GATT panel report—

Mr. Foster: That is bull.

Mr. Crosbie: —that found provincial liquor board practices to be unfair trade under international trade rules.

Ms. Copps: Sour grapes, Crosbie.

Mr. Crosbie: It is the GATT approach that the Official Opposition favours. That is where the main problem arises.

Ms. Copps: That is totally false.

Mr. Crosbie: We are prepared to do our share, and a very generous share, of assisting the Ontario industry. We need the help and assistance of the Ontario Government. Put some pressure on the Ontario Government.

Mr. Foster: That is totally false. The free trade deal went out first.

Some Hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. McDermid: Get your facts straight.

Ms. Copps: Stop spreading manure.

Mr. Speaker: I might just say quietly that the Hon. Member for Algoma will undoubtedly have another occasion to pursue this matter, along with his colleagues. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Birds Hill.

* * *

REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

QUEBEC AND MANITOBA ALUMINUM SMELTER PROJECTS

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister for Regional Industrial Expansion. How can he claim with any degree of intellectual and political honesty that the Government is creating a level playing field when the Prime Minister, according to the quote which the Minister himself read to the House, has agreed to promote Sept-Iles as the site of an aluminum smelter? Does the Minister believe that investors who, he claims, will make the final decision, exist in a vacuum? Does he think that they do not read the papers or pay attention to the House of Commons? Does he think they will not notice that the Prime Minister has agreed to promote a certain location? Is that what he calls a level playing field?

• (1430)

Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I would like to be very, very clear on this issue.

Some Hon. Members: We would like you to, too.

Mr. de Cotret: We will give equal consideration to a request that could come for a smelter in Manitoba and one that could come for a smelter in Quebec. I would like to make it very clear that these are not competing projects. I do not know where the Hon. Members opposite got that idea.

We will give equal consideration, fair consideration, to both projects and both projects could go ahead.

I really fail to see the point of the argument which the Hon. Member is trying to raise, Mr. Speaker. It will be a level playing field and both could go ahead.

REQUEST THAT PRIME MINISTER PROMOTE MANITOBA SITE

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, the Government continues to maintain that there has been no request from Manitoba, no proposal. But that simply is not the case.

If the Minister is serious about this level playing field, will the Prime Minister be making a statement to the effect that he is prepared to promote, to use the words the Minister used here in the House, Manitoba as a site for equal consideration? We know what equal consideration means. We got that with the CF-18.

Is the Prime Minister willing to promote Manitoba as a site in the same way that he is willing to promote Sept-Îles?

Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member keeps on referring obliquely to the fact that there is a kind of competition here. There is no competition. It is not a question of Manitoba versus Quebec. There can easily be two smelters. There is easily the potential for two smelters and we will consider both requests on an equal basis. Everybody will be treated equitably in this question. There is no difficulty with that.

All I am saying is that we will wait until we have the full documentation on both projects and, if they both go ahead, so much the better. It will mean more jobs throughout Canada.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Regional and Industrial Expansion.

On what basis does he make the claim that there is no competition between these two proposals? Does the Minister have a study that is available to the House and to the various Governments that shows the rationale behind the Prime Minister's statement in Quebec and the rationale behind the Minister's statement here today that there is no competition?

Is there any intelligence behind this, or is it just the electioneering of the Prime Minister in Quebec, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether the Hon. Member opposite is against this kind of project anywhere in the country.

We are going to deal with the requests that we receive when we receive them, on an equal and equitable basis. We must have the requests in before we can give an answer, and we do not have them.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that these requests will be dealt with equitably whether they be in Québec, in Manitoba, in B.C., in Newfoundland or in any other province in this country. There is room for more than one. We have no problems with that. It is a level playing field. We will look at the requests as they come in and hopefully we will be able, through the initiative of private investors in this area, to create more jobs throughout the country again.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FREE TRADE

CLOSURE OF SIMONDS PLANT IN GRANBY—REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade and is further to the questions I asked him yesterday about the 131 victims of the spirit of free trade who were laid off by the Simonds Company.

This morning, the workers read the Minister's advertising, which says, "Let's be prepared to take advantage of free trade. Canadians are getting ready for free trade and the Government of Canada is there to help them."

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 131 Simonds workers, what is the Canadian Government prepared to do for those who are losing their jobs because the plant is being transferred to the United States, according to the good principles of free trade? What is the Government ready to announce for these workers?

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, as I surmised yesterday the Hon. Member's facts were entirely wrong. The company in question, which is known as Simonds Industries Inc., has four plants.

It has two plants in the U.S. and two in Canada. For reasons of economy and efficiency the company has decided to close one in Canada to consolidate operations in the east, and to close one in Portland, Oregon, consolidating its production in the west in the company's plant in Vancouver, B.C. The company will end up with two plants instead of four, one in Vancouver and one in the United States, rather than having four plants.

In addition, I am told that Toronto will be the location for a new warehouse and distributing centre for the company as well as being the site of the Canadian head office, and that a president has been appointed for the Canadian company.

It is a complete tissue of fabrication that the plant in question is closing because of any connection to the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement. Tell the truth. If you are going to go to the people, start to learn to tell the truth.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lapierre: Mr. Speaker, I think that is some consolation prize for the 131 unemployed workers to know that there will

be a warehouse in Toronto! If that is the kind of economy he wants to build, that is not what we want!

REQUEST FOR ADJUSTMENT AND EARLY RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, in advertising paid for by the Government of Canada with taxpayers' money, the Government offers assistance to victims of free trade.

What I am asking the Minister is: What else has he to offer these 131 unemployed workers? Having a warehouse in Toronto will not feed their families next week.

I want to know from the Minister where the adjustment programs are. Where are the early retirement programs? What is he offering these families, instead of stupid answers like those he has given us since yesterday?

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, all of our government programs will be available to assist anyone laid off as a result of this decision of a private company to consolidate its operations in the interests of the over-all company's productivity.

Operations will continue with one plant operating in western Canada and closing one in the western United States, one plant operating in Massachusetts and unfortunately closing one here in Canada. It has no connection with the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement which is not even in effect yet. It is not suggested by the company that it has any connection, and the hon. gentleman deliberately distorted the facts when he brought that up. No amount of subterfuge can conceal the fact that you do not wish to tell the truth. You are following your Leader. You do not want to tell the truth.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Essex-Windsor.

GRAPE GROWING INDUSTRY

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister for International Trade who spoke against a closure motion in 1981 when he was not a Minister. In the course of that speech against closure he said:

> "Where are the people with the grapes in their district? They do not care what happens to the grape industry—"

Let me ask the Minister as he sits there with grapes on his desk, is he not the person who now doesn't care about the grape industry in this country?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the fact is that three years ago the European Community made a complaint to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, loved and supported by the Liberal and New Democratic opposition Parties. They love the GATT. They hate the U.S.-Canada relationship but they love GATT and all 96 countries that belong to GATT.

The European Community laid a complaint before GATT that our provincial liquor board practices with reference to liquor and wine were unfair and discriminated against those competing from outside. During the three year period a GATT panel found against a Canadian province, Ontario, and the rules had to be changed—

• (1440)

Ms. Copps: After the trade deal was announced.

Mr. Crosbie: —and the protection given to the grape growers by Ontario and other provinces has to end. It does not matter whether the U.S.-Canada agreement never goes through. If it never sees the light of day, grape growers in Ontario are in trouble. We are doing our best to help them, not Members opposite who do not give a darn about them.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, that is totally false.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Langdon: The agreement which was signed with the United States came first. It also put a much faster situation into place to which grape growers had to adjust.

Why is the Minister trying to distort the facts in front of the country? Why is he trying to distort the facts in front of grape growers who are here and who will be able to tell him and tell the country that he is wrong?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman opposite would not be able to tell the truth if it came up and smacked him right in the chops. He would not recognize it.

Ms. Copps: Sit down you buffoon.

Mr. Cassidy: Why do you not clean up your act?

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Minister is getting very close to crossing the fine line between colourful language and accusing another Member of not being able to tell the truth, which is pretty close to saying that the Hon. Member is doing something else. I ask the Hon. Minister and other Hon. Members in this Chamber to restrain themselves.

Some Hon. Members: Withdraw!

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, we are subjected to a campaign of untruthfulness from persons who, whether or not they know it, are telling untruths.

Three years ago the European Community took Canada—

Ms. Copps: Quit lying!

Mr. Crosbie: —to the GATT. The GATT found that provincial practices on pricing, listing and distribution discriminate against imports of alcoholic beverages and are inconsistent with GATT rules. We have to go back to the GATT by the end of 1988 to report how we are now complying with international GATT trade rules which both Parties opposite support. So the grape growers of Ontario and British Columbia are in difficulty in large part because of the GATT to which 96 countries belong and to which we cannot afford not to belong. That is the truth. Those are the facts, whether you are capable of realizing it or not.

* * *

EDUCATION

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION—FOLLOW-UP TO SASKATOON CONFERENCE

Mr. Don Ravis (Saskatoon East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State. Last October nearly 600 people representing students, labour, industry, and educators met in Saskatoon at the National Forum on Post-Secondary Education. I am aware that the Minister's predecessor met with provincial Ministers at a later date.

Can the Minister tell this House what type of follow-up action students and educators can expect from him since he has recently assumed this portfolio?

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Secretary of State of Canada): Mr. Speaker, the Saskatoon Forum called for closer federal-provincial co-operation on post-secondary education. We have achieved this. I met the Ministers of Education of Canada in Québec last June. We have also met many groups representing colleges, universities, professors and teachers. That was the first time ever that consultation involving both levels of government took place.

We must also recall that the Saskatoon Forum called for action on post-secondary education. We are now tackling specific issues in co-operation with the provinces, for example, improving accessibility to student aid, increasing support to university research, and supporting better research and information on post-secondary education.

I intend to have another meeting with provincial ministers next fall. This is just a start. Contrary to the past we are now creating a new partnership with governments and with the private sector on post-secondary education.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

FISHERIES

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR INSHORE FISHERY

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Acting Minister of Fisheries. Yesterday the Minister dismissed reports of an inshore fishery failure in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador by saying that all is well in the Minister's own riding of St. John's West and therefore all is well in all of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I want to ask the Minister whether he has managed in the last 24 hours to shed that callous and, I suggest, arrogant attitude, to discover that inshore fishermen on the Burin Peninsula on the south coast of the province, inshore fishermen on the Labrador coast in the north, inshore fishermen in the Straits of Belle Isle and, indeed, elsewhere in the province are having a very difficult year this year and are in desperate financial straits.

Given that the Minister has probably had 24 hours to recognize reality rather than the fantasy of his own visit to St. John's West, will he now say to the fishermen, primary producers, that help is coming from the federal Government? Or is he telling them all to move to St. John's West?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Hon. Member said that there was a disastrous failure of the inshore fishery in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador this year. That is absolutely untrue.

Here are the figures. The over-all landings and landed values for the Newfoundland region for the period January to July have increased over the same period in 1987. Inshore cod landings and values are estimated at 90,000 metric tonnes so far this year and $40 million, compared to 59,000 metric tonnes and $28 million in 1987. Capelin landings and values in 1988 show a dramatic increase with 78,000 metric tonnes compared to 32,000 last year, with landed values up to $28 million from $7 million. Total crab landings have gone up by a $2 million increase in landed values.

There is no disastrous failure. There are some areas in which there has been a poor fishery. Where there has been a poor fishery and if the fishery does not improve—and we are only half way through the year yet—this Government, as always, will be prepared to bring in special measures of assistance to help, through employment programs or otherwise if that is necessary. But the over-all fishery in the Newfoundland inshore fishery this year from the facts, from the figures—not from the fiction—is far better than it was last year. The hon. gentleman should stop getting up in this House with specious nonsense and falsehoods.

REQUEST FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, is that not just like the Hon. Member for St. John's

West? He calls his corporate friends to get the total landings, but he does not bother to inform the House that the price of fish is half what it was last year and fishermen's incomes are halved. Many fishermen have had no landings whatsoever in significant areas of the province. I am not interested in the statistics—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Tobin: —I am interested in people, fishermen and their families.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member can complete his question.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, my question is a straightforward one, a very straightforward one. Given that fishermen are primary producers, just as farmers are primary producers, and given that the price of fish is half what it was last year, and in some areas there have been no landings whatsoever, will the fishermen of Atlantic Canada, and in particular those in Newfoundland and Labrador most severely affected, be treated exactly the same as the farmers of the country and be offered financial compensation? It was right and proper in the case of farmers. We saluted it. It is right and proper in the case of fishermen. Why will you not announce it?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I just gave the figures to show the increase in landed value of the fish caught this year. In cod it is up from $28 million, compared to the first six months of last year, to $40 million this year. The fishermen are getting $40 million so far this year rather than $28 million—

Mr. Tobin: The fishermen are not. They are getting half the price. You are lying to the House.

Mr. Crosbie: —for the landed value of cod. In capelin it is up from $7 million to $28 million. In crab it has gone from $8 million to $10 million. We have a program, a Newfoundland inshore fisheries agreement, infusing $60 million into the fishery over the next five years. We are spending $10.7 million this year in capital projects in harbours, and infrastructures.

• (1450)

In any particular area where there is a disastrous inshore fishery we will continue to assist as we have done in past years. The over-all inshore fishery in Newfoundland this year is better than last year. The hon. gentleman is totally and maliciously wrong in what he says.

HEALTH

LEAD CONTENT OF GASOLINE

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health who will know that evidence is mounting and is coming from a variety of sources that lead in quantities smaller than heretofore thought is harmful to human health, and particularly to the development of children.

Will the Minister admit that the Government's plans to reduce the lead in gasoline are too little and too slow? Will he announce that the Government will speed up the removal of lead from gasoline to improve the health of Canadians, especially children?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member has indicated, the Government of Canada has put forward a program to remove lead from gasoline by 1992, and the responsibility falls particularly within the Ministry of the Environment, but not exclusively.

Recently a study was presented to the Minister of the Environment and myself respecting the program for lead removal by 1992, as well as the effect of lead on the development of children, especially infants. The Department is examining that information, and I have asked for recommendations relative to that report.

CHILDREN'S EXPOSURE TO LEAD

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. The latest estimates are that half a million Canadian children are at risk from present levels, and indeed these may be low estimates given the harm that lead does to the development of children.

Will the Minister confirm the figure that half a million children are over-exposed to lead and that their development might be harmed, or does the Minister have another figure that he could give us as to exactly how many children are being harmed by exposure to lead today?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I cannot dispute that figure or confirm it. It was in a report that was given to two Departments and, as I already mentioned, to two Ministers.

I wish to tell the Hon. Member with respect to lead removal, and I am not putting forward that other action might not be considered with regard to gasoline, that also lead soldering in containers, especially containers for baby food and infant formulas, is being examined.

I have asked my Department for further recommendations following not only that report but other work that has been done in the Government respecting lead poisoning.

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT ACCELERATE LEAD REMOVAL DEADLINE

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, and it also concerns leaded gasoline. I wish to obtain from the Minister an answer that would indicate to us whether he is willing to accelerate the deadline for reducing lead in gasoline from the planned date of 1993 to 1990, as it was originally indicated as a feasible and possible date by the Royal Society of Canada. Is the Minister willing to give us that commitment today?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): No, Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to give that commitment. As I said to the Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood, that report had been given to us. The effective date is December 31, 1992.

The Minister of the Environment and I have asked our respective Departments for further recommendations, and I cannot go beyond that at the present time.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the same Minister. Will the Minister at least indicate to the House when he will report to the House indicating his decision in light of the additional study that he has requested, considering the fact that a number of studies that have been conducted on the subject north and south of the border indicate that lead is a very poisonous element in human blood?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I want to ensure that we understand the manner in which the word "study" is being used. I did not ask for a further study as to the validity of lead poisoning. The evidence is quite clear, and that is not the argument, but rather if changes were to be made, or additional steps to be taken with respect to lead poisoning, what would be the various administrative details that we would have to consider, plus any other considerations. It is in that area that I have asked for further information rather than a further study confirming what we already know in terms of lead poisoning.

* * *

ENERGY

SALE OF TEXACO CANADA

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy. I am sure the Minister is aware that last Thursday the Petroleum Monitoring Agency published a report that stated in the last two years Canadian ownership in petroleum has declined by some 5 per cent, and Canadian control in petroleum has declined by some 13 per cent.

In light of the objective of the federal Government to have some 50 per cent Canadian ownership in the petroleum industry, I wonder if the Minister, as the Minister in charge of energy in this country, and considering that Texaco Canada is now for sale, can tell us what he is doing to ensure that this corporation is Canadianized in order to restore some of the balance and meet the objective of the Government that 50 per cent of the petroleum industry is Canadian owned.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the statistics published by the Petroleum Monitoring Agency show the direction in which the petroleum industry is going. Some years it may be going in one direction and other years in another direction, but this does not in any way affect the objectives and goals pursued by the Government of Canada with respect to the Canadianization of the upstream component of our petroleum industry. As for Texaco, Mr. Speaker, for the time being this is a private transaction that will take place in accordance with the regulatory system existing in this country, especially if it includes investments in Canada.

[*English*]

ROLE OF INVESTMENT CANADA

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that control of the petroleum industry in this country by Canadians has declined by a sharp 13 per cent in two years, which is very significant, is the Minister now contemplating giving any special instructions to Investment Canada to ensure when Texaco Canada—which is foreign controlled—is sold, that it is sold to Canadians in order to Canadianize the industry?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, that is not exactly the way business transactions are handled in a free enterprise country. If there is any reason for Investment Canada to be consulted and to intervene, this will involve the co-operation of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Minister responsible for Investment Canada.

* * *

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of International Trade. Today Canadians were shocked to learn that the Government increased the free trade advertising budget by an additional $6 million after public opinion polls indicated that

an increasing number of Canadians were against the Prime Minister's trade deal.

If the Prime Minister's trade deal with the United States is so great why must we spend another $6 million to convince ourselves that surrendering our sovereignty to another country is in our best interests? How can the Prime Minister justify this? How can the Minister justify this?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, this is an example of the type of devious tactics that are being used by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman's question comes from a report in *The Globe and Mail* today which received the information under the Freedom of Information Act. It refers to last year's budget for free trade communications where a special audit was done that gave us the assurance that all tax dollars were spent properly. As the House knows, last year a total of $16 million was spent. The article and the information detail and outline what was spent. The free trade printing cost $6 million.

Every inquiry and poll in Canada shows that the public wants more information on the free trade agreement, and by golly we are going to see that they get it. They got it last year, and it cost money to print; and they are going to get it this year, so that they will get the truth, the facts, and not the deceit and deception of hon. creatures like the hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. Boudria: It has been said that the opposite to the truth has never been stated with greater accuracy, and that would apply today.

[*Translation*]

COST OF TRADE AGREEMENT—REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT JUSTIFY EXPENDITURES

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): I would like to put a supplementary to the Minister. So far, the Prime Minister's trade agreement has cost Canadians a total of $44 million: $20 million for the negotiating team, $14 million for advertising and now another $14 million to convince Canadians that handing over their sovereignty to the United States of America is in their best interests.

How can the Minister justify this kind of spending? How can he justify spending taxpayers' money on advertisements of the kind referred to by the Hon. Member for Shefford earlier today, in which Canadians are asked to believe statements that are utterly false?

• (1500)

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. gentleman asked me about the Hon. Member for Shefford. I have in my hand a Canadian Press report wherein a Granby Simonds official, J. P. Patry, said there is no connection between the plant closing and the trade deal. Patry, the plant controller and a native of Granby, also said he would have no stake in protecting the parent company since he is one of the 131 workers who will be laid off.

The hon. gentleman, knowing of this statement by this official who will be laid off himself, got up in the House with deliberate deception and suggested that the Granby plant was being closed because of the free trade agreement—deliberate deception of the Hon. Member for Shefford, deliberate.

* * *

[*Translation*]

RAILWAYS

SURVIVAL OF MONTREAL SOUTH SHORE LINES—REQUEST FOR MORATORIUM

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed either to the Deputy Prime Minister or the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport. It concerns the survival of Montreal's south shore commuter railway line. Since the line between Beloeil and Montreal's Central Station is suppose to close on August 31, is the federal Government prepared to pay the cost of a moratorium on the closing, to give a federal- provincial task force time to examine ways in which these lines can be maintained on a permanent basis, with the support of the federal, provincial and municipal governments?

[*English*]

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the Cabinet would not be in a position to make a decision like that at the moment because, under the new National Transportation Act, there is a process the NTA goes through. A railway applies to abandon. Anyone who is interested can appear at public hearings. The NTA then has certain guidelines it can follow in determining whether a line is economical or uneconomical. It can be kept on. Interested parties can purchase the short railway and run it themselves. A huge number of possibilities can occur under the new National Transportation Act that Parliament recently passed.

As well, over-all the railways are limited to a 4 per cent reduction each year. Change is inevitable in certain instances simply because the dynamics of Canada are changing *vis-à-vis* railway and other methods of transport. Parliament put a 4 per cent maximum on the reduction and I thought that was pretty wise.

[*Translation*]

RETENTION OF RAILWAY SERVICES FOR SUBURBAN AREAS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

M. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The Parliamentary Secretary says that change is inevitable. I am sure the Parliamentary Secretary never travelled on one of these trains from Montreal's south shore. They go back to 1925, have no washrooms or heating and are among the oldest trains in this

country. Will the Government make a commitment to maintain commuter railway services in the Montreal region? If so, will the federal Government participate in a joint program with the Government of Quebec and Montreal region municipalities to maintain these commuter services and thus prevent the closing of the Saint-Hilaire line which will otherwise disappear on August 31?

[*English*]

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate moment there is no doubt that the Government will be prepared to consider any type of combination of possibilities. If an area is in trouble, it is because people are no longer using the service, whether it is VIA Rail service or traffic service, because they have often moved to other modes. That is the reality of the market-place.

CN finds itself in a position where some one-third of its lines carry over 90 per cent of its traffic. That means that two-thirds of its lines are carrying only one-third of its traffic. It simply cannot carry that on and be competitive with the trucking system that is becoming very sophisticated in Canada.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—ONTARIO GRAPE GROWERS

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture. Recently the Minister announced an adjustment program for the grape growers of the Province of British Columbia. Why has the Government not made a similar adjustment for the grape growers of the Province of Ontario?

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, this Government is fully committed to a policy and a process of consultation with provincial governments and with producers, wherever they may be. We are pleased by the results of those negotiations with the Government and the producers of British Columbia. As the Hon. Member for Erie has indicated, the results were announced some time ago when a package of some $28 million was announced.

I want to make it very clear that there is an offer on the table with respect to the difficulties the producers are encountering here in the Province of Ontario, difficulties which they are encountering for a variety of reasons that have already been discussed at some length during Question Period today. The federal Government has put an offer on the table. The provincial government is currently looking at that offer and I would hope that there could be a resolution to this problem in the not too distant future. In fact, I would hope it would come very soon.

I would also point out that we as a Government are fully committed to the process of keeping producers informed, wherever they may be, including the producers who I understand are here today. I also understand that Department of Agriculture officials have announced that they would be happy to meet with the producers to whom the Hon. Member for Hamilton East has referred, but I regret that apparently that offer has not been accepted.

Ms. Copps: That is false, Mr. Speaker, that is false.

An Hon. Member: That is a lie. That is a lie.

Mr. Speaker: I do not know who said that, but it does not help the Chamber and it does not help the Speaker. I will not pursue it further, but please, it is not necessary.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF NUCLEAR POWERED SUBMARINES

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, the Government, and in particular the Minister of National Defence, used to grandstand all over in Canada and in NATO circles telling everyone they were going to bring on stream 10 to 12 nuclear powered submarines by the year 2012, 24 years after this Government will have been defeated. The rhetoric has really cooled of late and silence seems to be the order of the day. The Government has long passed the date it said it was going to make an announcement.

Is the Government now prepared to admit that it was wrong and that it will no longer proceed with this ill-conceived idea?

Mr. Bud Bradley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member raises a very serious question, as he is well aware. I would be interested to know if the Hon. Member is now showing that he no longer supports such a move by the Government of Canada to modernize Canada's Armed Forces.

I think the Hon. Member will find that it is Canada's intent to modernize its navy and to provide its navy with the best technical equipment available. I think he will also be aware that the Minister of National Defence stated very recently that the announcement would be made soon.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, that answer is the square root of nothing. The Hon. Member knows that I support the Armed Forces and the refurbishing of them. However, this Party does not support nuclear submarines.

Will the Government proceed with this $8 billion ill-conceived purchase of 10 to 12 nuclear powered submarines or will it not? That is the question. Perhaps the Parliamentary

Secretary could come to the answer, stop the grandstanding and tell the people of Canada where he stands.

Mr. Bud Bradley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to tell the Hon. Member where I stand. I stand with this Government in supporting Canada's Armed Forces and in replacing their ill-equipped vessels which were given to them and not replaced by previous Governments. We will provide the navy with the required weapons systems.

I notice that the Hon. Member says that he supports but his Party does not. I wonder if he supports a submarine program or if he is talking through his hat.

Mr. Speaker: That concludes Question Period.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGE

MR. LAPIERRE—ALLEGED INCORRECT INFERENCE IN CHAMBER

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I feel I must raise a question of privilege, because during Oral Question Period the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) let his emotions get the best of him and finally impugned my motives. Mr. Speaker, I think we should realize that every statement made in the Simonds case is connected with the concept of free trade, and even the company itself has made statements to the effect that in future it would cover the North American market from its plant in Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I did not want to mislead the House, far from it! I think that the arguments put forward by the company, by the Opposition and even by free trade supporters . . . I would like to quote to the Minister what was said by, the PQ MNA for Shefford: "Manufacturing of knives and tools will be transferred to Fitchburg, Massachusetts in . . .

• (1510)

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member but if he wants to raise a question of privilege, the Chair must have a very clear position. I would appreciate the Hon. Member's co-operation.

Mr. Lapierre: Mr. Speaker, I cannot make my position any clearer: It is that the Minister of International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) be asked to have the strength of character to withdraw the fact that he questioned my motives or that he said we voluntarily misled the House.

I can say one thing, Mr. Speaker. Not only was it not done voluntarily, but we did not mislead the House at all. The Minister refuses to face the facts, and instead of reacting like a hard-hearted *nouveau riche*, he should realize what it means to those 131 people to lose their jobs.

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member says that he did not have this information or he did not deliberately mislead the House, then I will accept that. However, he certainly did mislead the House, because I have just cited a person working in the company at Granby who was quite clear in his position. He is one of the persons being laid off, and he said that there is no connection between the plant closing and the trade deal. If the hon. gentleman said that he did not know about that at the time, fine. I will withdraw my suggestion, if there was one, that he deliberately misled the House.

Mr. Speaker: I will hear the Hon. Member for Windsor West and I note that the Hon. Member for Hamilton East is rising. I want to advise the House, and I think that I should do so, that I have a fairly complex question of privilege from the Hon. Member for Halifax West, and I will be hearing that as well. In the meantime, I will hear the Hon. Member for Windsor West.

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, it had been my intention—and I usually notice this during the Question Period—to raise a point of order on what I consider to be the use of unparliamentary language by the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) during the Question Period.

Mr. Crosbie: Give me some examples.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): I want to draw to your attention that at one point in the Question Period the Minister for International Trade used the words "deliberately distort" with respect to a question posed by a Member on this side, and later in the Question Period he used the words "deliberate deception" with respect to remarks made in the Question Period by the Hon. Member for Shefford (Mr. Lapierre).

Mr. Speaker: Once again in order to assist the Chair, the Hon. Member cited two instances, do they occur in the same exchange between the Hon. Member for Shefford and the Minister? I only ask that because the Minister has risen and said that if he contravened the rules he withdraws. I just want to know where we are here.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): I am talking about two separate instances in the Question Period, separated by some minutes of time. The Hon. Minister for International Trade, in responding to the Hon. Member for Shefford, did make some comments about the second instance to which I referred, concerning the Minister's use of the words "deliberate deception". He said, "If the Member for Shefford now says that he was mistaken, he", that is the Minister for International Trade, "withdraws the words 'deliberate deception'".

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is unparliamentary for the Minister for International Trade to use the words "deliberate deception", whether or not there was an explanation given by the Hon. Member for Shefford which the Minister found satisfactory. Even if the Hon. Member for Shefford had not said anything, it would have been improper and unparliamentary for the Minister for International Trade to use the words "deliberate deception".

If you look at page 106 of Beauchesne's, you will see—

Mr. Speaker: I can assist the Hon. Member. I do not need quotes from Beauchesne's. I accept the proposition that the Hon. Member for Windsor West is putting to me. He is a Member with very great experience in this House. The use of words "deliberate deception" is just like calling somebody a liar. I accept that. I do not need any quotes from Beauchesne's.

Would the Hon. Member complete his comments, please, for the assistance of the Chair?

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Therefore I also want to ask you to give attention to the use—earlier in the Question Period on a separate occasion—of the words "deliberately distort" by the Minister for International Trade. This has also been ruled on several occasions by distinguished predecessors to you, Mr. Speaker, to be unparliamentary. I therefore respectfully call on you to insist that the Minister withdraw, unequivocally and unreservedly, those words.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate those comments from the Hon. Member for Windsor West. The Hon. Minister has already, I think, dealt with at least part of the complaint, but I would hear the Hon. Minister.

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, let us get this quite clear. I believe that there is a deliberate campaign by the Official Opposition and the New Democratic Party deliberately to distort and deceive with reference to the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. That is my position.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: Now, if Your Honour feels that to say that is unparliamentary, I will withdraw it in this Chamber but I will repeat it outside the Chamber. There is no doubt in my mind that it is a campaign of deliberate distortion and deceit that is going on in this connection.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the Hon. Minister to do this to assist the Chair. Whatever the Hon. Minister may think about the strategy or tactics of another Party, that may well be his or somebody else's opinion, but in this Chamber we cannot use those words about a Member. Perhaps the Hon. Minister could assist the Chair in making it clear that, whatever he may think of the strategy or tactics or pronunciations or campaign of another Party, he is not applying those words to any Hon. Member in the Chamber.

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make your task difficult, so I therefore withdraw the words that you say offend the rules.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member. The Hon. Member for Hamilton East.

PRIVILEGE

ALLEGED REMARKS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I am also rising on a question of privilege, and it deals with a false statement made by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Clark). I am not going to debate the substance of most of what he said because most of what he said is certainly in my mind not true, but he definitely stated a falsehood about me when he said that my office had refused to have a meeting with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise).

In fact, the facts are as follows. We contacted the Prime Minister's Office to see if we could have a meeting with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) so that he would follow through on his promise to the grape growers. He bounced us off to the office of the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Agriculture was unavailable. We suggested that if a mutual time could be set up in the future for a meeting between the grape growers and the Minister of Agriculture, the grape growers would be very happy to come back to Ottawa. So, please, do not spread falsehoods.

Mr. Speaker: I wanted to say something on the past exchange. I understand that it is one of your colleagues who has been here for a good many years, and at times we all perhaps go beyond the mark, but I do want to thank Hon. Members for the way that they have dealt with this matter, and I thank the Hon. Minister for his complete withdrawal. I should have made a point of that before hearing the Hon. Member for Hamilton East. I apologize to Hon. Members and to the Minister for that.

However, I am now listening to the complaint of the Hon. Member for Hamilton East, and I recognize the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary in reply.

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be most useful in exchanges such as this one if various Members involved were to wait until they had a chance to see the "blues" in order to verify what was and was not said. Having said that, however, the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) has risen and I think to some degree has put words in my mouth, but I will let the record speak to that itself.

What I said—and I chose my words very carefully—was that we as a Government were very much committed to a process of consultation with provincial governments and with producer groups. I reported to the House, through you, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Agriculture officials had offered to meet with the grape growers who had been referred

to earlier in the House by the Hon. Member for Hamilton East, and that offer had been declined.

Ms. Copps: That is totally false.

• (1520)

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I can assist the Hon. Member for Hamilton East and the House. I will look very carefully at what *Hansard* reports. If it is appropriate I will come back into the Chamber with this matter. If I need any further assistance from Hon. Members I will call for it.

The Hon. Minister on a point of order.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

A GIFT OF GREEN GRAPES

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I want to object to the production and sending of these sour grapes which were sent to me during Question Period. If we are going to start throwing fruit around during Question Period we will not be having very fruitful Question Periods because the grapes of wrath will seize the House.

Are we going to permit the production of these kinds of exhibits? A rotting salmon was brought in at one time, or was it a mackerel?

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, we saved 400,000 spawners.

Mr. Crosbie: You did? I do not know whether this will save the grape industry, but I do not believe this should be carried around the House by pages, and not with notes.

Ms. Copps: Why do you not read the note?

Mr. Crosbie: The note says: "Please tell the truth and help the trade victims". That is an allegation that I do not tell the truth, but I am not going to bring it up because we have had enough of that today.

Mr. Speaker: I am terribly grateful to the Hon. Minister for not bringing it up.

The Chair noticed that there was a basket of grapes in the House some time ago. Messages were sent to the Member who seemed to be the owner of the basket of grapes. The basket of grapes was then put underneath the Member's desk. How the grapes got from there to the Hon. Minister I do not know, but I must say that the Hon. Minister is absolutely right. It is not according to the rules to pass grapes or other things like that back and forth across the House, and most certainly it is less than elegant to send notes such as the note of which the Hon. Minister complains. The note was, I take it, a private communication and was not brought to the attention of the Speaker.

PRIVILEGE

COURT MARTIAL RESPECTING SUBMARINE CASE

Mr. Howard Crosby (Halifax West): Mr. Speaker, this is not an easy situation in which to raise a question of privilege which I honestly believe has grave merit. It was with some regret that I gave you notice and now seek a hearing on the question of privilege I described in the notice which, as you know, involves the actions of serving officers of the Canadian Forces.

As I indicated to you in my notification, the basis of my claim is a violation of my privilege as a Member of Parliament by reason of the gratuitous interference in the performance of my duties and what I honestly believe to be an attempt to intimidate me to prevent me from investigating and commenting upon what were apparent acts of violence reported in the media as a result of a court martial under the National Defence Act.

The court martial involved two members of Maritime Command, then Petty Officer Timothy C. Farler and then Master Seaman Ryan M. Buttar. This case attracted wide regional attention as well as national attention. Members of the House of Commons will know that in yesterday's *Quorum*, circulated to all Members and to many other people connected with the Parliament of Canada, there was a report of this case and the surrounding circumstances originally published in *The Globe and Mail*. I do not need to convince you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter of wide and serious concern.

I believe there is a clear *prima facie* case disclosed in published media reports, particulars of which appeared in *The Daily News* of Halifax on August 11, 1988, and I have provided you with a copy of that publication. At this time I do not have access to the transcript of the remarks as reported in the court martial, but I have made attempts to ascertain from persons in attendance at the court martial that the report in *The Daily News* is a reasonably accurate presentation of the thrust and tenor of the remarks made by serving officers in the court martial.

If you affirm my view that there is a *prima facie* case, Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, prepared to present a motion requesting reference of this matter to the appropriate committee, which I assume is the Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges and Procedures.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you recognize a substantive difference between the question of privilege I now raise and the matters of privilege which you have just witnessed in this Chamber. If you will allow me the time, I would like to begin by reviewing what I consider to be the relevant considerations.

Mr. Speaker: I want to assure the Hon. Member for Halifax West that I have received material from him. I take this as a very serious complaint and want to assure the Hon. Member that I will listen very carefully to his entire submission. The Hon. Member.

Mr. Crosby: Mr. Speaker, first, to relate the facts to Your Honour and to put them on the record of the House of Commons, there was, in the City of Halifax, a court martial proceeding which resulted in a conviction, if that is the appropriate term, of then Petty Officer Timothy Farler. The punishment which was imposed on Petty Officer Farler was a demotion of three ranks with a recommendation of immediate promotion to the next rank.

In commenting to a journalist on this matter I indicated my view, which I do with some sense of pride as well as concern, that the punishment did not fit the crime, that had that kind of offence been prosecuted in a civilian court the punishment would have been much greater. I do not see why I should hesitate to express that view. The cruelty involved in the actions of Petty Officer Farler was evident to all involved.

As a result of making those remarks certain events took place. For the purposes of Your Honour's consideration you merely need consider the events which took place with regard to a subsequent court martial of another member of the Canadian Forces whose name I have just indicated.

In that proceeding counsel for the accused seaman argued before the court martial that as a result of the remarks I made, and the publicity attendant upon the court martial, the charges should be dismissed as a fair trial or a fair court martial, if that is the proper terminology, could not be had.

As I understand the authority one should quote from the article, and I do so as follows:

> "—Halifax West MP Howard Crosby jeopardized a court martial in Halifax yesterday by trying to contact a chief witness before the trial, a defence lawyer charged yesterday.
>
> Defence lawyer Lieut. Guy Phillips said Crosby has tried to contact Leading Seaman Paul Jack Mishak, chief witness in the court martial of Master Seaman Ryan Michael Buttar. That, coupled with media reports on a prior court martial of Leading Seaman Timothy Charles Farler, means charges against Buttar should be dropped, said Phillips.
>
> Mishak, 22, testified at Buttar's court martial yesterday that a friend had received a phone call, asking him to contact "a Mr. Crosby".
>
> Rather than return the call, Mishak consulted his superior officer who told him not to talk to Crosby."

There are the facts, Mr. Speaker. However, the relevant consideration is that I made no attempt whatsoever to contact any witness and I certainly made no attempt to contact Leading Seaman Mishak. In fact, quite the opposite, I was contacted by a person and I avoided any further involvement in the inquiry.

● (1530)

For a serving officer of Canada's Armed Forces to rise before a court martial and say a Member of Parliament does not have the right to speak out on a matter of wide public interest involving national defence and the Canadian Forces is totally wrong and without any justification. To accuse a Member of Parliament of contacting a witness for apparently improper reasons is a serious allegation which should not be disregarded. If untrue, it raises questions about the motivation of the officer who made the allegation. What is the purpose? I suggest to you that on the face of it, it is to intimidate the Member of Parliament, to say butt out, this is an affair for naval authorities, a court martial, and you should not concern yourself with what is regarded as military justice.

I said in Halifax and I repeat in this Chamber, not for one moment will I butt out of what I consider to be a serious matter involving the health and welfare of individuals in the Canadian Forces and one of interest to all citizens. We know, you and I, that civilian law governs in this country, not military law or their version of discipline in the Forces.

I do not want to impute ill motives to everyone involved in the situation, but it is certainly worthy of close investigation. Let me tell you why. While that officer, Lieutenant Guy Phillips, was prepared to make the suggestion in the court martial that I was interfering in the process by making remarks which were published, as well as the media who exercised their rights, the same officer made no comment on an article published in the *Halifax Chronicle-Herald* of August 11, 1988, signed by Rear Admiral H. T. Porter, in which he said the sub affair was an isolated incident, not to worry. That did not affect the outcome of the court martial. That did not bring to the attention of the officers involved that they need not treat this matter too seriously because it was an isolated incident in the mind of Rear Admiral Porter as published in the newspaper under his signature. However, the chance remark of a Member of Parliament, repeated to a journalist, published in the paper, does affect the court martial. Now do you get the picture, Mr. Speaker? Now do you begin to wonder what is going on in this court martial? What are these people up to? Are they trying to intimidate a Member of Parliament? Are they trying to say courts martial are the business of the military and they do not want any civilians interfering?

I think this relates very directly in a very serious way to every Member of Parliament. I will tell you right now the next time around I will do exactly the same thing. If I think the punishment meted out to a member of the Armed Forces by a court martial or by anyone else is not in the public interest, I will say so. I am not going to be told what to do by any lieutenant in the Navy or any other serving officer.

I want your backing on this, Mr. Speaker. I want you to stand up on behalf of all Members of the House and say civilian law governs in this country. The laws enacted by this Parliament are what govern. We are the ones who have to see that they are implemented and enforced to the benefit of all Canadians.

I want to point out that one reason we are talking about courts martial is because of a recent decision of the courts of Canada under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms which now makes courts martial public hearings. We can expect this in the future. We, Members of the House of Commons as well as members of the public, will know what takes place in courts martial. We will see and judge for ourselves what constitutes military discipline. If I think the cruel treatment of a seaman in the Canadian Navy by a petty officer and a master seaman is not properly punished, I am going to say it.

I know you have ruled in other cases. I have been up in this House on previous occasions raising questions of privilege. I know about the Quigley case. I know you said that privileges are for a Member of Parliament and not for Mr. Quigley. He is punished for contacting a Member of Parliament, not to worry. You saw what happened in that case. The ruling was that it was none of Parliament's concern, that Mr. Quigley was punished by loss of employment by the Deputy Minister because of his involvement with Members of Parliament. Time goes by, he is reinstated, and then fired again for what I consider to be an inadequate reason.

You, Mr. Speaker, are not going to answer the question in the way you did in the Quigley case, in my humble opinion, because if you set it up so that no one with a problem, in the Canadian Forces or the federal Public Service, can contact a Member of Parliament for fear of recrimination or sanctions or fear of getting into difficulty, then you will indirectly have destroyed the ability of Members of Parliament to function in the performance of their duties.

I could quote authorities to you but, as you said earlier, there is no need, the situation is clear. The obligation is to present a prima facie case of a violation of a Member's privileges. I think I have done that. The facts are there. In my view they indicate a violation of my privileges as a Member of Parliament in a very clear way. It is an attempt to keep me from communicating with a person with whom I have a perfect right to communicate. The reverse also is true. In this case I am referring to Able Seaman Mishik and he was, according to the reports, told not to communicate with me.

Has anyone in this country the right to tell any person not to communicate with a Member of Parliament? Is that not a violation? Is there not something wrong with that? Can you say that if you allow that to occur it will not affect the rights of Members of Parliament? I think it is obvious that we cannot tolerate this kind of abuse. We as Members of Parliament have to decide whether we have duties to perform. If we make that decision, we have to have the capacity and the right to perform those duties untrammelled by anyone's view of what we should or should not be doing. We are going to be judged by the people when we run for office. Do not let us be judged by any other authority other than those that we endorse and condone.

In conclusion, I want to make this point. If you tell me as a Member of Parliament that I do not have protection, that I do not have the force of the Parliament of Canada behind me when I inquire into what I believe to be a case of injustice, I do not have that ability and authority, then tell me because I will not do it. I will not stick my neck out in these situations. Why should I if I am not going to receive the support and endorsement of my peers in the House of Commons represented by you?

I ask you to review carefully the things you said in the Quigley case and come down on the side of Members of Parliament and their right to investigate without fear of molestation, hindrance, interference, or obvious attempts to denigrate them in the eyes of the public.

Mr. Speaker: I think I should say to the Hon. Member for Halifax West and other Hon. Members that I have listened very carefully to the relation of events which has been brought before the Chair. I do not have in front of me the written reasons in the Quigley case, but I seem to remember that it turned on the question of whether or not the Hon. Member who raised the matter had in fact his capacity to act as a Member of Parliament abridged or restricted in an undue way. If that had been the case, it would of course have been within the definition of privilege.

• (1540)

I believe what I decided at that time was that the Hon. Member's capacity to function as a Member of Parliament had not been in any way impaired by whatever happened to Mr. Quigley. I bring this to the Hon. Member's attention, but I will look at it very carefully and will reread the Quigley case. There may be a distinction between what happened in that case and what happened in this case.

I advise the Hon. Member for Halifax West that I shall reserve and I shall look with very great care at his submission.

I think I can say something, at least as a Speaker and as a lawyer, that there is no property in a witness. In this case, the Member of Parliament says that he not only never did, but did not even try to speak to a witness. Even if he did, there is no property in a witness. That is not like phoning a judge. That is not like tampering with a witness, bringing undue or improper influence on a witness. To speak to a witness is a right, not just of a Member of Parliament but a right of any Canadian. I say this because I am concerned about the thought pattern that has been related by the Hon. Member and I think that ought to be clearly understood. There is no property in a witness. There is no law in this country that says a Member of Parliament or an ordinary private citizen cannot talk to somebody who happens to be a witness in a case.

What the law does not allow is tampering with a witness, putting undue or improper influence on that witness, or in some way pressuring, persuading or doing or not doing something, that would influence that witness' capacity to tell the truth, whether that be by threat or by seduction or by whatever other means.

I say to the Hon. Member for Halifax West, who has clearly said in the House today that he did not contact the witness, that even if he had there is nothing wrong with that.

I am concerned about the matter that the Hon. Member has brought in front of me. I say to the Hon. Member and other Hon. Members that the question the Chair must decide is whether the Hon. Member's privilege has been abridged or wronged. As I say again, that comes down to the question of whether what has happened affects the Hon. Member's capacity to carry on as a Member of this place. That is the question I will have to decide. As the Member for Halifax West who as a good lawyer well knows, I will have to do that on the basis of the procedural law of this place.

I do say to the Hon. Member that whatever I may decide he most certainly has a justifiable complaint and, as other Members will always find in a case like this, the Chair will listen very carefully.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

SPEAKER'S RULING CONCERNING ALLOCATION OF TIME TO CONSIDER REPORT AND THIRD READING STAGES OF BILL C-130

Mr. Speaker: I have a decision to render.

Yesterday the Honourable Minister of State (Treasury Board) (Mr. Lewis) gave oral notice of a motion for time allocation for the report stage and third reading stage of Bill C-130 the *Canada-United States Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act*, pursuant to Standing Order 117.

[*English*]

The Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) then rose on a point of order to argue that the notice was defective because it failed to specify the number of hours or days to be allocated. This morning he further claimed that the Minister could not proceed because agreement had been reached under Standing Order 116 "by a majority of the representatives of the several parties".

The Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) has supported the Hon. Member for Windsor West in both the arguments and took the position that the Government House Leader was precluded from resorting to Standing Order 117 because of a declared agreement between the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party on a specific number of days for debate at report stage. That is, the agreement between the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party indicated that they had agreed on 150 days at report stage and on 200 days at third reading with respect to the free trade Bill and, as they argued, as required in the Standing Order.

I will first address the issue relating to the deficiency of the oral notice. The basis of the argument against that notice was because it did not specify the amount of time to be allocated for further debate. The Chair has carefully reread Standing Order 117. When it deals with notice the Standing Order employs the words "and has given notice of his or her intention to do so". It appears to require only notice of intention and not notice of the text of the motion *per se*.

Furthermore, I can point to two precedents, on May 3, 1988 and June 3, 1988, when the same notice of intention was given without specifying a number of days. I should point out that I bring both these occasions to the attention of the House, not necessarily to suggest that just because it has been done once it ought necessarily, to legally be done again but to bring the matter to the attention of the House. I do not take those two incidents as the basis of a legal, procedural precedent, but I do bring them to the attention of the House.

I remind Hon. Members that at the moment the motion which may eventually be proposed to the House by the Chair is one that has been proposed by the Hon. Minister. A point of order has interrupted that process. I am considering whether or not the Hon. Minister's motion is acceptable. If it is acceptable, then it would inevitably be proposed by the Chair, and the motion that might eventually be proposed to the House by the Chair is required to be specific and to provide for at least one sitting day for report stage and at least one sitting day for third reading. I think that comes from any clear reading of the rules.

I must therefore rule that the Minister has properly given notice of his intention and that his action was in keeping with the House's usual form.

The second point the Hon. Member for Windsor West argued this morning is more complex and simply restated is: Is a Minister of the Crown precluded from invoking Standing Order 117 if a majority of the Parties, not including the Government, states that it has reached an agreement under Standing Order 116?

[*Translation*]

The first sentence of Standing Order 116 hears repeating:

> "When a Minister of the Crown from his or her place in the House, states that a majority of the representatives of the several parties have come to an agreement in respect of a proposed allotment of days or hours for the proceedings at any stage of the passing of a public bill . . . "

[*English*]

I have read carefully the words "representatives of the several Parties". The Hon. Member for Windsor West has stated that those words mean the three Party House Leaders, but the use of the word "representatives" is open to considerable interpretation and could mean a majority of the members of each Party or, indeed, even a majority of the Members of the House. I think the Hon. Member for Windsor West and the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap will remember that earlier I may have made a comment in that direction. I probably should have used the counsel of the seniors from whom I learned to do court work who always said that it was wise, a judge who did not comment while listening to an argument. In any event, these words have never been clarified. I have to say now, after having given both Hon. Members' submissions careful consideration, that I would tend to agree with the view that the words mean the House Leaders of the several Parties or their appointees, for no other definition is practicable since there is no former mechanism in the Standing Order to determine the majority of a larger group of Members.

• (1550)

That being said, I am not sure I can agree with the Hon. Members for Windsor West and Kamloops—Shuswap that two Parties in opposition alone can form the basis of an agreement that would compel a Minister of the Crown to act under Standing Order 116. Just so the Hon. Members and the public understand, if that proposition were accepted by the Chair it would mean that two opposition parties, or three opposition parties, or whatever number of opposition parties could form an agreement to decide on how many days of debate would continue on any given Bill, and the Government would thereby be bound by that agreement. All three Standing Orders, that is 115, 116 and 117—and they all deal with the question of how to handle the time allocation at various stages of debate on a Bill—in their opening sentences clearly leave the initiative of announcing any agreement or no agreement to a Minister. It is my view that a Minister must be party to any agreement and that rising in his or her place under Standing Order 115 or 116 to take any initiative means that he or she is supportive of the proposed proposal for time allocation.

Standing Order 117 provides for a Minister to act if there is no agreement and, as I stated on June 6, 1988, the Chair must take a Minister's declaration at face value and cannot judge the quality of negotiations or of any proposals that may have been made. In this case I was not even asked to judge on the quality of the negotiations because there is a document that indicates the arrangement at least had been entered into with two of the Parties in the House, albeit, not that of the Government.

As a consequence, I have to rule that the notice was in order and the motion is receivable.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

ALLOCATION OF TIME TO CONSIDER REPORT IN THIRD READING STAGES OF BILL C-130

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)) moved:

That, in relation to Bill C-130, an Act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States of America, not more than two further sitting days shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage, and two sitting days to the consideration of the third reading stage of the Bill; and

That fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business on the second day allotted to report stage consideration and on the second day allotted to third reading stage consideration of the said Bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required, for the purpose of this order and, in turn, every question necessary in order to dispose of the stage of the Bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

Mr. Speaker: I remind Hon. Members that this is a debatable motion, and I will hear Hon. Members.

Time Allocation

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to explain fully the Government's position and to explain why we are moving to time allocation in this particular instance.

There are four or five reasons. First, it is fair to say that there have been numerous statements by Opposition Members that they have intended from day one to delay the Bill, the legislation, as long as possible, not to correct or amend but to delay as long as possible at any cost.

Second, I would point to the manoeuvres by the Right Hon. Leader of the Liberal Party to trade power by the elected representatives of the people for power by the Senate in asking the Senate to delay forever the Bill, or at least until a general election is called.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I refer you to the delays in the past week or so. In fact, last Wednesday the entire day was wasted by votes on the introduction of Private Members' Bills to which government Members were naturally pleased to assent because we hold the view that every Member should have the right to introduce his or her Bill and have it read for the first time.

I also refer you to last Friday's recorded division on whether or not the House would move to the business of the day and thus debate of Bill C-130 at report stage. As well I refer you to yesterday from eleven o'clock in the morning until one o'clock when the Opposition pulled the same manoeuvre by introducing a Private Member's Bill and then having the last three rows of the New Democrats say "no" and the first two rows say "yes" in order to trigger a recorded division and waste the time of the House.

I also refer you to the remarks of the Leader of the New Democratic Party on the CBC radio program *The House* on July 23, when the point was made by the interviewer that the New Democratic Party was opposed to free trade. The interviewer said:

> "Yet watching the debate in the House of Commons and elsewhere, the message seems to be lost on people."

In reply the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent) said:

> "I think that around here amongst politicians because it has been debated for so long and we know the arguments in one sense on both sides so well that there can be amongst journalists, amongst some MPs, some jaded, "I've been through this so many times" perspective."

Those words are very helpful from the Leader of the New Democratic Party in making the case.

Yesterday, as soon as the bell rang on the first vote to see if we would introduce and print a Private Member's Bill, I went to the House Leaders of the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party and asked them if they could give me some idea of the amount of time required at report stage and at third reading stage in order to dispose of the Bill. That was an honest bona fide effort to elicit a reasonable timetable from the Opposition as required under Standing Order 117. I received the following letter from the coalition Party. I have read this letter into the record, and it is very specific. It says that the two Opposition Parties:

"—are prepared to agree to an allocation of a further 150 days to the report stage and 200 days to the third reading stage of this Bill."

The letter is dated August 15, 1988. While it is a coalition letter, I would not want my friends in the New Democratic Party to think that they are on equal footing with the Liberal Party in this coalition. I would point out that it is a Xerox copy of the signature of the House Leader of the Liberal Party but that it is an original of the signature of the House Leader of the New Democratic Party. I do not want my friends to think that in this coalition one is exactly equal. The are in it together just as they were in the national energy policy together. However, it is not an equal footing. If my friend from the New Democratic Party wants to then consult, we can perhaps give him some advice as to how he can bring himself up to equal so that he can sign original copies too. I would be glad to do that at another point.

• (1600)

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this letter is an embarrassment to the democratic process. It is a mockery of democracy. It is an embarrassment to efforts to negotiate in good faith. I think it is a fundamental error.

If my friends opposite had wanted to place the Government in an awkward position, they would have given us a reasonable proposition. I ask my friends opposite how we would have responded if the argument had been five days at report stage and five days at third reading. Then we would have had to argue that two days at report stage and two days at third reading is reasonable. But my friends made the argument for us when they said 150 days at report stage and 200 days at third reading.

I point out another piece of advice that I give my friends. In my office when, as one does on occasion—and we all do it—I write a letter in a fit of temper without thinking it through my office staff will come to me and say: "Mr. Lewis, do you really want to send this letter out?" I take another look at it in the calm of the moment and I say: "You are probably right. I should not send out this letter". That did not happen across the way. They rushed into this and gave us the entire case, the entire case that they are not serious about this Bill, that they are not serious about this Parliament.

I say this to my hon. friend from Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy). The critics in this case have made an honest effort, I would expect. They sat at committee hearings. They spent time on this Bill. I suggest that the critics who sat in committee on this have been undercut by their House Leaders. They have been undercut because they have made a mockery of the effort that my hon. friend made at committee. I would expect that there is some disappointment. For example, my friend from Winnipeg—Fort Garry was quoted in *The Ottawa Citizen* as having said last week two weeks at report stage. Why did that not come in the letter? Why was it not suggested that there be two weeks at report stage, as my hon. friend is quoted as saying? No, we got 150 days at report stage. There has been a breakdown in communication between the Parties opposite. I suggest it is an embarrassment to every Member who has debated substance in this House. I think that it is unfortunate.

We regret that it has come to time allocation on this Bill. We regret that. But the substance of the issue of free trade has been debated over the past two years. One could even go back farther than that. I think Your Honour would find that other speakers are going to go back to the 1978 report of the Senate committee, the report of the House of Commons committee and various other committees and refer to those in their arguments. The issue of free trade has been before the House for a long time. The issue before the House now is whether or not this Bill properly implements the free trade agreement. We suggest that is what this debate is about at report stage. That is what this debate is about at third reading.

We have moved the motion of time allocation with a view to moving this through the House in order that the issue can be sent to the Senate for approval. We hope, obviously, that the appointed and anointed Liberal Senators will withdraw their embargo of any further discussion as dictated by the Right Hon. Leader of the Liberal Party. We hope that we can get on with what the House and the duly elected representatives of the people have decided in this case, that is, what was decided at second reading—that the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States should be implemented by way of Bill C-130.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, we have just witnessed one of the greatest acting performances of all time in the House of Commons, the visage of pained innocence on the Deputy House Leader who seemed to say: "The devil made me do it. The Opposition forced me into calling closure. Something that I would not dare to do in my wildest nightmares I had to do because I had no choice".

Let us look at the facts. On every single step along the way on this trade agreement the Government has imposed a restriction on Parliament. At every single stage of the Bill there has been closure. At every single stage there has been a clear decision by the Tory majority to restrict debate, to restrict travel, to restrict exposure and to restrict examination. The Tories said that they did not want this Bill, this legislation, this agreement to have the open, honest, accountable judgment of the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, I take you back two and a half years to the original communication strategy paper by the Cabinet of the Conservative Government. Let me quote from that communication paper. It states that: The strategy should rely less on educating the general public than on getting across the message that the trade initiative is good". In other words, it is a selling job, not information, not examination but a selling job.

The paper goes on to state that the public support generated should be recognized as extremely soft and likely to evaporate rapidly if the debate is allowed to get out of control. Two and a half years ago the strategy was set. It was: "Do not let the people know. Keep it in darkness. Keep it restricted. Keep it confined. Keep it under cover. Oh, it is okay to spend $30 million or $40 million in propaganda. We can sort of get all the printing presses wound up. We can get all our Conservative public relations firms into the trough putting forward all kinds of bright messages. But for goodness sake don't let Parliament have the right to examine what we are going to do—$35 million and $40 million of PR propaganda for five or six hours of debate at report stage looking at 77 amendments".

What that basically says is that this is a Government that has replaced Parliament with a rule of propaganda. Today, when we spoke in Question Period about the victims of the trade agreement, the grape workers in the Okanagan and in southern Ontario, the manufacturing group in Granby, and all the other workers—the 186,000 workers that the Economic Council of Canada has described as going to lose their jobs—we see that there will be victims. But the most serious, the greatest loss will be the integrity and sanctity of this Chamber itself. The greatest casualty of the Canada-U.S. trade negotiation is the Parliament of Canada. It is an institution that is central and integral to our identity as a country but which has been abused, manipulated and tortured out of its rules, out of its procedures and out of its proper operation simply to support the maniacal and fanatical obsession to get this deal into place according to the timetable set by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney).

The Prime Minister, who has a natural gift for counterfeit, has bestowed that same endowment on his friends and allies. All the Tories have now become true believers. I weep. I came into Parliament at a time when there were some great Conservative parliamentarians, for example, Ged Baldwin and Walter Baker, people that one could look up to as Members who would defend the rights of the House. What a sad and sorry lot sits across from us now. Ged Baldwin and the late Walter Baker must regret that they ever used the word "Progressive" Conservative because it has been so corrupted by the present Government. It has been corrupted in part by the agreement itself. The Conservatives have abandoned their traditions, their beliefs, and their commitment to defending the sanctity of this country, and in so doing they have trampled on the rights of Parliament.

• (1610)

The Deputy Government House Leader has stated that there has been enough examination, and "Why would people want to debate more than nine or ten hours on the trade agreement?" It is a document which the Government itself states is the singular most important piece of legislation in this administration.

When I was Minister of Transport in the previous administration, we brought in the Western Grain Transportation Act. It was an important piece of legislation affecting western Canada, but not nearly as comprehensive or extensive as the trade legislation which covers 26 other Acts. The Western Grain Transportation Act was debated for 58 hours and 30 minutes at report stage alone, and 37 hours at second reading. That amount of time is four or five times what the Government has allowed the House to debate on the trade legislation. The Western Grain Transportation Act was a Bill of significance, but not nearly of the consequence of the Bill in front of us. To feign that somehow "the devil made them do it" and that the Government has now been forced into bringing in time allocation is sheer hypocrisy and deception.

We knew what we were up against. In a rare moment of lucidity when he was not blustering and bluffing his way around the country, the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie), said out straight: "I am not going to let this Bill go more than two or three weeks". He is the Minister responsible. We do not see him very much, but we are told that he is responsible.

The fact of the matter is that the Government has a timetable. It had a timetable from the beginning. The Minister for International Trade announced the timetable, and that the timetable was that the Government was going to complete this Bill by the third or fourth week in August. That is what the Minister said. Well, the Government is on its timetable, but in achieving it the Minister and the Prime Minister have been prepared to torture and twist the rights of the House, and that is shameful.

In attempting to achieve a win on the trade agreement the Government is prepared to lose in the surrendering of Parliament. In the classic words of the old play: "They stoop to conquer". They reach down to a level in order to get what they want most of all. We will have some opportunity to argue whether or not it is worth it, but surely to goodness do Members of the House, particularly on the government side, not recognize the damage and the travesty they are doing to an institution that they took a sworn oath to uphold? Do they really think that Canadians will buy their argument for allowing three or four days of debate on second reading?

Do they really think that Canadians will buy their argument for allowing three weeks in committee? The committee was not allowed to travel outside Ottawa, it had a restricted number of people who could come before it, and it was not allowed to talk to individuals, only organizations. Now at report stage there are 77 legitimate amendments accepted by the Chair, therefore designed to be relevant, but the Government will only give us four days to debate them. Does the Government think that the Canadian people will buy a piece of legislation that affects the Bank Act, investment, energy, agriculture, the service industry, and customs duties, and that we are to be allowed to debate that in all its stages in four days and consider that to be a proper and honest expression of parliamentary view? It is impossible. We know now that it will be impossible to get to anywhere near all the amendments and allow Members a proper opportunity to express themselves on important amendments dealing with the changes in this country.

The two opposition Parties have some 70 Members, and we recognize that we are a minority. We recognize that we cannot carry the day, but simply because we will fail to carry the day in the House it surely should not mean that a minority has to stop advocating its point of view. Surely we recognize the rights of minorities in this country, whether they are Liberals or New Democrats, to have a voice, and to be heard, and to speak for what I think is a majority of Canadians. I believe in the House that we speak for the majority of Canadians on the trade agreement.

Whether we are a minority or a majority our voice is being snuffed out, the rights of Canadians are being denied, and Parliament is being trampled on by a Government that is so suffused with the appetite for power that it has forgotten its obligations and rights to recognize the most fundamental principle that we must honour in the House is the rights of democracy and freedom of expression, and those are what the Government is turning the lights out on in this House of Parliament.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, once again this is a very dark day for Canada's Parliament. This is a closure-crazed Government. Time and again over the last four years the Government has brought in the heavy jackboot of closure. It brought it in on the drug Bill. The people of Canada were speaking out against the initiative of the Government regarding prescription drugs and we see the results in rising prices. The Government brought in closure on the Air Canada Bill, the refugee Bill, the immigration Bill, and the Official Languages Act.

The Government has assumed because it has 208 Members that it can do anything it wants. We saw it with the Standing Orders which govern the behaviour in the House in terms of regulation. Government Members tossed them out the window and said: "We don't have to follow any Standing Orders. We can make up our own. We have the majority. We have the jackboots on in this democratic system". This is a closure crazed Government.

It brings in its parliamentary assassins. For example, the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) is one of the major assassins, then there is the Government House Leader (Mr. Mazankowski), the Deputy Government House Leader (Mr. Lewis), and the Parliamentary Secretary, and the other Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade (Mr. McDermid). They are parliamentary assassins because they are making a mockery not only of Parliament, but they are democratic assassins. They have said to the people of Canada: "We are going to thumb your nose, Canadians". The fact is that seven out of ten Canadians, 70 per cent of the people of Canada, have said time and again that they want an election on this trade deal before the Government jams it, rams it, forces it, and rushes it through the House of Commons.

What does the Minister for International Trade say to them? "Poof, we don't care about 70 per cent of Canadians. We know better. We have the majority. We have the muscle in the House of Commons and we can do anything we want. We are going to jam this legislation called the free trade deal down your throats, Canadians".

The people of Canada are just waiting to get back at the Government. The people of Canada are just waiting for the election to be called. Everybody in the country is saying: "Call an election, Prime Minister. If you have the courage of what you say in the House of Commons regarding the trade deal, if you believe what you say, then let us debate it for the two months of a general election, and let the people decide whether or not they want to proceed".

But, no, this Government does not believe in democracy. After all, why should we be surprised? This is the Party that shut down the House of Commons for 16 days. Its members rushed around and said: "We are not going to come into the House of Commons, we are going to close it down. We don't want any more debate". That is the Party that abused Parliament.

Once again we are seeing what happens when it decides to hold hearings across Canada before anybody sees the trade deal. Can anyone imagine anything so silly, so peculiar, and so dumb as the Minister for International Trade stating that hearings would be held across Canada for one day in every major city before anybody sees the trade deal?

• (1620)

That is exactly what they did. They said: "Well, we have had hearings across the country". Well, they have used closure at every single stage of this Bill. Then the Deputy Government House Leader (Mr. Lewis) came to the House Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Gray) and to the House Leader of the New Democrats (Mr. Riis), and said: "Listen, could we cut a deal? Can we agree to wrap up the debate in a few days?" What does it take for these people to understand what we are saying? We are trying to say that we are not going to facilitate the passage of this legislation.

An Hon. Member: Tear it up.

Mr. Riis: This is bad legislation for Canada. This is unCanadian. This is undemocratic, the way that they are approaching this. We will not have anything to do with it. Do not ask us to cut a deal behind the scenes.

How do we get through to these thick-headed monsters called Tories across the way? We wrote a letter and said: "Well, listen, we want to spend the next two years debating this trade deal". Maybe they will then get the impression, the picture, that we do not want to co-operate to facilitate a deal that we think is not in the best interests of Canada. Finally, they caught on. They realized that we were not prepared to facilitate the debate. They caught on that we were not prepared to make a deal to jam this through before the people of Canada have had an opportunity to indicate their position on the trade deal.

I will be sitting here in a moment, waiting to hear the speech of the Minister for International Trade, while he explains to the people of Canada the fact that seven out of ten Canadians want an election fought on this deal before it passes in the House of Commons. I am going to be listening with interest to what he is going to say when he says: "We do not believe in that process, we do not have to go to the people of Canada before we jam this through the House of Commons".

I look across now at the Minister for International Trade and at his colleagues. The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) said to the people of Canada that he was against the trade deal. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) told the people of Canada, in 1983, that he was against the trade deal. Then the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said that he was against a trade deal with the United States. That is what he said. The people of Canada made the mistake of believing the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister did not say what he was really feeling.

I want to say to the Minister for International Trade that I do respect him for being honest with the people of Canada. I remember during the last campaign where he said to the people of Canada: "We can't tell them what we are going to do, because if we told them what we are going to do, they would never elect us". He was dead on. Now they know what they were going to do; they were going to sell out this country, they were going to give away Canada. The people now have figured out that that is the hidden agenda of this Government. The minute that they have a chance to walk into those polling booths, they are going to make an "x" and this Government is going to be history.

I want to simply say that the Minister for International Trade has finally realized that we do not want to be part of any process that jams this trade deal down the throats of Canadians. He may want to use that approach, and he is using that approach, but we are not going to be part of that process in any way, shape or form.

If he wants to introduce closure, muzzle the Members of Parliament and jam this legislation through the House of Commons and then some time in the distant future call an election to see what the people of Canada think about it, I am afraid that the people of Canada are going to send a very clear message. Then the Minister for International Trade will finally have his way. He will then, as a defeated Member of Parliament, ask to go to the United States to become an American citizen, because that is what he wants to do. That is what he wants all of us to do. He wants Canada to become a fifty-first state, a territory of the United States. That is what he wanted when Newfoundland was coming into Confederation. He went out with his family and he said: "We do not want to join Canada; we want to join the United States". A few years later, he is finally having his boyhood dream of being an American citizen. He can even still live in Canada.

When the people of Canada have an opportunity to register their view on this—and they will—unfortunately this Government will have ignored their requests to have a chance to indicate their position on this trade deal before it passes the House of Commons. They do not have a mandate to jam this legislation through the House of Commons. The Prime Minister said that he was against the trade deal. It was never even mentioned during the last general election, not once. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade did not mention it once during his campaign. The Minister for International Trade did not mention it once during the campaign. The Prime Minister of Canada did not mention it once, and they are jamming through the House of Commons the most important piece of legislation that this country has ever seen. Those are the words of the Prime Minister.

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, this is not a difficult or a complicated matter. This present Government of Canada has a two-track trade policy. One, of course, is to negotiate in the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade to try to improve our trading access to the 96 partners of GATT, particularly with emphasis on the Pacific Rim. We are pursuing that. The conference of the Uruguay Round will be held in Montreal in December. We all hope that there will be some progress. It is very difficult. There are 96 countries involved.

The second arm of our trade policy is to secure better and more assured access to the U.S. market. They take 80 per cent of all of our exports. A third of all the wealth of Canadians every year comes from our exports. A quarter of the wealth of Canadians every year comes from our trade and our exports to the United States of America.

We have secured an agreement after two years of negotiation. It started in June 1986. The elements were agreed to in October 1987. They were made public then. The full text of the agreement was made public in December. We have had that for eight or nine months, whatever the period is. The agreement was signed on January 3, 1988. We had Senate reports in 1982 and 1987 that we should enter into a free trade agreement with the United States. It has been studied in the Senate and in the House of Commons on many occasions. I will not go into all of the details. They are already on the record.

This present Bill has been studied and debated longer than the debate in the United Kingdom Parliament, when in the United Kingdom they decided to join the European Community. The debate there was a shorter debate than we have already had in this House. The Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Turner) said: "Let the people decide". The problem is, Hon. Members in the two opposition Parties were never satisfied with the decision that the people made in 1984. The Liberals do not think that the people of Canada should be allowed to have any other government than a Liberal government. They would not accept the verdict of 1984.

In 1984, the people decided. The Canadian people elected the Mulroney PC Party and they elected them for a five-year term. That Government is legitimate and is entitled to be in place, to govern this country, to bring forward this policy and to have it enacted with its majority of the House of Commons, as a result of the election of 1984. At some point in that five years the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) decides when there should be another election, if he has a majority, and he has a majority today.

The Liberal Party is not satisfied. They think that they are destined to govern Canada forever. If they are not elected by the people of Canada, as they were not in 1984, then they think they will govern Canada through their majority of appointees in the Senate. It was people like Senator Kirby, Senator Kenny and Senator Fairbairn, all from former Prime Minister Trudeau's staff, people who are going to be in the Senate for the next 30 years. Do the people of Canada want these Senators deciding what government policy is to be until the year 2018? Senator Kirby will be there until the year 2018. There would be a Liberal majority in the Senate, if they all lived to be 75, until the year 2008.

Are we to be governed by the Liberal Party no matter who the people of Canada elect to form a majority in this House? That is going to be a crucial question in the election. The Leader of the Official Opposition said: "Let the people decide". Well, he should decide by beginning to tell the people the truth. When is he going to start telling the people of Canada the truth?

We are going to see that he starts telling the people of Canada the truth. He had to be corrected by Premier Bourassa the other day. Premier Bourassa said that Turner was wrong on trade. He made a stupid statement about the stock savings plan in Quebec. Premier Bourassa said: "I do not want to intervene in the federal election, but if I have to be personally involved, especially to re-establish the facts, I will do it". I will venture to guess that Premier Bourassa is going to be very busy in Quebec establishing the facts, when the Liberal Party and the NDP Party go to Quebec with their distortions, their inaccuracies and their rumours, as they will be doing during the election campaign. He is going to have his hands full if he wants to keep the federal Liberals truthful. They are finding it very difficult to do that on their own.

Last October, almost as soon as the FTA was made public, the Opposition announced that they would tear up the deal. The official Liberal Party. The line was: "Tear up the deal". Never in Canadian history has there been such a silly and juvenile position adopted by the Official Opposition. Since then they have constantly complained that they have not had time to study and debate it. Why do they need to study and debate it when last October they said that they would tear it up? Why are they studying and debating this Bill when they say that when they get into office they are going to tear it up, even though they only have to give a six month notice to terminate the agreement anyway? It is hypocrisy, pure and simple, for members of the Liberal Opposition to say that they want to further study and debate this Bill. They made their decision months ago when they said they would tear it up.

• (1630)

When we sought to table Bill C-130 this spring, the Opposition, and mainly the New Democratic Party, blocked the tabling of it for three weeks with a series of procedural points, all ruled out of order by the Speaker. Why did they do that? Simply to obstruct. They do not want to study and debate the Bill, they want to obstruct the Bill. They want to kill the Bill. They want to guillotine the Bill. They do not want to discuss and debate the Bill.

While protesting that we are supposed to be seeking to ram the legislation through Parliament, opposition Members tied the House up with measures like recorded votes on first reading of a Bill to proclaim hockey as Canada's national sport. Why are members of the NDP doing that? They did it this week as well. It is simply to obstruct.

Even though both opposition Parties are committed to tearing up the deal—the Liberals want to tear it up, the NDP want to tear it down—they have moved over 100 amendments to the implementing legislation. Why would they move 100 amendments to legislation they say they will tear up? It is simply to obstruct, naturally.

When we sought to establish a reasonable time frame in which to conclude the debate on Bill C-130, what did members of the Opposition propose when we asked them how many days they thought would be reasonable? They proposed 350 sitting days, almost two years of House time. They suggested that we should debate this for two years. Why? Simply to obstruct.

Now, when we propose to conclude consideration of this legislation, those who have done nothing but obstruct say that they want more time for study and debate. They do not want any time for study and debate, their minds are closed. The poisonous vapours of their machinations and distortions are radiating across Canada. They do not want to study and debate the Bill. They are not interested in the Bill. They want to tear it up. They want to get into power and they want us out of power. It is just as simple as that.

Opposition Members do not believe that the people should ever decide to have a Progressive Conservative Government. That is why they are calling on the Senate to do their dirty work for them, to try to stop passage of this Bill. In this debate, members of the Opposition have shown nothing but hypocrisy, deception and deceit from start to finish.

What of the debate itself? Have opposition Members proposed to deal seriously with the free trade agreement? Who has heard a serious opposition speech on tariffs, procurement, financial services, the rules of origin, border measures, agriculture, investment, energy, services, temporary entry for business persons or binding dispute settlement? Has there been one sensible paragraph uttered by a Member opposite on any

of those important, vital matters? Nothing at all, nothing but attempts to distort. Nothing but sweeping charges without any basis in fact, just charges that the FTA will force Canadian society to become like American society. There has been no proof, just charges, charges that everything that distinguishes Canada from the U.S. will be swept away, all our social programs, regional development, agricultural supply management, cultural policies, all are going to be imperilled. This is not debate, this is trying to spread alarm with broad, general, silly statements.

This is what *Le Devoir* had to say about that in an editorial of August 12:

> It is difficult to take seriously the Liberal amendment recommending that the free trade legislation be amended so that it not undermine Canada's social programs, including health care insurance, unemployment insurance, pensions, minimum wage legislation, labour legislation and maternity benefits.
>
> This rhetoric has a hollow ring to it, because none of the programs mentioned is even remotely jeopardized by the (free trade) agreement.

The Winnipeg *Free Press*, the hon. gentleman's home paper, does not think much of him. This is what that paper said about the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) on August 9:

> There is room for honest disagreement over the likely effects of free trade on Canada and Canadians. The point at issue in Mr. Turner's approach to free trade is not one of honest disagreement but of simple, deliberate distortion.
>
> John Turner these days has a liking for slogans. "Let the people decide" is his latest. Before the people do decide, he might direct another slogan to himself: "Tell the people the truth."

That was the Winnipeg *Free Press*, not the words of a partisan Member of this House, not the words of an active politician. That is the impartial judgment of the Winnipeg *Free Press*.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret that the Hon. Minister's time has expired. The Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) has the floor.

Mr. Rossi: You are a phoney, John.

Mr. Crosbie: You are a phoney and you are a dummy. You are never up to speak.

Mr. Rossi: You are a phoney and you did not even read the report and you are a bluffer. You are a big bluffer.

Mr. Crosbie: You do not even get up and speak. Let us have your maiden speech.

Mr. Rossi: I would rather not speak than tell what you are saying.

Mr. Crosbie: All you do is grovel from your seat.

Mr. Rossi: Big blabber-mouth, shut up.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, order. Both Hon. Members are out of order. I would like to hear the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray).

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, when I listened to the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) ranting and raving, I was reminded of the story of the lawyer who looked over his brief and wrote beside one paragraph: "My case is very weak here. When I get to this point in court, I'm going to yell like hell". That is obviously what has happened here.

All the Minister for International Trade has done with his ranting and raving is to confirm what a weak case the Government has in its attempt to force through a motion to choke off further debate on the Bill to implement the trade deal in only four more days. He has also confirmed, through his ranting and raving, just what a weak case the Government has when it says that it has negotiated a deal with the United States that deserves the support of the Canadian people.

The Deputy Government House Leader, in introducing the Government's motion, attempted to paint a picture of sweet reasonableness, of a true desire to have a useful debate and to give a reasonable period of time for that debate. However, he was soon undermined by the Minister for International Trade who tore away that veil of reasonableness with which the government House Leader attempted to cloak the real position of the Government.

The Minister for International Trade made clear that the Government had no intention, from the very beginning, of allowing a reasonable and proper debate on this trade deal in the House, or of allowing a reasonable and proper debate on this trade deal throughout Canada by the Canadian people. The Minister for International Trade has made this very clear, and in this he has certainly told the truth.

The Minister for International Trade has in fact taken issue with the very desire of Members of this House to have any debate at all on this measure. He said in effect that he and his Party won the last election and therefore they can do whatever they want until the next election. He said that he and his Party have been allowed to form a one-party state, a form of what he might consider to be a dictatorship, benevolent perhaps but a dictatorship all the same.

The fact is that this was not what the Canadian people thought they were doing when they, perhaps with good intentions but now intentions they may well believe were misguided, elected the Minister and his Party to office. The idea of having the trade deal that the Minister's Government negotiated with the United States was never mentioned once during the last election campaign. In fact, the only thought that Canadians might have had about the issue during the election was that it would be the very last thing that a Government led by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) would ever attempt to do. I say this because when that Prime Minister was running for the leadership of his Party, he made very clear, in rejecting the support of the current Minister for International Trade for free trade with the United States, and I think I recall his exact words, that it would undermine our sovereignty and he would have none of it at that time or at any other time.

I think it is very clear that whatever Canadians had in mind in voting for the Conservative Party, it was not because they wanted to give it a mandate to negotiate any kind of comprehensive free trade deal with the United States. Therefore, I do not think it is very credible for the Minister for International Trade to say in this House that because his Party won a majority in the last election it can push this trade deal through this House and down the throats of the Canadian people without any real or meaningful debate or study. That is what he is saying to this House but I do not think Canadians agree with that in any way, shape or form.

• (1640)

The Minister and his colleagues claim this matter has been debated for over two and a half years. However, the Minister himself made clear that could not be correct because he said the negotiations for the deal started two and a half years ago. The elements of the deal were tabled in the House on October 6, and the full text of the deal was made available only last December. He then said, and this is perfectly true, that the Bill to implement the deal was only presented to this House last May 24. That means that whatever was going on over the past two and a half years, it was not debate in this Parliament or in this country on this trade deal which Bill C-130 asks us to accept and put in force to damage this country in perpetuity.

If the Minister and the Government really had any intention of allowing a proper debate and a study of this Bill, they would not have choked off debate on second reading after only five days. They would not have choked off committee proceedings after three weeks. They would not now be trying to choke off report stage and third reading debate after only four days. Apart from the committee hearings, that means they want to allow only eleven days of debate in the House of Commons on what is the most important measure to come before Parliament in the history of this country. It speaks to the very future, the very existence of this country in days to come, but for them eleven days is too much. The Minister talked about the decision of the British Parliament on the entry of the U.K. into the European Common Market. If I am not mistaken, before that debate there was at least one election and one referendum.

The Minister and the Government are afraid to let Canadians decide in a general election whether they want to have this deal and that government. The Government knows that if there were ever to be an election, as there must be before this deal goes into effect, the Canadian people will say no to this deal because they know it means the undermining of their future and the future of their children. They would say no to this deal because they know it is the product of an incompetent and inept government and is a prime example of its lack of sincerity and credibility.

We have said we believe there must be an election with a resulting majority vote for the Government before this deal can be implemented. That is why we have asked our Senate colleagues not to block it, not to defeat it, but simply to postpone a final decision on this matter until the Canadian people have had a chance to speak in an election. That is why in our response to the inquiry as to whether we would agree to time allocation on this Bill we said there should be a sufficient number of days allocated, yes, over 300, to bring the debate past the time when this Parliament must end so there could be no final decision on this measure until the Canadian people have had the chance to speak during an election.

Let us be very clear that in approaching the opposition Parties to see if there could be an agreement on time allocation, the Minister was only going through the motions. As the Speaker made clear in a ruling earlier today, the statement of the Minister on behalf of the Government that agreement on time allocation could not be reached has to be accepted at face value. It cannot be looked at, it cannot be probed. Therefore, it is clear from what the Minister for International Trade just said in the House, the Deputy Government Leader, in spite of what he said in opening this debate, was only going through the motions, and the Government never intended from the beginning to allow a proper study, a proper debate, either in this House or in this country on its trade deal.

Why not? Because it knew that the more this measure was studied, the more it was understood by the Canadian people, the less the Canadian people would like it, the less the Canadian people would want it, the less the Canadian people would support it. That is why the original strategy was to try and slide it through without the Canadian people knowing what it was all about. That is why every step of the way the Government attempted, unfortunately with success, to choke off debate so the Canadian people would not have a full understanding about how damaging, how harmful this trade deal is and would be to them and future generations.

The Government may be able to abuse the opportunity given it through its majority to force this measure through this House but I say it will not be able to play that same game with the Canadian people. The Canadian people are already on to what the Conservative Party is about and we will join with the Canadian people to make sure they have a chance to pronounce themselves in an election. I am confident that when they do so they will reject this deal and they will reject this Government because both the deal and this Government are harmful to Canada and its future.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, when we listened to the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) a few minutes ago, we were treated to an example of why in recent polls we find that politicians are held in about the same esteem among Canadians as convicted sex killers. Politicians continue to plummet in public esteem because of people like the Minister for International Trade.

Mr. McDermid: Oh, shame!

Mr. Fulton: I will tell you why bringing in closure at this point in time is so inappropriate.

Mr. McDermid: Look at your performance last week.

Mr. Fulton: Let us take a look at where those same cabinet Ministers on the other side stood in 1984 on free trade. Let us look at what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) had to say, because the Government has no mandate whatsoever to be proceeding with this legislation, let alone damaging the rules and the reputation of this House by bringing in closure in this way.

Here is what the Prime Minister had to say: "Canadians rejected free trade in 1911, they would do so again". "It affects Canadian sovereignty and we will have none of it". That is what he had to say four and a half years ago. What about the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson)? This is in 1984:

Mr. McDermid: In 1983.

Mr. Fulton: In 1983.

Mr. McDermid: Early 1983.

Mr. Fulton: "Bilateral free trade with the United States is simplistic and naive. It would only serve to further diminish our ability to compete internationally." That is the Minister of Finance.

Mr. McDermid: Read what the Minister for International Trade said.

Mr. Fulton: What about David Crombie, the former Secretary of State? He said: "It is silly. Our natural destiny is to become a global leader, not America's weak sister". What about a friend of all Members of this House, the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Hees): "An examination of the facts as they are today gives a clear indication—"

Mr. McDermid: "As they are today".

Mr. Fulton: —"that a move towards free trade with the United States would not be a good thing for this country from either the economic or political point of view". Who else? What about the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark): "Free trade raises the possibility that thousands of jobs could be lost. Before we jump on the bandwagon of continentalism we should strengthen our industrial structure so that we are more competitive". There you have some of the key actors on the government side.

There are some very critical things you have to obtain in a democracy. You have to obtain a mandate for major platforms that you are going to implement. The Progressive Conservative Party not only did not try to obtain such a mandate, they never pursued it during the election campaign, in their literature, during the leaders' debate or anything else. In fact, exactly the opposite impression was pushed through to the Canadian public. The former Prime Minister, the Member for Yellowhead, the present Prime Minister, and the Minister of Finance all said exactly the opposite.

• (1650)

Canadians should be concerned about what is going on on the floor of the House of Commons today because the Government is now starting to hurry on with its agenda again. It spent $16 million on propaganda last year. A good chunk of it was turned into toilet paper because it was so bad that they could not convince a dog catcher that it was a good idea with all the crap and so on that was being published by the Minister for International Trade.

Let us not forget that during that same time period the former Minister for International Trade, when she was on the West Coast said that people would be able to go from anywhere in B.C. to Washington and bring back all the stuff they wanted and would not have to pay any more customs or duties. Within a few hours, of course, it had to be said that that was not really true. However, the headlines had been made, the propaganda was spread.

What kind of propaganda are we going to get this year? We know that it will cost more than $16 million. The Minister for International Trade fudged on the figures in Question Period today, but we know it will probably be $30 million, $40 million, or $50 million in propaganda. Canadians need to know. Parliament is important because it focuses the debate and gets information to the media and the constituencies across the country.

Canadians are finally asking the critical question: Where did this idea come from? A couple of year's ago the Conservatives were all opposed to it. Both opposition Parties are opposed to it and most Canadians want an election. Three-quarters of Canadians want an election on this issue prior to it going through the House of Commons. The Government is acting with a knee-jerk response to a very small group.

Canadians are wondering where this idea came from. It has finally been tracked down and Canadians are now starting to talk about it. The Republican convention is taking place in the United States right now. The idea came from the United States. President Reagan was talking about this more than a half dozen years ago. It was one of his main Republican planks for re-election as President of the United States.

In addition, the large multinational corporations in the United States and Canada support this idea. The present Solicitor General (Mr. Kelleher), when he was the Minister of Employment, said that it would affect 800,000 workers in the short term. When the present Minister of Finance was the Minister of Employment he estimated that up to 500,000 Canadians could lose their jobs because of the deal.

The Government wants to close off debate on this issue. Closure was imposed when it was originally brought in. There were three weeks of hearings and now four days have been allocated for debate.

The President of the Canadian Manufacturers Association has said that it is simply a fact that as we ask our industries to compete toe to toe with American industries we in Canada are obviously forced to create the same conditions in Canada that exist in the U.S., whether the unemployment insurance scheme, workers' compensation, the cost of government, the level of taxation or whatever.

The Canada West Foundation says that free trade between our two countries will inevitably lead to wages being equalized between Canada and the United States and that this will occur since the high-cost producer will not be able to compete against a lower-cost producer if goods are traded freely.

Nine U.S. states have no minimum wage. In Texas the minimum wage is $1.40 Canadian an hour. I will give you a graphic example of what happens when some tariffs are taken down. Ten years ago there was a protective tariff on home appliances made in Canada. Fridges, stoves, percolators and all those kinds of things were made in little GE and other plants in Canada. When the tariff was in place, 80 per cent of home appliances purchased in Canada were made in Canada. The tariff was taken away and 10 years later 80 per cent of the home appliances purchased in Canada are made in the United States in states like Texas where the minimum wage is $1.40 an hour.

Canadians ask what this means for them. We know that our social programs are threatened. Medicare is clearly threatened. I have yet to hear a single Member from the government side, including the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp), give a speech nailing down point blank that they will not be affected. The Government will not put up speakers like that on social programs; unemployment insurance, Canada pension, medicare, or workers compensation.

We know that 36 million Americans do not have any health insurance of any kind. I will not even talk about the Maquiladora zone between Texas and Mexico where workers are paid 65 cents an hour. They produce commodities, put a U.S. label on them, and bring them into the Canadian market. Companies making widgets in Canada will pay $8 an hour or $7 an hour but will have to compete against a widget producer in Texas who only pays $1.40 an hour and does not have to pay for any health benefits, lay-offs, or anything else.

If Canadians think for one moment that the one-fifth of goods traded between Canada and the United States which have protective tariffs are going to survive, they are dreaming in Technicolor because the widget producers in the United States will make it almost impossible for those kinds of widgets to be produced in Canada.

Mr. McDermid: Total mythology.

Mr. Fulton: We always hear the Parliamentary Secretary saying it's mythology and the Minister for International Trade saying that all the Members of the Opposition are involved in deceit, untruth, and everything else. We will see, Mr. Speaker. We want an election. We are going to get an election and Canadians will throw the Progressive Conservatives out of office in this country for good.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, since the ways and means motion was tabled on May 18, 1988, by the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie), we have had more than 130 hours of debate, including more than 90 hours of testimony before the legislative committee by witnesses from practically all walks of life. I refer only to what transpired in Parliament, because I think it would be frivolous to include all the seminars, briefing sessions, press releases and other kinds of public debate we have had for over two years across this country. Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop this ridiculous farce designed by the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Turner) to obstruct debate. Canadians, Mr. Speaker, are sick and tired of the incredible ravings of the Opposition, and that is exactly what we have been hearing today.

[*English*]

There is more to it. It is also a question of honesty, especially when the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition is calling to let the people decide.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Minister will have nine minutes left after six o'clock. It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—MOTIONS

[*English*]

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

SUGGESTED REPEAL OF SECTION 17

The House resumed, from Monday, July 4, consideration of the motion of Mr. Redway:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of repealing Section 17 of the Financial Administration Act and require that all remission of taxes, fees or penalties be submitted, each year, to Parliament for approval.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): When the motion was last before the House the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Dorin) had the floor. I will recognize the Hon. Member for Calgary South (Mrs. Sparrow).

Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to speak tonight on Motion 101 during Private Members' Hour. Section 17 of the Financial Administration Act and Section 101 of the Customs Tariff, which is the new tariff remission authority, allow the Government to respond quickly and selectively by Order in Council to rectify inequities and anomalies in the tax and tariff regimes. This important flexibility would be lost if these remedies had to await parliamentary debate and approval. Most remission orders provide relief for individuals or single companies in very specific and non-reoccurring circumstances and, as such, are not really appropriate matters for parliamentary consideration.

• (1700)

Parliament did grant the Government authority to remit taxes, fees and penalties by order in council mainly in recognition of the need for quick and selective action where the application of general laws and regulations are having unintended or undesirable results in particular cases. Since most remissions fall into this category, the *raison d'être* for the authority is still valid and it would be inappropriate at this stage to rescind the order in council authorities.

I want to relate a problem that we have in Calgary and southern Alberta that really calls for a faster and more efficient system to rectify unfair duties and tariffs, especially on the conversion side. Let us start at the beginning. Before January 1, 1988, a great deal of equipment utilized by drilling contractors and petroleum service companies in the oil patch came into this country duty-free by virtue of statutory concessionary tariff items. Approximately a year and a half ago, the customs tariff was amended to adopt an international system of numbering. In that conversion, or slotting of all the items into one group during the redrafting of the schedules, there was a mix-up. For some reason, everything duty-free on the petroleum equipment side of the page on the schedule was missing.

In effect, when the harmonization system came into effect on January 1, a lot of oil field equipment and apparatus such as well logging equipment, well perforating equipment, seismic instruments, pressure maintenance or other formation pressure improvement equipment became subject to a 3 per cent to approximately 10 per cent duty. This represents tens of millions of dollars in duty, all because of a mistake. I would like to see fast action on that problem. This equipment is vital to the oil industry. It is vital to the drilling contractors and to the Petroleum Service Association of Canada.

During 1986, when oil prices fell from $35 Canadian a barrel to some $15 or $16 a barrel, the industry came to a slowdown. More than three-quarters of the drilling rigs in western Canada were put out of operation. When the drilling rigs are not operating, the service companies also become inactive.

Progressive Conservative Government policies and programs have been able to assist the medium and the small sized producers by providing incentives to go back to explore, drill, develop and produce. We are working our way out of a very slow time, when over 40,000 in the Province of Alberta were laid off as a result of that slowdown in the oil and gas industry.

As a result of a mistake with regard to the harmonizing system that was put into effect on January 1, the drilling contractors who are importing some portions of equipment, as well as the petroleum service industry, are now faced with an unfair duty that they should not be paying at all. I have been working to rectify this mistake and I believe the process should be much faster.

The implementation of Motion No. 101 which would repeal Section 17 of the Financial Administration Act would require all remissions to be submitted to Parliament. It would create further delays because, unfortunately, the parliamentary system sometimes can come to a crawl, a standstill and indeed, a dead stop. Companies and people need to be assisted in the most efficient and quickest way possible.

Today I understand that these conversions and remission proposals go through a review committee where they are thoroughly reviewed, as they should be. Once they have been approved by the committee, they go to the Minister who reviews the details and recommendations. They then go to Cabinet, and once they have been reviewed by Cabinet they finally receive an order in council. This is extremely important for either the remission or conversion to go through.

I also want to pay a compliment with regard to the remission order with respect to an excellent equestrian area in Calgary called Spruce Meadows. Some time ago they were able to purchase some specialized timing equipment for international events. The equipment had to be purchased overseas and there was a large duty factor on it. Through the assistance of the Department and the committee review of this particular issue, we were able to have the duty remitted, mainly because Spruce Meadows does entertain international equestrian teams for international events. This is an area where fast action took precedence, and I want to compliment the Department.

That is why it is important for Section 17 to remain in the Act. If it came to a parliamentary review, it may take many months to be put on the agenda, and many hours of debate may slow many companies and individuals to a point where people may be put out of action.

I am pleased to speak on this motion today and hope that Section 17 will remain in the Act. I hope the entire procedure can be speeded up so that everyone who has duties or tariffs that prove to be unfair or injurious can have them remitted as quickly as possible.

Let me say on behalf of drilling contractors and petroleum service people in the riding of Calgary South and Calgary generally that their proposal has been approved and is in the Minister's hands today. I believe the system that is in place provides the most efficient service.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard—Anjou): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity today to speak to motion No. M-101 in the name of the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway), who is also a member of the Public Accounts Committee which in the past made a study of this question and reported to Parliament on the remission of taxes, fees or penalties.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, to make sure everyone understands what we are talking about—fiscal matters tend to be so complex that even the experts get confused—I would like to quote Section 17 which allows the remission of taxes or penalties. Mr. Speaker, I will now quote Section 17 which provides: "The Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Treasury Board, whenever he considers it in the public interest, may remit any tax, fee or penalty".

• (1710)

Mr. Speaker, today we are talking about repealing this section which currently allows the Government, on recommendation of the Governor in Council, in circumstances when it is in the public interest or economically preferable, to forgive income tax owed to the Government by a company, an institution or a private citizen.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, the Public Accounts Committee drafted a very detailed report on the question, after the Auditor General of Canada's reminder on March 31, 1985, in connection with the income tax remission granted to Hudson Bay's Oil and Gas Company Ltd., a subsidiary of Dome Petroleum Ltd., in February 1985.

Mr. Speaker, the report contains a number of recommendations. For instance, the Public Accounts Committee recommended under No. 7 of its report tabled in the House on October 28, 1986: The tabling in Parliament of all income tax remission orders; the preparation of an explanatory note, to accompany each remission order so tabled, outlining why the remission order is in the public interest; the reference of all remission orders so tabled to the appropriate Standing Committees; and the prior approval by Parliament of all income tax remission orders exceeding $20 million in value.

Mr. Speaker, we have here a recommendation by the Public Accounts Committee which says that income tax remissions should not exceed $20 million, and we have a motion that says that the Government should consider the advisability: "of repealing Section 17 of the Financial Administration Act and require that all remissions of taxes, fees or penalties be submitted, each year, to Parliament for approval".

Mr. Speaker, I believe Parliament has the right to review all tax remissions. We have income tax legislation that is clear and specific, with whose provisions all Canadians, whether private citizens or corporations, must comply. If the Government, and I think the Government has a right to make that decision, if the Government considers that it is in the public interest, it should grant remission of income tax or penalty or interest or whatever, but I also think that the Government should provide Parliament, in a report or through the Auditor General . . . that was actually how the whole thing started, how we found out about the problem, when the Auditor General reported he had been unable to obtain the requisite information on this transaction.

I recognize the fact that the Government is entitled to act under Section 17 but I also think this section should not always be kept secret in the case of such transactions, and I don't think it should be left up to the Government or to the corporation but to Parliament, which represents the people of this country, which represents all taxpayers who have a right to know all the details and what the justification was . . . in other words, if the Government makes this decision, it should at least let taxpayers know, through Parliament, what its reasons were for making the decision. I think that this would let us give the Government an opportunity to take the appropriate action in the public interest and then call the Government to account for what it has done; it could report directly to Parliament or through the Auditor General's report so that we could know whether the reasons why such a remission of tax, interest or penalty was necessary.

I believe that the same goes for all the other recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee. For example, I quote the recommendation in Section 9 of the Public Accounts Committee report: "Your Committee recommends that the Minister of Finance in future ensure that income tax remission orders do not deal with any matter currently before Parliament." This is to avoid conflicts of interest, etc.

So, Mr. Speaker, I agree that we need a Section 17 to allow the Government to make tax remissions if it sees fit in the public interest, but at the same time, the Government must account for its actions and report to Parliament.

We have a tax system—and I said at the very beginning that it was a very complex system that no one can understand—that gets more complex from time to time, especially these days, and every time we want to improve it, every time we talk about tax reform, Mr. Speaker, this system becomes more complex.

In the 1970s, we had a tax reform and it was really six months after the new Tax Act was passed—there were so many amendments that it was impossible to figure out. Nearly twenty years later, we have another tax reform, which is even more complex.

Why are the tax laws so complex? The reason is the Tax Act does not concern only taxes. If we just said, "Taxes must be paid, period," fine. But the tax law is meant to take account of the regions. Each region has its own needs. Different sectors of our society have needs. So we have a tax system that addresses particular social, economic and political situations and thus creates all this complexity and exceptions. Often, there are very specific cases, individual cases in the public interest that relate to regional economic development, so the Government, for the sake of regional development and in the public interest, grants tax exemptions or waives an interest penalty, but I think that like any democratic government, after taking such action, it must report to Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this is the distinction I make in this debate between the motion to repeal and have Parliament approve all remissions and the Public Accounts Committee report that sets a limit of $20 million on transactions.

One need only explain why, in our budget process every year, the Minister of Finance must maintain strict secrecy. The reason is that transactions affecting our economic system might lead to speculation. If people knew beforehand, they could take advantage of it. That is why, at the same time as we ask the Government to allow tax remissions, we ask that before accepting them, they be considered in Parliament; I think that it would take about the same amount of time. It is a matter of passing a Bill. I think that we often have to act quickly in such cases, because of the economic effects. It is better if the public is not informed in advance.

But once the action is taken, once the tax remission is granted, Mr. Speaker, it is very important for any democratic government to report to Parliament—that is the least it can do—and give the Auditor General all the information when the books are audited; the Government must act like any good householder or corporate citizen. When the auditor arrives at the company's office, he must be provided with all supporting documents and all the reasons why a particular action was taken, why such a transaction was approved. And the same goes for the Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker. In this case, in the public interest, I agree that it should continue to be allowed to remit taxes, provided of course it is in the public interest, in accordance with Section 17, but once such action is taken, at least once a year, it should report to Parliament, which represents the people, so that Parliament can judge on behalf of Canadian taxpayers whether the Government has acted in accordance with Section 17 of the Act, under its mandate; it is on this precise point that the Canadian people can judge the Government.

So on that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks and of course I hope that at the end of this debate, my colleagues can deal with this motion so that we can perhaps send the Government a message to make an amendment and find a solution between outright repeal and setting a $20-million ceiling, so that the Government can grant tax remissions but must report them to Parliament when it does.

• (1720)

[*English*]

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, it is always a useful exercise to have a debate about the expenditure of public funds or the non-collection of taxes which we are talking about here when we are considering Section 17 of the Financial Administration Act. Section 17 allows remission orders to be made either to say that people do not have to pay a certain tax which they would normally have to pay, or to rebate those moneys to them either conditionally or unconditionally once the taxes have been paid. As parliamentarians we always have to keep a watchful eye on the financial dealings of the Government. That is one of our prime responsibilities.

I want to say this in respect to the proposition put forward by my colleague from York East (Mr. Redway). My heart is with the Hon. Member but my head is with the existing Section 17. It would be nice to say that Parliament should monitor every particular expenditure of Government immediately before it is made, or look at every particular remission order before it is made. But in actual fact I do not think that is possible. There are hundreds if not thousands of remission orders made annually, and if Parliament were to scrutinize every one of those in advance, we would be doing very little else. However, occasionally, and I might get back to this later in my remarks, a very political one or one involving great amounts of money can slip by. If we could isolate those particular remission orders and have a parliamentary debate on them before they took place, that would be the ideal situation. How we would do that I do not quite know.

Both the existing Financial Administration Act and the Hon. Member for York East recognize that there has to be a provision for remission orders. There has to be authority in legislation for the making of those remission orders. That authority, under the existing legislation, is Section 17(1) which states as follows: "The Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Treasury Board, whenever he considers it in the public interest, may remit any tax, fee or penalty". If we were, as was suggested, just to get rid of Section 17, then we would have to re-examine the Financial Administration Act, or some other Act, to put back that authority. Presumably, that is recognized by my colleague from York East.

However, were we to act on his recommendations we would then require an additional stage in the process by which remission orders are granted. There would be a necessity for parliamentary consent, and I presume that that would mean the passage of a special Bill. Annually, or as the need arose, Parliament would be presented with a Bill listing these various remission orders that the Government proposed to make. That Bill would then have to go through the proceedings in this House and then over to the other place and receive Royal Assent the same as any other Bill. That could be a very time consuming process. For people on the government side of the House I can see a difficulty there in that it could take a great deal of time away from other government business which ought to be debated and which should be debated here.

There has to be provision for public and parliamentary scrutiny. It would be wrong if that provision did not exist. It exists to a certain extent in the present law. If we cared to examine Section 17(8), we would see that it states therein that a statement of each remission order of $1,000 or more granted under this section shall be reported to the House of Commons in the Public Accounts. So each year for those remission orders in respect of the previous year presentation is made to the House of Commons by way of the Public Accounts. Of course, that goes to the parliamentary committee which can study it in detail. Thus there is provision for scrutiny.

These remission orders are listed and made available to parliamentarians and the public at large so that they can be examined. If a parliamentary committee so chooses, it can call witnesses before it to say why a particular remission order was granted. It has wide-ranging authorities in that respect. So there is that element of parliamentary control that exists within the current system.

Also, as with any other Order in Council—and remission orders have to be made by way of Orders in Council—there is an obligation that these be published in *The Canada Gazette*. In this way any subscriber to *The Canada Gazette* can take the current issue and look at what remission orders are in the process of being granted. Sometimes it makes very interesting reading. However, I doubt very much if many people actually read them. If a parliamentarian had reason to question a particular remission order, it would be available to him at the time of publication in *The Canada Gazette* and could be brought up in the House.

I think there is in respect of most remission orders an adequate system of public and parliamentary scrutiny and that we need not necessarily go the full route suggested by the Hon. Member for York East in order that parliamentarians might do their work respecting remission orders.

I was going to go into a whole list of types of remission orders with which I am familiar, in particular the canned baby carrots remission order. Because I have only a minute or so remaining, I will not get into the details about canned baby carrots and the taxation thereon.

• (1730)

On balance, Sir, if we were to adopt the resolution before us we would have a little more public and parliamentary scrutiny, but we would tie ourselves up in a series of knots and loss of time. We would not be able to get these remission orders through in time. They are often badly needed, for example, by the marketer of canned baby carrots, or by some of the examples given to us by the previous speaker.

That, Sir, is my contribution to this great debate.

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate this afternoon on Motion No. 101 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway). My feelings are not unlike those of my colleague who just spoke, the Hon. Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson). I have a lot of sympathy for what my colleague, the Hon. Member for York East, is attempting to do, but I have some difficulty with the practicalities.

Before I launch into a few comments, I would like to indicate the high respect I have for my colleague, the Hon. Member for York East. We know him here in the House as an ardent and earnest Member of the House. In his capacity as a member of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts he has brought to that committee a high degree of inquisitiveness and, as my colleague the Hon. Member for Western Arctic pointed out, a desire to make sure that the funds spent or the taxes not collected are indeed done in a wise fashion.

Under Motion No. 101 my colleague, the Hon. Member for York East would like to have remission orders of various types, whether they be for taxes, fees, or penalties, brought to the House of Commons. We must acknowledge that due to the work of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts there is a new procedure, as was alluded to by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Western Arctic. The Government now publishes a document every six months. The first one came out recently, and represents the six month period ending March 31, 1988. It documents those cases of remission orders that have been approved by Order in Council in the six months preceding March 31. This is an innovation and it gives Parliament an opportunity to see the reasons why certain funds are being remitted and the circumstances that lead up to that.

For example, in glancing through the report in front of me, it is reported that the Lions Club in Riverside was building homes for handicapped persons. It had to import stoves and ovens that could not be obtained in Canada. They had remitted some $9,940. This was a reasonable thing to do considering the charitable nature of the work the Lions Club was doing in Riverside.

I was even more interested when I turned to the next page and found an example in my own constituency of Oxford where we have been blessed with the building of a large CAMI plant. It is an automotive plant, the largest of all plants being built in Canada under the combined efforts of an American and foreign manufacturer. In this case it is General Motors and Suzuki.

Much of the work going into that plant involves equipment and machinery being brought from Japan, or outside the country. In order for the plant to be competitive with foreign vehicles which would compete against the plant in Ingersoll, the Government has wisely seen fit to remit a significant amount over a period of three years to allow that company to bring in this equipment which will make it more competitive in the manufacture of automobiles.

I do not have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that a company which will employ somewhere between 2,000 and 2,400 people in my constituency will be a significant addition to our economy. I would think that the amount of money being remitted through this remission order of some $12 million will be more than recaptured by the sales that this company will produce as a result of manufacturing certain automobiles here in Canada, and also exporting them abroad.

There is another interesting problem in my constituency that relates to remission orders, but more in the area of taxation. It comes as a result of the plight of certain tobacco growers at the present time. The tobacco industry is in a downturn. As a result many tobacco growers have found themselves with an immense debt to banks or other financial institutions, often hundreds of thousands of dollars, and sometimes more than the value of their property.

When they go through certain negotiations with the banks, other financial institutions, or the Farm Credit Corporation, it sometimes happens that they are granted certain concessions in terms of repayment. There are provisions under a program instituted by the Department of Agriculture whereby assistance is provided to some tobacco growers who are able to get out of growing tobacco and into some other line of work.

As a result of a combination of factors, it may end up that, because of reductions in moneys owing to a financial institution, the Income Tax Act requires that the taxpayer, the tobacco grower who is in considerable difficulty, has to pay a significant amount of tax in one year when he has not received any money and is grossly in debt to the institutions. Yet at the same time he is expected to fork out a significant amount of money to pay tax on what is deemed to be income in his case. If significant hardship can be demonstrated, a remission order can certainly be requested, and one would hope at times that that might be granted by the Government.

I agree with my colleague, the Hon. Member for Western Arctic that it would be very desirable to have Parliament scrutinize this type of activity where we give Canadian manufacturers concessions. However, to do so, and to bring it before Parliament in each and every case, would certainly be unrealistic, and would add to the burden we already have in the House. When one considers that yesterday we were asked to spend 350 days debating one Bill, one can realize the impracticality of bringing forward dozens of remission orders, whether they be for customs tariffs or income tax.

I applaud the Hon. Member for York East in what he is attempting to do in terms of bringing more openness to the financial aspects of government. However, I do feel I have to oppose this motion in light of the practicalities of the whole problem.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion lost.

I believe there is unanimous consent to suspend the sitting until six o'clock?

Mr. Rossi: There is unanimous consent to adjourn until six o'clock.

SITTING SUSPENDED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being 5.40 p.m., the House will suspend sitting until 6 p.m.

At 5.40 p.m. the sitting of the House was suspended.

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 6 p.m.

Time Allocation

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

ALLOCATION OF TIME TO CONSIDER REPORT AND THIRD READING STAGES OF BILL C-130

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lewis:

> That, in relation to Bill C-130, an Act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States of America, not more than two further sitting days shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage, and two sitting days to the consideration of the third reading stage of the Bill; and
>
> That fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business on the second day allotted to report stage consideration and on the second day to third reading stage consideration of the said Bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required, for the purpose of this order and, in turn, every question necessary in order to dispose of the stage of the Bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, as I was saying to the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) just before we adjourned temporarily for Private Members' Business, the right hon. gentleman should tell the people the truth. It is a very surprising performance for a man, who was once regarded as a man of integrity, to take phrases from one part of the agreement and to apply them to another, distorting the real meaning of the wording and simplifying the application of yet others.

[*Translation*]

He should tell them the truth, Mr. Speaker. I would like to expand on that, if I may. Last Thursday, on August 11, the Hon. Member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Turner) rose in the House and proudly claimed that under the terms of the agreement, the Government of Quebec would no longer be able to promote investment by Quebecers in Quebec companies. Mr. Speaker, he was referring specifically to the Quebec Stock Savings Plan, better known as the QSSP.

I certainly would not want to question the intelligence of the Right Hon. Member with respect to his reading of the agreement. However, Mr. Speaker, I strongly question his ability to understand the wording without distorting the real meaning. His statement was a reflection on the integrity of the Premier of Quebec, a fervent supporter of the agreement who is well aware of the benefits it will provide for Quebec, and the Leader of the Opposition has proven once again that he has no compunction about resorting to tactics that rely more on rhetoric than on the truth.

If the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition had done his homework and had read the agreement, he would know that the investment provisions do not apply to investment portfolios, and that as a result, various levels of government are entirely free to establish investment promotion programs like the QSSP.

If the Hon. Member has trouble with my interpretation of this provision, perhaps he will accept the interpretation provided by the Premier of Quebec whose irony was apparent on the weekend when he made the following statement, and I quote: "At some time in our lives, we have all made statements based on facts that are not altogether accurate". Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bourassa said these words during the closing ceremony of the sixth convention of the Youth Wing of the Quebec Liberal Party which was held in Sherbrooke on the weekend. At the same convention, militant youth members of the Quebec Liberal Party endorsed a resolution to support the free trade agreement, despite intrusive action by more than 150 delegates from Mr. Turner's party who were sent by his Quebec lieutenant as mercenaries to try and dampen the enthusiasm of Quebec's young Liberals. However, these young people are not as easily taken in as the Leader of the Opposition would like to think. They know that the agreement is a ticket to the future that will give them access to jobs commensurate with their interests and capabilities.

There are others, Mr. Speaker, like the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau), who are lost in their nostalgia for what Canada was like during the last century and who turn a blind eye to this country's potential for the twenty-first century. Mr. Garneau refers to a possible amalgamation of Canada with the United States and spreads fear and panic with his so-called nationalistic tendencies. He says he is fighting to keep Canada independent, but he refuses to understand what this country is all about, a country that has prospered because of its exports. Mr. Speaker, I may remind the Hon. Member that Canada is and always has been a strong country with a distinct identity, and to claim it is on the verge of being assimilated is an insult to the very people who built this country. He hides all too readily behind the alleged values of sovereignty which to him is the same as protectionism. He forgets what his own leader said, and I quote:

[*English*]

—yielding to protectionism under the guise of economic nationalism is self-defeating for Canada. This country has always prospered under freer rules of international trade". Why is it essential to tell them again and again that the way of securing Canada's sovereignty and culture necessitates a strong economy capable of offering to Canadians security, prosperity and a future based on their hopes and aspirations? It is because they do not envision Canada's future.

[*Translation*]

How will these same detractors answer Quebecers, Mr. Speaker, if the United States imposes import restrictions on electricity? Will they answer that to save Canadian sovereignty, they preferred to sacrifice more than 8 per cent of Hydro-Québec's total income? Have they explained to Quebecers, Mr. Speaker, that electricity is not yet covered by international trade agreements, that the United States can impose restrictions without incurring the sanctions provided by GATT?

The free trade agreement provides that neither Canada nor the United States can impose duties or other charges, import quotas or any other quantitative restriction on energy imports, including electricity, from the other country, unless an exception is recognized by GATT.

Have they explained to Quebecers, Mr. Speaker, that a strong protectionist tendency is now growing in the United States and threatens the viability of our trade with our largest trading partner? Have they told them, Mr. Speaker, that our country's economy is heavily dependent on foreign trade, that more than 30 per cent of our national income and over 3 million jobs depend on this trade?

No, Mr. Speaker, they just raised fear by using false pretexts! In particular, they suggested that Canada would lose power over its water and the legitimate right to control this natural resource. They spoke of our lakes and rivers eventually drying up, but what was really drying up was their own ideas.

Our Government, Mr. Speaker, has removed any controversy by amending Bill C-130, because again they had spread doubt and fear.

And they have done even more by their acts of omission. They have intentionally not said that their leader was and still is the only leader of a national party to have suggested using water as a bargaining tool for greater access to the American market. In a speech to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce on December 9, 1965, Mr. Turner said, and I quote:

[*English*]

—and if some day we can agree to the sharing of this continent's water by offering some of our water for export, we might want at that time to insist that if water is to be considered as a continental resource, markets should also be considered on the same basis. We might wish to export—not for money—as we sold power under the Columbia River Treaty, but in return for access to your market".

[*Translation*]

History definitely has its ironies, Mr. Speaker!

[*English*]

We have heard an entire litany of myths, allegations and innuendoes regarding this free trade agreement from the Leader of the Opposition. We have yet to hear any reasonable arguments, any rational debate for substantive opposition from Mr. Turner. The quantity of his material is prolific but the quality of his debate is pathetic.

The people of Canada want to know about free trade. They do not need more simplistic argumentation without any basis of fact. It is time for Mr. Turner to either articulate a real reason as to why he cannot support this agreement, or he should admit that his opposition is based on nothing more than political opportunism, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker,

since you are indicating that my time is finished, that Canadians will remember.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, in bringing in closure to stop this debate on free trade, after only two days of debate at the report stage of the proceedings, the Government is committing a total affront to parliamentary democracy. Here we have what the Government claims to be the most important piece of legislation to be presented in this Parliament, and it has allowed five days of debate at second reading. Now, after two days of debate at the report stage, it is going to allow two more days at report stage, which is four days of debate at report stage, and then it will close down the debate with two days of debate at third reading.

In addition, the Government also imposed closure in the legislative committee when it only allowed three weeks of hearings for witnesses. There was a large demand for witnesses, not only to hold hearings here in Ottawa but all over the country.

• (1810)

With this most important piece of legislation, the Government has imposed closure at every stage of proceedings. The debates have been of very brief duration. As I said, there was five days of debate at second reading, three weeks in committee to hear from witnesses and groups representing the people of Canada, and now there will be four days at report stage and two days at third reading.

The Government has said that imposing closure is justified because the opposition Parties have already made up their minds. They say that the Liberals have already made up their minds, they are against the agreement. The NDP Members have made up their minds, they are against the agreement. Since the Members of both Parties in opposition have made up their minds, why bother continuing with the debate? The Government completely misunderstands the purpose of debate in this House.

No one presumes for one minute that by debating issues in this House, we will convince government Members to change their minds and vote with the Opposition. We know that the Government has 211 Members and the Opposition has about 70 Members. We know that we will be out-voted on every issue on every occasion.

The purpose of debate is not to convince Members on the other side that they should vote with us; the purpose of the debate is to elucidate what is being debated for the benefit of the public outside the House, the great Canadian public, the citizens of Canada, so they will understand what we are debating. If we are limited to only four days on report stage and two days at third reading, we will not have time to explain to the Canadian public the faults of this particular legislation. Nor would the Government, if it were interested, have the time to explain the good points about the legislation. I say "if it were interested", because it is obvious from this debate, both at second reading and at report stages, that government Members are not really debating the details of this agreement. They are debating theoretical free trade.

Time and again, Members have said what a great thing free trade is and what it will do for Canada. However, they are not debating this very specific agreement with the United States. We in the Opposition, on the other hand, are debating the specific details of the agreement. To do so, we need time. That is why it is a travesty of parliamentary democracy that the Government is closing down debate after such a short period of time.

We are not interested in convincing those people over there. We would like to, but we know that that is a lost battle. With these many amendments, we are trying to bring to the attention of the Canadian public the failings and faults of the legislation so that Canadians will better understand it once we have an election.

I mentioned that we are interested in the details of the legislation. In addition, we take the position that the Government had no mandate for this legislation at the time of the election in 1984. It was not mentioned during the election campaign of 1984. As a matter of fact, the only words we heard from the leading figures of the Government prior to the election were spoken in 1983 when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said:

> "Canadians rejected free trade with the United States in 1911. They would do so again in 1983. Canada must increase its share of total world trade, which has dropped by 33 per cent in the past two decades."

What did the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) say in 1983? He said:

> "Bilateral free trade with the United States is simplistic and naive. It would only serve to further diminish our ability to compete internationally."

What did the former Secretary of State, David Crombie, say? He said:

> "It's silly. Canada must improve relations in trade with the United States, of course. But our natural destiny is to become a global leader, not American's weak sister."

The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) said similar words. Before the election campaign of 1984, these were the positions of the leading figures in the Government. During the election campaign of 1984, nothing was said.

In 1986, they started negotiating this agreement following the Shamrock Summit between the President of the United States and the Prime Minister in Quebec City. They started negotiating this agreement without any mandate, and then in October of 1987, we received a 35-page Elements of Agreement, which we were given little time to be debated. I believe there was a short one or two-day opposition day debate on that. Then in December, we received the 1,400-page full free trade agreement, and we had three days to debate that. We had three days of debate on a 1,400-page agreement a few days after it was sent to our offices, but the debate was not on the legislation. We only received the legislation in May of this year, a few months ago.

A few moments ago, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Cadieux) was accusing the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) of not telling the truth with respect to this agreement. He said that the Leader of the Opposition distorted in a serious way the terms of the agreement, and he referred to his recent questions with respect to the Quebec investment plan. I must say to the Minister of Labour, though he has left the House now, that he himself should practise what he preaches. He has distorted the words of the Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition at no time said that the Canadian version of the agreement prevented the Quebec Government or the people of Quebec from having their particular stock promotion plan. What he said was the following:

> "Nevertheless, the official statement or official interpretation by President Reagan says, on page 86, that a province shall grant investors from the other country the same favourable treatment granted investors from that province.
>
> President Reagan is saying that the Government of Québec cannot use special measures to encourage Québecers to invest in their own province."

I read the response of Premier Bourassa. In his response, he did not refer to the American interpretation. He once again referred to the Canadian agreement and he also referred to the present plan and not to future plans.

When the Minister of Labour and the Minister for International Trade start accusing the Leader of the Opposition of distorting the truth, they should practise what they preach. They should not distort what the Leader of the Opposition said as recorded in *Hansard* of August 11, 1988, at page 18199.

Earlier this afternoon, the—

Mr. McDermid: You're choking on that.

Mr. Allmand: Yes, I am, because I have a cold. I am doing my best, and I wish you would accept that.

Mr. McDermid: You are choking on your own words.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary does not have very much to say so he is trying to bug me about my cold.

Earlier this afternoon, the very rambunctious Minister for International Trade was launching forth, as he usually does, with all sorts of wild statements. Of course, he referred to the proposed action by our Party to delay the passage of this Bill in the Senate in order to force an election so that the people could decide whether or not they want this agreement. It is our policy that since there was no mandate for the free trade agreement with the United States in 1984 and since it is such an important matter that will change the fabric and the nature of this country so much, it should be decided in a national election. We have decided that in order for that to happen, since we are massively out-voted in the House by the large government majority, we will delay the legislation. We will not defeat it but delay it in the Senate so that that can occur.

The Minister for International Trade, of course, was very critical of that. He started making fun of the Senate and referred to the fact that Senators are not elected and were mostly appointed by Liberals. At the beginning of this Parliament, and as a matter of fact, on May 9, 1985, in response to challenges from opposition Parties to reform the Senate, the Government finally put before this House a motion to reform the Senate. That motion to reform the Senate provided that money Bills that were sent to the Senate would be passed automatically after 30 days and non-money Bills that were not passed by the Senate after 45 days would be automatically passed.

The Leader of the Opposition challenged the Prime Minister to proceed with the legislation and said that he would support it, but that was never done. This motion to reform the Senate died on the Order Paper and was never passed by the Government because the Government did not have the political will to reform the Senate.

• (1820)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret that the Hon. Member's time has expired.

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here waiting to get in on this debate because I have listened to members of the Opposition moan, cry, weep and complain about time allocation on Bill C-130, an Act to implement the free trade agreement. They say we have not had time to debate. I am going to try to cover some of the points that the opposition Members have raised.

How can we take them seriously? First, the Right Hon. Leader of the Liberal Party said, yes, he would form a coalition government. Then, no, he would not form a coalition government. We have the Leader of the NDP saying, certainly, we will form a coalition. Yes, we have seen the first signs of it. Here it is in a letter to our House Leader. Our House Leader said, let us have an orderly debate, let us have time allocation here, come back with your ideas on time allocation. Here is what they came back with. They proposed, and both the Liberal House Leader and the NDP House Leader signed this, that there should be 150 days of debate at report stage. Then they had the audacity to suggest another 200 days for third reading.

How can you treat the Opposition Parties seriously when they bring in this kind of nonsense? They are talking about over two years of House time in debate. They are talking about ignoring day care, ignoring tax reform, ignoring the refurbishing of the Armed Forces, ignoring a myriad of issues we have to debate in this House. Now they are moaning and groaning because we have limited the debate.

They say we have not had time to debate. Let me just give you the figures on second reading alone. The Liberal Party put up 22 speakers on second reading. Their critic spoke three times. Four Members spoke twice. Yet they say they did not have time to debate it. Not only did they have that many people speaking, but on the third day of second reading they ran out of speakers. Let us take a look at the NDP. Twenty of them spoke, eight of them twice, on second reading. Their critic, the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon), spoke three times. They ran out of speakers on the same night. Do you know who carried the debate to make sure it went the whole five days? The Conservative Party carried the debate. They could not carry it that night, they ran out of speakers, and we kept the debate going. Now they are moaning and groaning because we are going to limit the time for debate. That is total nonsense.

They are saying we do not have time to discuss this with the public. We are ramming it through. The free trade debate has been going on in this country now for over three years. The agreement was signed January 2 or January 3 and this legislation has been before the House since May. All we have seen since May are stalling tactics, not genuine debate, not serious study of a Bill.

I have to give the NDP Members full marks. They stood up and said what they were going to do. They were going to obstruct and do everything they can to stop the debate, not to have a serious debate. They do not want to sit down and inform the public of what this is all about and how important it is to Canada. No, they just want to obstruct.

They say we need a lot more debate. I was reading something rather interesting the other day about the debate in the British Parliament over joining the European Economic Community. The total time taken to decide that important stage of legislation dealing with the decision to enter the European Economic Community took a total of 18 hours. We have been debating this for hours and hours and hours. Some days have involved extended hours, and every day of extended hours is like two days of debate. Members opposite fail to mention that in their great moaning and groaning about the lack of time to debate.

When we finish report stage debate we will have had a total of five days of debate, three of which will be extended hours so that is basically an extra three days of debate. When third reading comes along it will probably be two days of extended debate, so that is really four days. The Opposition Members could not sustain the debate on second reading and there is no reason to think they can do it on third reading. We are into well over a couple of hundred hours of debate in one form or another, yet Great Britain debated entering the European Economic Community for only 18 hours.

Then we have to deal with the red herrings the opposition Members bring up. They say we did not have a mandate. I keep hearing we do not have a mandate to negotiate this agreement. I went back just to take a look at the commitments that the Conservative Party made during the last election on trade matters. One of them was to develop stronger trading relations without limiting the access of developing nations. That is exactly what this agreement does. Another plank in the platform was working toward a reduction in world trading barriers. What is this all about? Reduction of trading barriers. That is exactly what we are talking about. That is what we campaigned on.

We campaigned on assisting our service industries in penetrating foreign markets. That is what this agreement does. Most of the two million new jobs needed in Canada in the 1980s will be in the service sector. We campaigned on creating a framework in which that sector can better compete worldwide. What are we talking about? That is exactly what this agreement does. We campaigned on working closely with provincial Governments and regional industries to develop local initiatives that will both increase exports and develop stronger regional economies. That is out of our campaign literature and that is exactly what this free trade agreement does. We campaigned on economic renewal in this country and part of that, I must say, is the free trade agreement. We have a mandate.

Let me just wind up by saying this. The Opposition Parties love to go around and quote the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and some of the candidates for the leadership, but since that time we have had a royal commission on the economy report to Parliament recommending free trade. We have had the Economic Council of Canada report recommending free trade. We have had the C. D. Howe Institute report recommending free trade along with other independent thinkers in this country, including the business community, both small, medium and large.

That evidence was presented to the Government. When it was, we made a decision to get an agreement. If that evidence had been presented and this Government had not acted on it, we would have heard the moaning and groaning and crying from across the House. They would be asking, why are you not paying any attention to the evidence presented to the Parliament of Canada? We did pay attention and that is why we brought in this agreement. That is why it is a good thing for Canada.

We will be debating this issue over the next period of time. Time allocation is necessary because the Opposition is not interested in debating the facts.

• (1830)

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to speak, particularly following the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade (Mr. McDermid). He took a lot of time to tell us that the proposal which was put before this House by the House Leaders of the two opposition Parties was unrealistic. Perhaps it was. However, we must remember that Bill C-130 is not an ordinary Bill. It is an omnibus Bill which will amend 27 other Bills.

In the House of Commons it takes anywhere from 10 to 15 days to amend a Bill. If you multiply 27 pieces of legislation for amendment by 10 days each, that is 270 days. At 15 days each, that is 405 days. If we debated each of the Bills that we are amending through this omnibus Bill for 15 days, it would take us 405 days.

Allow me to list the Bills that are going to be amended. They are: the Canada Agricultural Products Standards Act, the Department of Agriculture Act, the Bank Act, the Broadcasting Act, the Canada Wheat Board Act, the Copyright Act, the Customs Act, the Customs Tariff Act, the Excise Tax Act, the Export and Import Permits Act, the Canada Grain Act, the Importation of Intoxicating Liquors Act, and the Income Tax Act. We have been trying to amend the Income Tax Act for the last year and a half and have not done very well; it is still on the Order Paper. Along with amending 26 other Acts we are going to amend this Act in four days.

The other Bills to be amended are: the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act, the Investment Canada Act, the Investment Companies Act, the Loan Companies Act, the Meat Import Act, the Meat Inspection Act, the National Energy Board Act, the Seeds Act, the Standards Council of Canada Act, the Statistics Act, the Textile and Clothing Board Act, the Trust Companies Act, and the Western Grain Transportation Act.

Many of these Bills have been before the House for 25 to 30 years and they are being amended by this piece of legislation. Had this been done methodically, as the Government should have done it, we would have had 27 different Bills.

No one can tell me how the Acts affecting my area of concern, agriculture, will be affected by this legislation. We needed to hear witnesses on every one of the agricultural Acts which are being changed. Instead of that, witnesses on agriculture were given a mere couple of hours each in which to comment on the Canada Agricultural Products Standard Act, the Department of Agriculture Act, the Canadian Wheat Board Act, the Western Grain Transportation Act, the Seeds Act, and the Canada Grain Act. It is not unrealistic to suggest that this legislation should have taken a year or two to get through this House.

Democratic government operates well only if it operates with the consent of the governed. That is an accepted basis of democratic governments all over the world. That does not mean that a government receives a majority one year and then forgets about the people of Canada for the next four years. It means that the government keeps in contact with the people of Canada daily and ensures that it knows how they are reacting to the legislation being put before them.

We know how the people of Canada are reacting to this legislation. Seventy per cent of the people of Canada think there should have been an election before these 27 Bills were amended. A large portion of the population, approximately 51 per cent, disagrees with this trade deal.

When I ask people on the street about the free trade deal being pushed through the House of Commons they tell me that they do not understand what it is about. There is not enough information out there to inform them on what it is about. They do not believe what the Government is telling them and they do not believe what I am telling them. They want to know the facts from a non-political point of view.

I tell people that they are going to have to choose a government on the basis of whether or not they want this free trade agreement. Just because they do not know enough about it does not mean that they will not vote on it. I ask them how they will vote on it and they tell me that since they do not know very much about it they will vote against it. Very few people who do not know what this free trade deal is about are willing to take the chance and, in a leap of faith, vote for something which will affect them they know not how. They do not trust the people who are telling them that it is good for them.

"This country could not survive with a policy of unfettered free trade". Sounds familiar? "I'm all in favour of eliminating unfair protectionism where it exists. This is a separate country. We'd be swamped. We have in many ways a branch-plant economy, in many ways, in certain important sectors".

That quotation comes from an interview of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) by John Gray in *The Globe and Mail* in June of 1983. The Prime Minister said, "All that would happen with that kind of concept would be the boys cranking up their plants throughout the United States in bad times and shutting their entire branch plants in Canada. It's bad enough as it is". The people believed the Prime Minister when he said that in 1983 and they elected him. But he has sold his electors down the river. Canadians have not given their consent to this legislation. We should not have to go through it in the time to which we are being limited by this closure motion.

• (1840)

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there are very few things that have happened to me in my years in this House that have made me as proud to be a Canadian and a Conservative as this trading agreement. It is one of the most significant achievements we have been able to make in this Parliament. It is significant because of what it will do for Canadians, whether they are rich or poor, young or old. Every Canadian will have a higher standard of living as a consequence of this free trade deal because prices will go down.

History tells us that when small nations have entered into singular trade relations with larger nations, it has resulted in more and better paying jobs for the smaller nations. In every case, the smaller nation was very dependent on the larger nation prior to the trading relationship. Today, when the United States sneezes, we catch a cold because 80 per cent of our exports go to the United States and one-third of our jobs relate to exports. We are affected by protectionism in the United States.

We can expect increased productivity in the future from free trade, which will help us capture a larger share of the European, Japanese and other markets in the world. In 20 years we can expect that about 65 per cent of our exports will go to the United States, with 35 per cent going to other places in the world. We will be less dependent and less threatened by our relationship with one country. Therefore, free trade will result in lower prices, more jobs, better paying jobs and less dependency on the United States.

We have witnessed the filibustering tactics of the Opposition for over two years. In September, 1984, there was a massive change in government. We achieved the largest majority in Canadian parliamentary history, not because we were so wonderful, but because people understood that those who had been governing this country were not getting the job done. The Liberal Party really learned that because its members were almost wiped out.

The only reason the Liberals are filibustering today is that they do not want us to complete the job we were elected to do in 1984, which is to straighten out this country, get control of inflation and put 1.5 million Canadians who did not have jobs in September, 1984, back to work. We have made progress, but our target is for 2 million, 2.5 million and then three million more Canadians with jobs. The free trade agreement is a big piece of that agenda.

Canadians voted for change. Both opposition Parties stand consistently in the House seeking to go back where we were before, when Canadians were out of jobs, our standard of living was dropping like a rock, and prices were rising like balloons. Interest rates were 22 per cent and 23 per cent. Those were the results of the policies of those two Parties. We must not forget it.

This agreement is good for Canada and every Member in the Opposition knows and understands that. Yet they waste the time of this Chamber, at about $500,000 a day. Every dilatory tactic by the Opposition costs Canadian taxpayers another $500,000 in wasted money.

Yesterday the Opposition asked for Parliament to continue for another 350 days of debate on this issue. Such a debate alone would cost Canadian taxpayers $175 million in order to listen to the kind of speeches we have been hearing. Do Canadians want to spend $175 million of their money on this debate?

They do not want an election when we have kept our commitments. The Opposition wants to stop us from keeping our commitments in the hope that Canadians can be persuaded to go back to the old ways of unemployment, high inflation and so on. In addition, the Opposition has been somewhat sneaky about this. They stand up to say that they have not had much time to debate the free trade agreement.

Let us examine this situation and compare June, 1987, with June, 1988, when we were trying to begin the free trade debate. In June, 1987, we dealt with 23 Bills and three other major issues in this Chamber. In June, 1988, we were only able to deal with 14, 11 of which were dealt with in three days. In June, 1987, there were no dilatory motions and phoney votes on the introduction of Private Members' Bills. This June, there were 19, which, at an average of an hour each, represented six of the 21 sitting days in this Chamber. It cost Canadian taxpayers $3 million to watch us vote and hear the bells ring in the month of June. That took us into extended hours, with overtime for the House of Commons staff and so on.

Our first Ways and Means motion related to this legislation was first brought into the House on May 18. The opposition Members argued on procedural grounds right through to June 8, before we could even bring it into the House. That took three weeks of House time when they could have been debating if they sincerely wanted to debate the free trade issue.

We have made an assessment of this. There were eight opposition days on free trade before we got anywhere near this stage. There were two government motions and four days of debate in March and December, 1987, representing 12 days of debate on this issue in this Chamber in 1987.

The Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade spent 120 hours in hearings. In normal parliamentary days, that is equivalent to 40 days in substantive time.

At the committee stage on this Bill, there were 87 hours of hearings, 59 witnesses and 350 submissions. That is the equivalent of 29 days of parliamentary time. There were 12 days of debate in equivalent time on the second reading stage in this House. There will be the equivalent of seven days in terms of report and third reading stages.

I have added these numbers, which come to a total of 341 hours which Members have spent on this issue. In terms of normal parliamentary days, it represents 114 days at an average of three hours of substantive time per day. This Chamber will have spent 114 days on this issue, which is enough.

Canadians elected this Government to govern. They wanted better health care, they wanted inflation under control, they wanted better pensions, they wanted more fairness in the system. They wanted the economy strengthened and they wanted jobs to be created. We have done that for them as rapidly as we could over the last four years while straightening out the mess we inherited. This is another piece in that process and I am proud to look forward to 10 minutes from now when I can vote for time allocation so that this Bill can get out of the Chamber and into the Senate. Hopefully those unelected people in the other place will see the wisdom of bowing to the will of the democratically elected Members of this Parliament.

• (1850)

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, it was very discouraging to hear a speech like that and follow the Parliamentary Secretary on his cheap accounting of parliamentary time and how it is used.

We all believe—unfortunately the Parliamentary Secretary does not—that the House of Commons is a place which distributes information to the public because the public has a right to get it. The public after hearing different partisan voices, then makes up its mind. That is what this place is all about. It is not a place where you count dollars and cents to determine how long a debate should go because it is costing so much. It is a place, instead, from which the public can make up its mind about what is going on. The facts speak more than the empty, pathetic rhetoric of the Parliamentary Secretary.

In this debate, which was introduced in May of this year, not a year ago, not six months ago, but in May, in this Chamber on second reading we have had some 26 hours of debate and at report stage we have had some six hours and 24 minutes. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is that an unreasonable length of time on a piece of legislation which, as the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) has indicated along with others, covers some 27 pieces of existing legislation that will have to be changed as a result of this measure? Is it an unreasonable length of time to have 26 hours on second reading and only six hours and 24 minutes on report stage debate?

The sad and unfortunate fact is that when you are in government and you are embarrassed, you call closure. When you are in government and you do not know how to deal with the arguments of the opposition, you then bring in closure. In other words, when you run out of arguments and do not know how to deal with the arguments put forward by the opposition, you invoke closure. That was typical last Friday when we dealt with the question about why in an international agreement Canada is not defined in the opening clauses, not even included, while the United States is. This document mentions Canada and the U.S. all the way through. It was sad to see the weak defence which the Government put forward explaining why Canada had been forgotten in one of the major opening clauses.

Mr. McDermid: It has not been forgotten, and you know it.

Mr. Caccia: The Government is embarrassed, uneasy and will impose closure to move ahead.

The Government has forgotten to seek the advice and information essential to make sure this agreement is in the interests of Canadians. I refer specifically to the environment.

This agreement is a bilateral one. All the points which the Parliamentary Secretary made earlier would refer to multilateral, global agreements. This one is not one of those. When the talk began, the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council raised a number of interesting questions and brought them to the attention of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) and through him to the Government. For instance, it said that Canada's freedom to impose environmental regulations and to yield subsidies and tax incentives to pursue the social goals of a clean environment and sound resource management must not be restricted by any freer trade agreement.

Did the Government take any cognizance of that? It did not. Did it launch any study of this point? Unfortunately, it did not. The Advisory Council went on and made another point. It said there will be pressures to reduce costs. In the absence of uniform standards and inevitable enforcement there could be pressure from Canadian firms or firms wishing to locate in Canada to reduce the short-term costs of production in Canada by reducing expenditures for pollution control and for sound long-term resource management. Did the Government pay any attention to this point made exactly two and a half years ago? No, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately not.

The Advisory Council made another point in this paper. It asked whether a free trade agreement achieved either bilaterally or multilaterally would require Canada to adopt another nation's environmental legislative and management approach. Was that explored? It was not. We ended up, as in the case of pesticides, with a notion that we should harmonize our regulations with American regulations. We know who will harmonize with whom. It is not the bigger with the smaller, it is always the smaller with the bigger because that is the way harmonization works out.

I see you are getting impatient with me in terms of time, Mr. Speaker. There are three other major points—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I am never impatient with the Hon. Member.

It being 6.56 p.m., the two hours provided for the consideration of the motion now before the House under the provisions of Standing Order 117 have expired.

Accordingly, under the terms of the Standing Order it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the motion.

Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Lewis) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 511*)

YEAS

Members

Andre
Attewell
Belsher
Bernier
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Blouin
Bradley
Cadieux
Cardiff
Champagne (Champlain)
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Collins
Comeau
Cook
Corbett
Crofton
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Daubney
Domm
Dorin
Duguay
Duplessis
Fennell
Fretz
Friesen
Gass
Girard
Gormley
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Greenaway
Halliday
Hardey
Harvey
Hawkes
Hees
Holtmann
Howie
James
Jepson
Johnson (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception)
Joncas
Kilgour
Kindy
Ladouceur
Lawrence
Lesick
Lewis
MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Mantha
Marin
Martin
Masse
Mazankowski
McCain
McCrossan
McDermid
McKenzie
Minaker
Moore
Nicholson (Niagara Falls)
Nickerson
Oostrom
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Price
Ravis
Ricard
Schellenberg (Nanaimo—Alberni)
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Sparrow
Stackhouse
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Tupper
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)—86

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy
Benjamin
Blaikie
Caccia
Copps
de Corneille
de Jong
Dewar
Finestone
Foster
Frith
Fulton
Gagliano
Gauthier
Gray (Windsor West)
Heap
Hopkins
Isabelle
Langdon
McCurdy
McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood)
Murphy
Nystrom
Penner
Prud'homme
Rossi
Tardif (Richmond—Wolfe)
Young—29

• (1920)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Riis: I have a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) on a point of order.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to say that I actually thought that it was a 30-minute bell. I came in late.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Riis: Order.

Some Hon. Members: Resign!

An Hon. Member: Resign as House Leader.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): This is only Tuesday. It is August 16 and it is not a full moon. Could I have just a little order so that I can hear the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap?

Mr. Riis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did want to say that had I made it in time, I would certainly have voted for democracy and against this particular motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I do not have to say that that was not a point of order.

* * *

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-130, an Act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States of America, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Motions Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 are grouped for debate. A vote on Motion No. 9 will apply to Motions Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14. Is the House ready for the question? The Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy).

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry) moved:

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-130 be amended by adding immediately after line 43 at page 3 the following:

"7. For greater certainty, nothing in this Act shall be interpreted so as to apply to lands, resources, and waters claims by aboriginal peoples under an aboriginal claim."

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-130 be amended by adding immediately after line 43 at page 3 the following:

"7. For greater certainty, nothing in this Act shall affect programs to protect the environment or conservation of land, resources and waters."

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-130 be amended by adding immediately after line 43 at page 3 the following:

"7. For greater certainty, nothing in this Act shall be interpreted so as to affect or preclude the continuation of existing or the establishment of new special adjustment programs to help firms or workers adjust to the changes brought about by the implementation of the Agreement."

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-130 be amended by adding immediately after lines 43 at page 3 the following:

"7. For greater certainty, nothing in this Act shall be interpreted so as to affect or preclude the continuation of existing or the establishment of new regional development programs."

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-130 be amended by adding immediately after line 43 at page 3 the following:

"7. For greater certainty, nothing in this Act shall be interpreted so as to affect the continuation of existing or the establishment of new Canadian social programs, including medicare, unemployment insurance, daycare, pensions, minimum wage laws, labour laws and maternity benefits."

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-130 be amended by adding immediately after line 43 at page 3 the following:

"7. For greater certainty, nothing in this Act shall be interpreted so as to affect or preclude the continuation of existing or the establishment of new cultural programs by future Canadian governments."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this group of amendments that were moved will put the Government to a test. It will challenge the assertions that they have made over the past two years. The important parts of the Canadian national fabric; environment, aboriginal rights, regional development programs, cultural programs, are in no way affected by this agreement. We have heard the guarantees, assurances, from the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney). That great counterfeiter has provided every kind of guarantee that one could ask for.

Now they have a chance to prove it by voting for these amendments. Now we will really see if they are prepared to live up to their word. There is a very important precedent for supporting these amendments. The Government said that during the course of the last month or two, because of a concern raised in the country about the issue of water, they would move an amendment to the legislation for greater certainty. For greater certainty they moved an amendment to ensure that water was excluded in the legislation.

We have here five amendments which say that for greater certainty we want to ensure that cultural programs, regional development programs, and adjustment programs will not be affected. So if the Conservatives can support an amendment for greater certainty on water, then surely they will have to support these amendments for greater certainty on issues that have raised similar doubts and skepticism in the minds of many Canadians. It is very simple. They vote for these amendments, they support them, then, in part they will have taken away much of the doubt that exists, so they can say that at least in the legislation we have made our case clear and we know.

In my own generous, charitable way I am trying to help the Government. I want to give Government Members the means by which they can convince Canadians that they are prepared to stand by their word.

• (1930)

I have a suspicion, though I do not want to be too skeptical, that Government Members may not vote for these amendments. If they do not vote for them, then we will know that all those assurances are simply the kind of misrepresentation we have had from the time this agreement was first announced. We will not be able to trust them any longer.

I would like to deal with one particular amendment. My colleagues will deal with environmental issues, social policy and aboriginal rights, but I want to deal with adjustment. We know how important that is. The Economic Council of Canada has indicated that some 186,000 workers will be dislocated by this agreement.

Before the committee we heard testimony from the food processing industry, one of Canada's largest employers, indicating that close to 60,000 workers could lose their jobs as a result of the free trade agreement. The printing industry, a highly skilled industry, a small business industry based in every city across Canada, estimated that 10,000 workers could lose their jobs. The same is true for the textile, clothing, machine and electrical fabrication industries.

There was very substantial testimony from members of industry groups indicating that they will be directly affected by this agreement. Companies will close down. Workers will lose their jobs. It is very clear that adjustment programs will be required.

What has been so curious is why the Government changed its mind about so-called adjustment programs. The Prime Minister, before a big convention in Ottawa, said that there will be a big adjustment program, not to worry. The then Minister of Employment and Immigration indicated that there could be up to half a million workers affected. All of a sudden, about a week later, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) and the Prime Minister started changing their tune. We are used to that. We are used to them changing their tune on a 24-hour cycle, but surely not on something as important as someone's job being put at stake.

We began to understand why this is so. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance recognized that bringing in the kind of adjustment programs that would be required would be contrary to the agreement itself. They recognized that the Americans would exercise their right under the agreement to take trade action, according to U.S. trade law, against any industry.

As an example, we know that the applications for assistance by various industries under our regional development programs are now being screened by the Department of External Affairs to determine whether or not they live up to the conditions of the agreement. Already, before the trade deal is even in place, bureaucrats are providing a filter to determine if programs passed by this Parliament, in its sovereign right to help regions or workers, are acceptable. They are being censored by DRIE and by the Western Diversification Agency. Those agencies admit to that.

In the committee, I posed a question to Ambassador Ritchie who was testifying before the committee. I said that the assurances given by the Government were that the adjustment programs would not be affected. Ambassador Ritchie went on to say, as recorded in issue 22:24 of committee testimony, the following:

> "The difficulty would of course arise with targeted assistance to particular firms or particular industries. There the jurisprudence, if one can qualify it in such a way, is ambiguous and would leave open the distinct possibility that certain forms of assistance could be attacked under Canadian law or under American law.
>
> In addition to that, it should perhaps be noted that there are a number of other forms of adjustment assistance or measures that could be presented as adjustment assistance which would be contrary to the agreement—"

The most knowledgeable bureaucrat, the one who negotiated the agreement, now admits that adjustment programs for industries would in fact be contrary to the agreement. That seems to be a pretty compelling argument for how we are limiting our independence as a Parliament. Programs already passed by Parliament will be subject to the discipline of the trade agreement with the Americans.

We saw a very clear example of that in the softwood lumber case. The Americans challenged the right of provincial governments to impose a certain royalty scheme because they said that it was an unfair form of government subsidy. The Government of Canada agreed with them, and as a result, we imposed a $600-million tax on ourselves.

Perhaps more significantly, by accepting that judgment and not challenging it at the GATT, we accepted the precedent that this kind of direct assistance to industries could be considered an unfair trade act on behalf of Canada. We surrendered before the battle started. We gave up those rights before the battle even began. That precedent established in the softwood lumber case is now being applied to all other kinds of Canadian exports.

Let me give Hon. Members another example that should give real cause for concern. Under the American implementing legislation that is being examined by Congress today, Congress is taking upon itself new powers to monitor all Canadian exports to determine if there is a subsidy. The Congress will not require U.S. industries to do the work themselves, the U.S. Government will pay for it. By monitoring it, it is prepared to take action against any Canadian exports. The Congress has acquired a brand new trade power.

One of the great ironies of the free trade deal is that after two and a half years of negotiation, we are ending up with tougher U.S. laws. The writing is on the wall. If there is any attempt by the federal or provincial governments to provide direct assistance to specific industries to meet the needs of the dislocation that will be caused by the trade agreement, we will be subject to American attack and the Americans will have the power and precedent of the agreement to point to. That is why they are backing off. That is why they are in retreat on this issue.

This amendment, along with the several others in the grouping on culture and social programs, is here to put the legislation to a test. If there is any question in the minds of Canadians about just how strong and unalterable an impact this trade agreement will have on the right of Canadians to make decisions for themselves, the test will be tonight when this vote is taken. When Government Members rise to vote against this amendment, it will be a confession of guilt. It will be an admission that we have already surrendered our right as the Parliament of Canada to take actions to support workers and industries that will need assistance to deal with the dislocation that this agreement will cause.

There can be no clearer example of how we will restrict and restrain our right as a Parliament, as a government and as a society to make choices for ourselves. The victims of the trade agreement will be prevented from getting decent assistance because the Government has already sold its soul. Yet we know how crucial this kind of assistance can be.

In 1971-72, when President Nixon brought in a surcharge on Canadian taxes, we introduced the Employment Support Act which provided assistance for something like 5,000 to 6,000 Canadian companies to meet the American challenge. It kept them in business, it kept their operations going and it allowed them to survive. It was a very successful program. It has now been put in abeyance by this Government.

The Canadian Industrial Renewal Board was designed to protect direct assistance to the footwear and textile industries to modernize and buy new machinery. Again, it was a successful program and was so considered by the North-South Institute, an objective institute. What did this Government do? It cancelled the program. It let it run out.

The ILAP Program allowed for a combination of assistance to communities affected by labour problems. In the throes of the downturn of the automobile industry in southern Ontario, it kept automobile communities alive. It allowed the people to keep their jobs and to bring new industry in. What did this Government do? It cancelled the program.

Once again, we go back to the thesis that this is a Government that is trying to introduce, under the guise of a trade Bill, its kind of 19th century economic philosophy. That is, to not permit the Canadian Government to offer decent, constructive, productive support for its own citizens. They borrowed the Republican-Regeanite philosophy from the U.S. and are trying to entrench it in a Bill and an international agreement.

• (1940)

The group of amendments I brought forward, which you will hear a great deal about tonight, are the ultimate test. They will show the Canadian people who is right and who is wrong in this debate. What we say is that the Government has sold out the right of Canadians to make decisions for themselves.

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane—Superior): Mr. Speaker, despite the heavy and very expensive flow of propaganda which has come out of the Government, despite the huffing and blustering which has come from the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) and his Parliamentary Secretary, we in this Party, and a great many other Canadians, know this trade agreement is much more than merely a commercial transaction. It is in fact changing the very direction in which Canadian society has gone.

It is interesting to note how very quickly the U.S. administration and the Congress gave their sanction to this trade agreement. Why not? Like the "Open sesame" door, this agreement has opened to the United States all the rich natural resources of Canada. In a sense, we could describe it as one of the biggest giveaways in the history of the western world.

Mr. McDermid: Nonsense.

Mr. Penner: You have done your blustering and now we are counteracting some of it.

Mr. McDermid: You will hear from me again, too. We have to keep you honest.

Mr. Penner: No wonder the great business corporations and those who speak for them love the agreement. Yet what about other Canadians? That is who we are talking about tonight, other Canadians who care about the environment, Canadians of aboriginal ancestry, Canadians who know they are not in a strong position to survive as employees in the new kind of society that this trade agreement will bring about, and I will describe that in a moment.

What this trade agreement seeks to do, to put it one way, is to deify the market-place. If you are a person who is ruthlessly competitive, highly entrepreneurial, if you are at all times market driven in your motives, then you may survive the stiff, vigorous U.S. competition. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) has said on more than one occasion, yes, we Canadians can compete. The trouble is that in those areas where we have been successful in competing, we have had our foot stamped on in a way that still hurts.

My hon. friend from Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) mentioned the softwood lumber deal. There we were competing successfully and we know what happened. The penalty we paid because we competed successfully has now been written into this agreement and we have to live with it for all time. I want to tell you that many Canadians with whom I speak tell me that they do not want an American market driven, commercial type of society in Canada. Many feel we have too much of that already. Certainly many of Canada's aboriginal peoples feel that way about the trade agreement. That is why the Assembly of First Nations rejected it outright. They oppose it as forcefully as they can, knowing they do not have a big voice in the Canadian political system. They have neither political nor economic power, but we give them all credit possible for the efforts they make on behalf of the First Nations and their people.

The Native Council of Canada has many serious reservations about this trade agreement. I quote to you from the committee hearings when the Assembly of First Nations appeared. They pointed out that the Government of Canada has gone to great lengths to enable people designated as nationals of the U.S. and U.S. citizens or corporations to have all the benefits and all of the protection anyone could want to operate in Canada. They may do whatever they wish with respect to trade, investment, buying and selling energy, raw resources, setting up manufacturing plants, establishing outlets for goods and services, or anything in the field of commerce. The Government has conveyed these and all other kinds of rights to people over whom Canada has absolutely no control or jurisdiction. These people are protected by this agreement, while at the same time the rights of First Nations in Canada have not been defined despite the fact they are spelled out as specific rights in Section 35 of the Constitution of Canada.

Since my time is very brief I want to limit myself to only two points and then conclude by stating to the House why we need in Bill C-130 a non-derogation clause for aboriginal peoples as proposed by my hon. friend from Winnipeg—Fort Garry in Motion No. 9.

Point number one is that a totally market driven economy can be very threatening and damaging to many, and none more so than to the aboriginal peoples of Canada. A U.S. magazine specializing in trade matters and economic issues said in a very recent issue, in explaining the Canada-U.S. trade agreement to its readers in the U.S., that as this agreement evolves, choices would expand and prices would fall for consumers in both countries as Canada becomes the equivalent of the fifty-first state. That means our goods in Canada will have to be produced more cheaply in order to be sold in the U.S. Quite obviously that means a downward pressure on wages, on benefits, on various forms of government assistance to people, communities and fledgling enterprises.

That is clearly threatening to Canada's aboriginal peoples. There may be some Canadians who say, well, a good thing, too, because we give them too much. We are too concerned. However, I tell you that there are no well informed Canadians who take that position. There are Canadians who realize that our economic debt, our economic rent to the first citizens of this country is enormous. There are still a majority of Canadians who care about human rights and who care about trying to establish as much equity as it is possible to establish in a modern society.

I know that those who have been educated, trained and conditioned to live and survive in a market driven society may do well. However, there are a great many others who are going to fall by the wayside. We in the Liberal Party are concerned about those people, and my hon. friend from Winnipeg—Fort Garry has talked about that already. Marginal firms and marginal workers, when confronted with intensified competitive forces coming from the U.S., will not be able to survive. Many of those Canadians are going to be native people. They are already less well educated than the population at large, less well trained. Already they are struggling to make it in Canadian society. They are going to find life ever so much more difficult, ever so much tougher in the American-type market driven society which the Government wants to force down our throats. I say no, and many Canadians say no.

I wish the Government would give the people of Canada the opportunity to decide before we pursue this folly any further. There is an old hymn that you may remember which says there is a wideness in God's mercy like the wideness of the sea. Be that as it may, I want to tell you, Sir, that the god of the market-place has no affection for anyone except the most successful, the most competitive, the most aggressive. The aboriginal peoples of Canada have every right to fear their place in a so-called new-right market driven American type of commercial society. The Canada-U.S. agreement is going to put major decisions respecting Canada's economy and its political decisions in the hands of the market-place, and I say that that is frightening.

• (1950)

My second point is that this agreement paves the way for the mass influx of American capital to gain even more control over vast sectors of mining, petroleum, and other resource sectors of the Canadian economy. While it may be true, as the Government has stated and argued, that existing land claims are grandfathered and are in no way threatened by the trade agreement, it is clear that the trade agreement is entirely silent about future agreements. Large areas of Canada rich in oil and gas are still subject to outstanding aboriginal title. Canada has no right to negotiate the allocation or management of these resources until such time as a valid treaty or agreement between the first nations affected and the Crown have been concluded. Anything less, Sir, would amount to theft.

The cash and the benefits from land claims are entitlements which cede from large tracts of traditional territory given to Canada. These entitlements must never ever be regarded as subsidies. Yet, I can imagine that when these entitlements are used to start aboriginal type of businesses and these businesses begin in some way to penetrate the American market, which the Government promises is going to be open to more Canadians, agents from the U.S. Department of Commerce will begin to smell around for subsidization. We will have many of those agents in Canada. They will be searching out subsidization in exactly the same way as the CIA and FBI are constantly searching out communism.

I conclude simply by saying that we must have this non-derogation clause for aboriginal people. I plead with the House to put it in Bill C-130 for greater certainty.

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, we have before us a set of five motions which, in a certain sense, attempt to set out as an objective or a certainty with respect to this trade deal something which is in fact very much threatened by the trade deal. In that sense they are strange motions. They are potentially contradictory motions. They are motions which I wish the Conservatives would confound us by adopting and then proving in the future that their adoption actually demonstrated that these were facts, once adopted.

However, in practice that is not the way it is going to be. In practice the various motions which are put forward here attempt to present some kind of protection for aboriginal land claims, some kind of protection for environmental or conservation programs, protection for new special adjustment programs to help workers or firms adjust to the changes brought about by this agreement. The motions suggest that regional development programs will be protected, that social programs, including medicare, unemployment insurance, pensions, minimum wage laws, and labour laws will be protected as well as new cultural programs.

Would that it could be so, Mr. Speaker. Would that it could be somehow in this terrible trade deal, simply by passing these motions, an established fact that these protections were provided. In fact, that cannot be done. It is not possible to do because the agreement itself, in fundamental ways, threatens each and every part of the areas which these motions are meant to protect.

I would like to mention the heart-felt speech of the Member for Cochrane—Superior (Mr. Penner) whose sincerity no one in this House can possibly doubt when he speaks of aboriginal land claims. I hope very much that the Conservatives will take his speech seriously and put that clause into the Bill even though the agreement contains such threats to aboriginal land claims. It includes the threat that all local governments including, therefore, local aboriginal governments, must not offer preferences, must not have the freedom to set economic policies which will be contrary to national treatment of United States firms.

I want to talk about three of the motions within this set. First, I want to talk about Motion No. 10 which says:

> "For greater certainty, nothing in this Act shall affect programs to protect the environment or conservation of land, resources and waters."

It is absolutely clear, as we found out from expert testimony in committee, that protection of water cannot simply and completely be protected by an amendment to the Act. In fact, the Liberal Party has been arguing that very strongly and I am, therefore, a little surprised to see this put forward here.

With respect to conservation of resources, under changes which are made as a direct consequence of this agreement we will be forced to export our resources and to export our energy even when we face situations of shortage in this country. That is a fact which no one can deny. It is a fact which the Conservative Party should, if it has enough honesty within it still, stand up and admit.

I believe that the threat to environmental programs under this agreement is immense. Under this agreement for five to seven years we will negotiate subsidies.

• (2000)

It does not say certain subsidies and therefore includes subsidies which are provided to assist industries in this country to become environmentally viable and stop polluting rivers and lakes as a consequence of the assistance with which they are provided. That is very much at risk as a consequence of this agreement.

Mr. McDermid: Nonsense.

Mr. Langdon: It is very much at risk, absolutely and totally at risk.

Mr. McDermid: Total nonsense.

Mr. Langdon: If the Parliamentary Secretary were ever to get this Act through, he would find that those are precisely the points that the United States would raise as key concerns. For instance, the pollution grants that we have given to our forest companies will be very much subject to that discussion and negotiation.

Mr. McDermid: Not true.

Mr. Langdon: The Parliamentary Secretary says not true. Every subsidy is open for negotiation—

Mr. McDermid: It takes two to negotiate.

Mr. Langdon: He cannot possibly say that these will not be negotiated. All he can say is that he can hope they will not be negotiated. I am not sure if many Conservatives share that hope. That particular motion is useful and important, but it runs directly contrary to the agreement itself.

A second motion suggests that new regional development programs and existing regional development programs will be safe. Let me quote from an authority, the Deputy Minister of Finance in the Conservative Government at that time who said:

> "We are going to have to think differently in terms of ways to promote economic development."

That is what he said in response to questions from Members of the Public Accounts Committee. He said:

> "The Michelin Tire type of transaction is just not on any more."

He went on to say that: "We will have to find other unobjectionable ways" to provide industrial development assistance. That was his statement to that committee. What more definite and clear-cut proof could we want than the statement of the Deputy Minister of Finance that we will have to change our regional development programs as a consequence of this trade deal?

Finally, this agreement says a great deal about health care and the future of medicare in this country. If we look at the various services that are provided under the services section of the trade deal, one sees that there are dozens of health services that are not just management services but commercial services that run medical labs, public health labs, and blood banks. All these are being open to national treatment, that is, equal treatment for American firms with Canadian firms.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, as you have noticed in the past half hour, one Member after another has brought to your attention and to the attention of people watching this debate the fronts on which the Government has failed in negotiating this agreement. It has become gradually evident when examining the Bill.

The Government has failed in protecting aboriginal rights, as the Member for Cochrane—Superior (Mr. Penner) so eloquently put it. It has failed to protect Canadian social security programs as the Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) will point out. It has failed on the front of protecting the workers and firms which will be affected by the deal, as other Members will point out.

It has also failed to protect the environment. I will briefly give a chronology of facts to show how, despite the warnings the Government was given, the environment has been neglected.

Despite the fact that the Government published a booklet for almost every activity that comes under federal jurisdiction in which to praise, promote and propagandize the virtues of this agreement, it did not do so with respect to the environment. Not one word was expressed on it. That is, in itself, an astonishing fact. It means that the Government somehow concluded that it would be wiser to say nothing either because conceptually it did not link the agreement with the environment or it felt it was too treacherous a territory on which to speak up on behalf of the Canadian environment.

Let me take you through this chronology, beginning with June, 1986, when the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council alerted the Canadian public to the fact that free trade could have an impact on the environment in Canada. Five months later, in November, 1986, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) came to our committee on the Environment and Forestry to say that although he had requested the report by the Council, he had read it and saw no links between free trade and the environment. The fact that he saw no link was, in itself, an astonishing statement.

In 1987, the Minister of the Environment for Canada endorsed the Brundtland Report, which is a very carefully crafted policy paper that speaks about environmentally sustainable development. The Americans have remained silent on this. They have not taken any position on it. Surely at that point, having committed the Government of Canada to the Brundtland Report on the northern side of the border, one would want to make absolutely sure that the commitment would not be eroded by Washington because of its lack of commitment to the very same report.

Let me take you to September, 1987, when the Minister of the Environment endorsed the report of the National Task Force on the Economy and the Environment, which is another emanation of the Brundtland Report. Let us then move to November 23, 1987, when in response to a question of mine on the Order Paper, the Government replied that the free trade agreement is a commercial accord, it is not an environmental agreement.

How blind could one be? How short-sighted can one be for the sake of lower prices, as some of the spokespeople on the other side have said, not to realize that this is not just a commercial agreement? It entails regulations and develops more and more into other measures and legislation that go far beyond commercial operations, as many Members have already indicated this afternoon in the House.

We then come to May, 1988, when an official of the Department of the Environment appeared before the Standing Committee on the Environment and Forestry to deal with the Estimates that came before that committee. We asked him if he conducted any studies on the implications of the agreement on the environment. The answer was that nothing had been undertaken because there was no need to do so. The Minister of the Environment and the Government had decided that trade and the environment are unrelated. Can you believe that, Mr. Speaker? It is unthinkable to have such a short-sighted, blind attitude, if I may say, toward the implication of this agreement.

• (2010)

Another important front that has to be covered by Motion No. 10, which I am addressing now, as proposed by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy), is one representing a major shortcoming in the legislation itself. Every Member on the Government side, when we come to vote, will have to vote for Motion No. 10. I cannot see any other alternative if Members really mean what they say about the environment. If they are serious about it, Motion No. 10 is essential to personify, to give substance to the rhetoric that we have heard over years from the Government that it is in favour of protecting the environment.

The points that have to be raised are very clear. They are not so complicated that they would not come to the mind of any observer. First, there is the question of Canada's freedom to impose environmental regulations and to use subsidies, as others have already said, or tax incentives to pursue certain social goals for the clean environment or for sound resource management. This is a very profound central question and it has not been dealt with. There are some fools across the floor who can smile about this matter because they do not understand the implication. The freedom for Canada to impose or introduce subsidies and tax incentives, as anyone who has read this agreement knows, is in danger. This matter has not been studied or examined by the Government as it should have been.

Mr. McDermid: That is totally wrong.

Mr. Caccia: Let me move to another point that is also at stake. There will be pressures to reduce costs as a result of this agreement. When you do not have uniform standards and equitable enforcement there could be pressure and, in this case, by Canadian firms or firms wishing to come to Canada to reduce the short term costs of production in Canada by reducing expenditures for pollution control. They will say: "We will come in and open up a subsidiary or a plant provided that you allow us to operate the dirty way because we want to be free to produce at the lowest possible cost in order to be competitive—"

Mr. McDermid: Come on. What nonsense.

Mr. Caccia: This shows the ignorance of the Parliamentary Secretary—"in order to be competitive with American firms which do not have to respect the regulations which exist in Canada". That will be their argument.

Mr. McDermid: Nonsense.

Mr. Caccia: If the Government of Canada would have taken the trouble to prove that this fear was misplaced, why did it not have the decency to produce a study which would have come to that conclusion?

Mr. McDermid: Where is your study that says it will? Don't be silly.

Mr. Caccia: We know this pattern could develop. We know that there are certain standards and regulations in Canada which do not exist south of the border. The Parliamentary Secretary should know that. It is not just me saying it, but the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council which said it two years ago. The Government is deaf. It does not want to listen.

We have another area which the Government failed to address in protecting the environment because it does not understand the issue. The Government understands lower prices and the free market. Life to the Tories is lower prices and a free market, but the quality of life does not mean anything to them. Protecting our natural resources for future generations is like hearing a foreign language. That is why the Tories ignored the environment. If they cared they would have undertaken these studies.

Mr. McDermid: Our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) spoke up about the environment. Trudeau never knew what the environment was.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member's time has expired. The Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood.

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, all aspects of life, and the Greeks divided them up into four elements, the earth, the air, water and fire, will be affected by this trade deal. My colleagues have dealt with three of the basic elements, the earth, water and air. I want to deal with the fourth, the fire, the spirit. In other words, culture.

I want to deal with the big lie which the Government has perpetrated with regard to the supposed cultural exemption in the trade deal. We were told that culture would not be on the bargaining table at all. Clearly it was. Clearly the Americans saw a great victory. For them culture is an opportunity for making another buck. It is business as usual. It is entertainment and all of the measures that we have developed as Canadians to promote Canadian culture. To Americans this is discrimination and it is against the spirit of the trade agreement. The Americans would like to have as little of it as possible. Because Canadians are sensitive to the issue, it could not be ignored altogether. We have a double-barrelled exemption for culture. We have a whole lot of areas where cultural industries are very specifically included. I have dealt with them in other speeches.

Here I want to deal with the big lie aspects and the so-called cultural exemption. Let us look at what the Americans say they won in the trade deal negotiations on culture. Recognizing Canadian sensitivities, the U.S. has agreed that certain cultural areas are not subject to special provisions. However, the U.S. retains the right to redress any adverse commercial effects of any future cultural measures enacted by Canada. To them this is just an opportunity to make a buck. If you limit the opportunity for American corporations to make a buck in Canada, that is against the trade deal and the spirit of it, even if it is promoting Canadian creativity and the Canadian cultural world.

We have the chief trade negotiator, Simon Reisman, who has been asked about what this exemption means. The exemption is there in one clause and then there is part 2 of the clause which says there can be retaliation. If Canada does something to promote Canadian culture, the Americans can retaliate. What does Mr. Reisman say about it? He says: "There are many things we can do that would not be inconsistent with the trade deal".

Canada wants to promote Canadian culture in publishing, music, sound recordings, performance, and broadcasting in a particular way, but let us ask the first question. Is it consistent or inconsistent with what we have given away on the trade deal? Unfortunately a lot of it is inconsistent. We have some measures to promote Canadian culture. For example, we have some subsidies. We know that all subsidies are up for negotiation in the next five to seven years. Cultural subsidies are not exempted there, not at all. We know we have some areas where there is actual protection in foreign investment, for example, in the area of broadcasting. We have Canadian ownership requirements. Canada as a society, and after some considerable thought, decided that it would be better to allow a very small minority of shares to be foreign owned in broadcasting. That is frozen, at least so far in the deal. That is one of the exemptions. But supposing we wanted to do that in some other cultural area—

Mr. McDermid: Yes, let's pretend.

Ms. McDonald: Supposing we wanted to make that choice. Supposing we wanted as a society to move forward in film distribution. As a matter of fact, we had a task force established by the former minister of culture who has moved on to other things. The report came up with a proposal that there be in film distribution Canadian ownership. Film distribution we know is massively American-dominated. The profits go into the United States, into Hollywood, to promote more American films which come flooding back into Canada. Supposing we wanted to have Canadian ownership in film distribution, a recommendation by a Conservative-appointed task force? We cannot do it in this trade deal.

• (2020)

We have a Minister of Communications (Miss MacDonald) who had a very modest Bill on film distribution to have a licensing scheme developed. Even that very modest proposal, which was not even remotely close to Canadian ownership in film distribution, had to be watered down to suit the Americans because any kind of attempt for Canadians to get back, to get control of, to use in this case people's purchases of cinema tickets, to get into Canadian production, to put Canadian writers, directors and performers to work was not acceptable. We have a great deal of creative talent here in Canada, but the money is going to Hollywood for American productions. We had the possibility of turning that around, but the Government bowed to the pressure. Jack Valenti's problem was certainly dealt with by a cowardly Minister who has lost all of the vision that she used to have.

We have another sign of the Government giving way on culture. We have a publishing policy. We do not have, unlike broadcasting, a requirement of Canadian ownership in publishing. We had a proposal by the previous Minister that we move in the direction of Canadian ownership in publishing. That was the so-called Baie Comeau policy. The Government has never repudiated that policy in so many words, but it is not implementing it. Whenever a specific case comes forward it finds an excuse such as: "This one does not apply. We cannot make it retroactive. We will start doing it in the future". We then got passed the so-called retroactive period and it simply stopped implementing it and looked for other excuses such as: "The operation was not big enough so we will not bother to apply it". We have a policy to move to Canadian ownership in publishing and it is not being acted upon in any concrete case.

We have the instance of the Broadcasting Act, a new Bill which was before Parliament 20 years after the last Bill. We have a Government which wants to reduce the Canadian content requirements in the Broadcasting Act. We had organizations appear before the committee today which recommended that we not pass this Bill because the old Act of 1968, is stronger for Canadian content. We have a Minister who puts her Canadian content into PR so she can appeal to her former nationalist friends. If one reads the fine print in the Act, one will see that that is not there.

The Canadian Broadcasting Act of 1968, was tougher because we did not have the Americans dictating the terms. We have reason to believe that the Minister had clauses removed from a draft Bill at the instigation of Americans who had a look at it and vetted it. It already includes mention of the free trade deal. Culture was always on the bargaining table. There are specific measures in the new Broadcasting Act which reflect that.

I suspect that there are a number of clauses that were recommendations of the Caplan-Sauvageau report, a Conservative-appointed task force, as well as the unanimous recommendations of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture, a Conservative-dominated committee. Yet we have a Government that is so base, so cowardly, so keen to do what the Americans tell it that it removes the Canadian content requirements in the Broadcasting Act to curry favour with the Americans. It cares more about them than it does about Canadian culture.

If the Government really believes what it said, that is, that culture was never on the bargaining table, and that we should be free to pursue our own cultural objectives, then it would pass this motion which would ensure that indeed there is a cultural exemption. It has no intention of doing that, however, because it has lied from the beginning. Culture was always being bargained away. Shame on this Conservative Government for doing it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Minister of Communications.

Ms. McDonald: Shame on the Minister. "Hon. Minister" is a corruption.

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that rattles around more than noise in an empty shell. We just had an excellent exhibition of that.

One of the things that has been said by the Hon. Member is that nothing has been done in the way of cultural initiatives by the Government. I would just like to mention some of the things that have been done, have been done because they were so long overdue.

In the field of book publishing we have invested $1,723,000.

Ms. McDonald: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Relevance.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I hope that the Hon. Member would give the same courtesy that the Minister gave the Hon. Member. I know that the Hon. Minister will be coming to the motions. The Hon. Minister has the floor.

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, do not hold your breath. She does not understand the word "courtesy".

In the field of film production we have invested $165 million in feature film funds.

Ms. McDonald: It is a buy-off. You are trying to buy out the culture community.

Miss MacDonald: Just recently after the signing of the free trade agreement, after the agreement was tabled in the House, we introduced legislation and new policies under Investment Canada. We have brought in a $200 million package—

Ms. McDonald: Buy out and sell out.

Miss MacDonald: I know that the Hon. Member does not want to see moneys go to the Canadian film distribution industry. I know she is not interested in supporting the Canadian film distribution industry. But it has been very interesting to me to see in the last week Astro Distribution Industries announce that it will distribute for the first time in a number of years 13 Canadian films as part of its package—13 Canadian films that were not there before.

Ms. Copps: I rise on a point of order.

Ms. McDonald: Mr. Speaker, a point of order—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Hamilton East on a point of order.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could speak to the amendments that are on the floor.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Mr. McDonald) on a point of order.

Ms. McDonald: The same point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I do not want to get involved in this particular debate with Hon. Members. I know that the Hon. Minister will get to the motions at hand. I think it would be nice if we would give her the courtesy and listen and wait and see. The Hon. Minister of Communications has the floor.

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I know that the Hon. Member from Toronto never really wants to hear the truth. I know it hurts her. But perhaps she will be quiet long enough to listen to some of the facts, some of the things that happened.

She has introduced some kind of a woolly-minded amendment. What I am saying is that these are measures that have been taken since the free trade agreement was signed, since this legislation was brought before the House. Therefore these are measures that prove that Canadian culture has been exempted from the free trade agreement. There is no reason or no need for such an amendment.

Do not take my word only, Mr. Speaker, for the fact that these measures have been welcomed by, say, the Canadian film industry. In fact, they have been welcomed by people in the distribution business. They have been welcomed by those who are producers. May I just say, for instance, the executive director of the Winnipeg Film Group, Bruce Duggan, had something positive to say. Winnipeg has a very active film group. I know that members of the Opposition do not want to see the Winnipeg Film Group helped. But it wrote to say:

> "It was with considerable happiness that we hear of your tabling of the Film Distribution bill in the House of Commons.
>
> Congratulations!"

From Sherrin Productions Ltd. of Toronto I received this:

> "Your recent announcement of more financing for independent film production and distribution in Canada is very encouraging and exciting."

I know that the Hon. Member from Toronto does not want to help a Toronto production outfit. I know that she does not want to help Toronto companies. But of course that is what they have to say.

Stephen Roth, Frank Jacobs, David Perlmutter of Cinexus wrote stating:

> "Congratulations on your long awaited distribution regulations. From the material available it appears the legislation will go a long way in satisfying the concerns of which we are all aware."

This was done after the free trade agreement was signed.

• (2030)

Ms. McDonald: Where is Canadian ownership in film distribution?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. There is such a thing as courtesy in this House. I would like to hear the Hon. Minister. I do not know if she is in order or not. If the bantering across the floor would stop, then I would be able to hear it. The Hon. Minister of Communications (Miss MacDonald) has the floor.

Miss MacDonald: It is indeed agreeable to hear that one can speak in the House without being shouted down by people who simply do not want to hear the truth.

The reason I am making these comments, and the reason that I am intervening, is that I do not feel that any amendment is necessary. That is what I am speaking to, the fact that I reject such an amendment, simply because the steps we have taken have strengthened the Canadian film distribution industry, and the broadcasting industry.

I heard the Member say a few moments ago that she did not want to see those aspects of Canadian content and measurement, which have always been associated with the CBC, and which will continue to be part of the role of the CBC, extended to private broadcasters in Canada.

Ms. McDonald: You do not know your own Bill. You have reduced the requirements.

Miss MacDonald: The Hon. Member did not want to see it extended to the distribution systems in Canada. She did not want to see the whole area of Canadian content enlarged beyond the public broadcaster.

Ms. McDonald: You have reduced it.

Miss MacDonald: I happen to believe that we should have a great deal of Canadian content in both our private and public broadcasters, in our networks, and in our distribution systems. When the Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald) says that she does not agree with this, then I could not disagree with her more. I want to see more Canadian content in our broadcasting system.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): On a point of order the Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood.

Ms. McDonald: The Hon. Minister is quite wrong. Her Bill actually reduces the requirements for Canadian content for private broadcasters—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That is not a point of order, it is a point of debate and the Hon. Member did have an opportunity. The Hon. Minister of Communications has the floor.

Miss MacDonald: I wish to mention a couple of other persons who have written to us to congratulate us and to urge the passage of the legislation before the House, legislation in film, legislation in broadcasting, all designed to improve and to enlarge the Canadian contents in these industries. The reason we are doing this is that these were steps that were taken following the introduction of the free trade agreement, following the time when, according to the Hon. Member, nothing could be done to strengthen Canadian content. That is absolutely wrong, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Axworthy: Talk to Jack Valenti.

Miss MacDonald: I hear the interjection of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry. He would be one of those who would not endorse the sentiments of the Winnipeg film crew who feel the film legislation has been beneficial to them.

Mr. Axworthy: They are opposed to the agreement. They came to the committee.

Mr. McDermid: They did not oppose it.

Mr. Axworthy: They did.

Miss MacDonald: They are the ones who wrote to say that the legislation would be helpful to them.

I have a letter here from Lauron Prouction Ltd. which states:

> "I am writing in my capacity as Chairman of Lauron Productions (you may remember us as the company which produced the film "Loyalties" which Anne Wheeler directed) to offer my congratulations to you on your announcement of *Film Legislation and Support Programmes* for the Canadian Independent Film sector at the CFTA 40th Annual meeting."

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Windsor—Walkerville on a point of order.

Mr. McCurdy: I hesitate to raise this point of order, but I am surprised that you have not noticed, Mr. Speaker, that there is a reasonable application of relevance that is lacking here.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Minister has another 30 seconds to wind up. The Hon. Minister of Communications has the floor.

Miss MacDonald: I am pleased to do that, Mr. Speaker. As I set out to substantiate, and as I can show from comments from coast to coast, the initiatives that we have taken in the field of culture, broadcasting, film, book publishing, and in postal rates, all taken since the free trade agreement was signed, have been introduced. One of the major positions is that we can show that there is nothing in the free trade agreement which inhibits us or forbids us from doing anything to strengthen Canadian culture, and that is what we have been doing.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, this evening we are dealing with six Liberal amendments to the free trade Bill, all of which have the purpose for greater certainty of exempting different matters from the Bill.

Motion No. 10 states:

> "7. For greater certainty, nothing in this Act shall affect programs to protect the environment or conservation of land, resources and waters."

Motion No. 9 has similar provisions for aboriginal lands and aboriginal claims. Motion No. 11 has similar provisions for worker adjustment programs. Motion No. 12 has similar provisions for regional development programs. Motion No. 13 has similar provisions for social and health programs. Motion No. 14 has similar provisions for cultural programs. All these amendments were suggested at the committee by various witnesses appearing before the committee.

For example, the proposal to exempt aboriginal lands and claims was proposed by the Assembly of First Nations. The proposal to exempt environmental protection laws was proposed by the Canadian Environmental Law Association and the Canadian Wildlife Federation. The proposals to exempt regional economic development policy and social programs were proposed by the National Anti Poverty Organizations, GATT-FLY, the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, the Canadian Council on Social Development, the Canadian Health Coalition, the "One-Voice Seniors", and *Mouvement Solidarité populaire Québécoise*. Finally, the provisions to exempt cultural industries were proposed by ACTRA, the Independent Record Producers, and so on.

My point is that these motions to amend which are presently before the House came out of hearings from Canadian groups of citizens who very strongly proposed that such measures were put in the Bill. Other members of my Party, and other members in the Opposition are dealing with various of these amendments, but I want to zero in on the ones relating to adjustment policies for Canadian workers and Canadian industry.

There is no doubt that, as a result of the free trade agreement, many jobs will be lost. There have been different studies and different estimates as to how many jobs will be lost, but the fact of the matter is no matter what study is accepted, jobs will be lost. In December, 1987, the former Minister for Employment and Immigration stated that he thought approximately 300,000 jobs would be lost. The next day he reversed himself and withdrew that statement. In 1986, a study conducted by the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion stated that approximtely 227,000 jobs would be lost in 17 industries. In a study tabled in December, 1987, the Ontario Department of Labour stated that 280,000 jobs would be at risk in Ontario.

The most recent report of the Economic Council of Canada published on April 13, 1988, stated that there would be a net gain of 250,000 jobs over a 10 year period, but it also stated that there would be a decline of jobs in 17 out of the 36 industries studied. The report of the Economic Council entitled "Venturing Forth", states at page 21: "It indicates clearly that without improvements in Canadian manufacturing productivity, increased United States competition could result in a net decline of output and employment in 17 of the 36 industries studied, virtually all of them in manufacturing". Further on it states: "Some firms will have to merge, others will have to close. As projected in simulation one, for example, the electrical products industry would account for 40 per cent of all of the job losses in manufacturing".

• (2040)

There would be serious losses in manufacturing. The report goes on to say that the employment gains would be in the service industries. It would be, for example, in clerical, sales and services, administrative jobs. We all know that manufacturing jobs, industrial jobs, are generally unionized, highly paid and have benefits and are usually full-time jobs, whereas jobs in the service industries are usually very often part-time and at minimum wage and non-unionized and without benefits. The jobs that we are gaining in this deal on the whole are service type jobs, and the jobs that we are losing are industrial type jobs.

Unfortunately, there is nothing in the agreement and in the Bill which provides for adjustment. The Government launched this whole free trade agreement, it says, as a result of the Royal Commission on the Economic Union and Development Prospects for Canada, known as the Macdonald Report, the Macdonald Royal Commission.

What did Macdonald say? He recommended a free trade agreement, but he also said on page 316 of Volume I of the report: "The commissioner's assessment of the economic costs of free trade indicates that Canadian investors and employees are likely to bear relatively larger adjustment burdens than their United States counterparts. A free trade agreement should therefore incorporate explicit provisions that reflect a proportionately greater cost of adjustment that Canadians will face. It should provide for transitional safeguards which permit temporary limits on the speed of adjustment, and it should operate to smooth out the dislocation and re-employment of workers and physical capital".

That is what was recommended. It was recommended in several other reports, but there are no new adjustment programs. Not only are there no new adjustment programs but the employment and training programs that are presently in place, and have been in place for several years now, have been drastically reduced.

Since 1984, employment and training programs have been reduced by this Conservative Government by 32 per cent. Whereas the budgets were $2.2 billion in 1984, they have now been reduced to $1.5 billion. This is the kind of program that the Government said it is going to rely on to help workers and firms adjust as a result of free trade. That will not do. I pointed out very clearly that there will be serious dislocations of workers. Industrial workers will lose jobs in Hamilton, Cape Breton, Toronto, southern Ontario. Jobs will be opening up in service industries in other areas of the country.

What are we going to do with these middle-aged workers, let us say in the electrical products industry, which will be the worst hit according to the Economic Council report, workers who have spent 20 and 30 years in electrical products industries and all of a sudden they are put out of work and told: "Well, don't be too upset. As a result of this free trade agreement you can have a clerical job out west"? Or, "If you are from central Canada, don't worry. You could have a clerical job or a sales job in Quebec, if you are from Ontario".

Adjustment programs are absolutely necessary. What is surprising is the day after the free trade agreement was tabled in this House, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) spoke to the Canadian Export Association—I believe that is the name of the association—and promised significant and massive adjustment programs. When he returned to the House the following day, we attempted to ask him questions about these programs. We attempted to ask the Minister of Employment about these programs. He said that the Prime Minister was misunderstood.

This is one of the travesties. We oppose the agreement and we think it is a bad agreement. Canada gave much more than it got. It is going to be bad for Canada's independence, identity and sovereignty. Surely, if we are going to have the agreement, there must be provision for adjustment programs. That is why Motion No. 11, which is presently before us and is one of the six motions, says:

> "For greater certainty, nothing in this Act shall be interpreted so as to affect or preclude the continuation of existing or the establishment of new special adjustment programs to help firms or workers . . . "

Of course, one of the reasons for that type of wording is that very often grants and subsidies to firms, to help workers, have been considered countervailable, or considered subsidies which may be negotiated away as a result of this agreement. We may not even be able to continue subsidies for workers in some cases, or subsidies for firms that are attempting to readjust, firms that will be very hard hit by the free trade agreement, whether they are textile firms, shoe firms or whatever.

I think it would be helpful to bring to your attention those firms which the Economic Council says will lose jobs as a result of this agreement. We have the rubber and plastics industry, the textile industry, the metal fabricating industry, the machinery industry. I have already mentioned the electrical products. We have the chemical products industry, the non-metallic minerals, paper products, furniture and fixtures, knitting mills and leather. These are among the 17 industries that will be hard hit.

If the Government maintains that adjustment programs will not be hurt by the agreement, then let it accept the amendment. The amendment only says that for greater certainty adjustment should not be hurt by this agreement. The Government will do no harm by accepting the amendment, but it can be very helpful by protecting adjustment programs and bringing in some new ones.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity this evening to speak on Motions Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14. I think, as perhaps the Chair, being one of the very few Government Members interested enough in this historic debate to be listening to it, that we must know that the FTA provides complete armaments for large multinational corporations and right-wing Governments to bust unions, lower wages, cut social programs—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): A point of order. The Hon. Member for Davenport.

Mr. Caccia: I apologize to the distinguished Member for Skeena for interrupting. I note that there are only two Tory Members in the House, and it may be necessary to call for a quorum.

Ms. Copps: Quorum.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I do see a quorum. On a point of order, the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary.

Mr. McDermid: Mr. Speaker, I would like it to be known to the House that earlier this evening an agreement was reached between the Parties, and it has just been broken by the Liberals, like they break every other promise that they make.

Mr. Axworthy: What agreement?

Mr. McDermid: Speak to your House Leader.

Mr. Allmand: I know that there is no such agreement. I have been sitting here all day.

Mr. McDermid: Too bad he does not talk to you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Skeena has the floor.

Mr. Fulton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, the FTA provides a complete arsenal of armaments for large multinationals and right-wing Governments on both sides of the border to bust unions, lower wages, cut social programs, lower environmental standards, cut regional development funding, while simultaneously giving what is know in the agreement as national treatment, or pipeline of resources to the same multinationals for wood, water, minerals, fish and many other things.

I am going to direct my remarks this evening to two key areas covered by the motions before us, one on Motion No. 9, in relation to aboriginal title and rights. I must say that I find it unusual that the one Minister of the Crown, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. McKnight), who clearly under Canada's Constitution and under rulings by the highest courts in Canada, has a fiduciary responsibility to the first citizens and First Nations of Canada, has not participated in the debate and has not produced for the First Nations a report on the impact of the FTA upon those to whom he has a direct constitutional responsibility.

• (2050)

The movement on aboriginal title and rights in Canada since Confederation has been a sorry and sad tale. Perhaps it has been the most sad and sorry in recent decades, going back to 1971-72 with the notorious White Paper which was reversed by the Calder decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, a decision that was tied three-three. That created some movement in the settlement of comprehensive claims but that movement was turned back in 1981-82 when the Government removed aboriginal rights from Canada's Constitution. Of course, we have seen that followed by the now famed Erik Nielsen report known as the Buffalo Jump of the 1980s, a report which would bring about the total assimilation and annihilation of the first citizens of Canada. That, of course, will be followed by the 1988 FTA should it in fact be passed and implemented.

One has to have some understanding of the gravity of the situation affecting first citizens and First Nations to know why the Assembly of First Nations opposed this Bill so strongly before committee and are opposing it so strongly across Canada. This Government has not moved since it came to office on Section 35 of the Constitution, recognizing aboriginal title and rights.

In my view, there is no fair-minded Canadian who is not appalled at the neglect by governments one after another which has brought the First Nations to such a state that any negative social indicator one can imagine can apply including the highest rates of suicide, the lowest rates of employment and the highest rates of incarceration. All the negative social indicators that can be found to measure the situation of the First Nations is there for all to see. The governments have a responsibility to settle comprehensive claims in British Columbia and North of 60 and to live up to the treaties in the rest of Canada. The governments have a responsibility to settle the specific claims which now number over 500.

Those first citizens who are listening this evening have to understand that a premonition of what will come under the FTA was what has gone on in Alberta with the Lubicon people. Just when the federal and provincial Governments could have moved to settle outstanding claims of the Lubicon people, the governments turned over a vast tract of land covering all of the Lubicon claim in northern Alberta to Daishowa Pulp Company, a pulp company wholly owned by Japanese. That process will accelerate, not just in Alberta but in every province and North of 60 should the FTA be implemented.

We must understand what national treatment means. The steeplechases that will have to be jumped by First Nations in order to settle comprehensive claims will be so much higher. One need simply read the FTA to see that local governments would have to follow rules against local preferences.

The First Nations have a true understanding of sustainable development. They understand the Brundtland report, the World Commission on the Environment. They understand how to properly harvest plants, animals and fish. They have a love for the land. One need only read the FTA to see how difficult it will be to maintain that traditional lifestyle.

For example, if an American corporation were to set up a large guiding and outfitting operation next to an Indian band which had a similar operation set up, it would be only a matter of a moment before the parent corporation would take some kind of countervailing action for unfair subsidies against the Indian band. I have here an excellent article entitled "The Binding Dispute Settlement Mechanism". It says:

> "And since all Canadian producers are to some extent subsidized by government-run hydro, telephones, postal services, health care systems, etc., etc.—failing US firms will never run out of grounds for filing unfair trade practices suits.
>
> Following a suit brought by the New England fishing industry, for example, the US International Trade Commission identified 58 Canadian government programs it labelled "unfair subsidies" to the Canadian fishing industry."

Let us think for just a moment about long-standing treaty entitlements and the specific entitlements of the first citizens of Canada. How long would it be before they would be challenged before the U.S. International Trade Commission? Even if they were taken before the so-called binding dispute settlement mechanism, we do know this, as stated in the article to which I just referred:

"—binational panels are bound only to US laws and practices whenever US firms want to challenge how we do things in Canada. They have no power to investigate, gather facts, or direct national agencies to make specific judgments. All they can do is judge whether American trade legislation has been applied properly."

The First Nations of Canada perhaps more than any other single identifiable group, stand at risk before the FTA.

I doubt any Member on the government side has read the excellent study done by the Native Council of Canada on the impact of the FTA on the First Nations and first citizens of Canada. We know that the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) has not even read the agreement, so we can be quite certain that the Minister of Indian Affairs has done nothing to date to protect the first citizens.

This motion would simply provide the kind of protection the Government says exists. If it exists, this is precisely the kind of motion the Government should accept to lay to rest the very deep, real and identifiable concerns of the first citizens.

I would like to spend a moment dealing with Motion No. 10. There is another question I want to pose. Why has the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) neither spoken in this debate nor produced for Canadians the estimate of the professionals who are working at Environment Canada of what the impact of the FTA would be?

We know from a recent Canadian Wildlife Service survey that over three-quarters of Canadians are prepared to accept a lower standard of living in order to have a higher quality and a safer environment. Yet south of the border, there has been no serious movement on acid rain. Anyone who has travelled to the Love Canal or to the Niagara Escarpment has seen how the Americans handle waste storage. They drove the locomotive from the atomic testing site to the Niagara Escarpment, simply dug a hole and drove it in. One need only go to Hanford in the State of Washington, just South of British Columbia, to see what American environmental standards are. They simply dump waste onto and into the ground.

When U.S. firms are required to install scrubbers in Canada and there are either federal or provincial incentives to do so, it would be just a blink of an eye before the parent company in the United States brought countervailing action against Canadian firms to try to reduce environmental standards. The Canadian environment stands at enormous risk from the way this agreement is worded, and any Member who truly cares and who truly speaks out on behalf of Canada's environment should support Motion No. 10 to ensure that the environmental standards that all Canadians support will be implemented, maintained and improved in the future.

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, in my riding of Hamilton East, I imagine that there are many people who are wondering what effect this trade deal will have on social programs. Senior citizens want to know what effect it will have on pensions. Young parents would like to know what kind of effect it will have on future child care programs.

Time and again, we have heard Government representatives say that our social programs will not be touched, our social programs are a sacred trust. I remind Government Members that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said the same thing about senior citizens' pensions. We remember what the Prime Minister said. He said that senior citizens' pensions are a sacred trust.

I would like to spend a few moments outlining very specific concerns we have about the trade deal and specifically about how it will impact very negatively on social programs. As many people in the public are not yet aware, the hidden agenda of the trade deal is not to be simply a strict economic and commercial deal. It will be a committee that will spend the next five to seven years determining what constitutes a subsidy. If the committee decides that pregnancy benefits or the extension of future pregnancy benefits or unemployment insurance constitute unfair subsidies, then we will see Canadian social policy being harmonized with that of the United States.

Mr. McDermid: Where does it say that in the agreement? Show me.

• (2100)

Ms. Copps: Annex 1498 of the deal specifically identifies health care facilities' management services as part of the trade deal. American companies can come into Canada and establish management services for profit in every single hospital across this country.

Mr. McDermid: Only if the provinces allow them to.

Ms. Copps: The Parliamentary Secretary is not interested in the facts. The facts are that the deal also includes a clause which permits the establishment of commercial blood banks in this country.

Mr. McDermid: Only if the provinces allow it.

Ms. Copps: The Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) when questioned on this issue, said: what does it matter? If people want to sell their blood, that is their business. I say, and Canadians say, that we have developed a universally accessible national medicare system because we do not believe people should have to sell their blood.

Mr. McDermid: Neither do we.

Ms. Copps: We do not believe we should be setting up a for-profit system where people in need, the sick, the poor, those at the lowest end of the socio-economic scale, are exploited.

Mr. Gormley: What about surrogate mothers?

Ms. Copps: As a matter of fact, surrogacy, as many Government Members probably do not care to know, happens to be big business in the U.S. There are many American lawyers who make their living matching surrogate mothers with people who want children. They do it for profit. As a

matter of fact, those American companies are now eyeing Canada as a potential market. They can come to Canada, hire a Canadian mother to bear a child, and it is all covered and paid for under the Canadian medicare system.

Mr. McDermid: Can they do it now?

Ms. Copps: If my Private Members' Bill is passed, no.

Mr. McDermid: Oh, but they can do it now before the trade Bill? I see. You mean the Liberals have allowed that all these years?

Ms. Copps: My Bill says that surrogacy for profit should be illegal. However, the Government believes in doing anything for the almighty dollar. It does not care for a national health care system. It would love to see us go to the kind of system they have in the U.S. where 25 per cent of women of child bearing age have no medical insurance.

Mr. McDermid: Oh, what nonsense.

Ms. Copps: Where the infant mortality rate is 40 per cent higher than in Canada. That is the hidden agenda of this deal.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Ms. Copps: Why do you think these companies, these big businesses, are coming to the Government to promote this deal? They would love to see a situation where we have no maternity benefits, where we have no minimum wage, which is the case in the vast majority of states in the U.S., where we do not have affirmative action, where we do not have child care programs. Those companies, aided and abetted by the Government, do not believe in the development of the social safety net which has characterized Canada.

We are different from the Americans. We extend our hand in friendship to the U.S., but we have made a conscious decision to develop a society which says we pay for national medicare. We developed a society which says we have responsibility to the poor and weak in a way quite different from the U.S.

If the Government is so sure that its trade deal is not going to affect this, why not pass a simple amendment?

I would like to read the amendment into the record. What could make it more clear? It says:

> ""7. For greater certainty, nothing in this Act shall be interpreted so as to affect the continuation of existing or the establishment of new Canadian social programs, including medicare, unemployment insurance, daycare, pensions, minimum wage laws, labour laws and maternity benefits.""

That is clear and apparently corroborates what the Government has been telling us. All along the Government has said that medicare will not be touched. Let us put it in the legislation by way of amendment. If the Government is so sure of its position that our senior citizens are going to be safe, then why not pass an amendment which puts it right in the legislation?

We believe that the Government will not move this amendment because it intends by way of commercial blood banks, by way of commercial health management facilities which could include for-profit operation of everything from hospitals right through to health clinics, to see the harmonization of social programs. In fact, a number of people who appeared before the trade committee made exactly that point. Let us look at some of the people who came before the committee and what they had to say about the deal. One was Mitchell Sharp. There are a number of eminent authorities who understand that the intent—

Mr. McDermid: Mitchell Sharp? The senior trade adviser to the Liberal Party?

Ms. Copps: —and long-term objective of this deal is to see the harmonization, not only of economic policy but also of social policy between the two countries.

Mr. McDermid: What nonsense.

Ms. Copps: The Government continues to say "what nonsense". Why not move a simple amendment to clarify the situation? Does the Government expect that the senior citizens of this country—

Mr. McDermid: It does not need clarification because it is not there.

Ms. Copps: —are to take your Government at its word? Senior citizens heard the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) when he said their pensions would not be touched. The first thing he did was to try to grab off their pensions. I am from Missouri and I want to see it written in the law.

This amendment will merely specify that medicare will not be affected by the deal. Unemployment insurance will not be affected by the deal. Yet the Government will not move the amendment because it knows full well that the subsidy panel which will be examining our social programs over the next five to seven years will put future parental leave programs at risk. It will put unemployment insurance programs at risk. It will put medicare at risk.

The Parliamentary Secretary flees because he knows that his position—

Mr. McDermid: The Parliamentary Secretary does not flee. He is going to check your facts.

Ms. Copps: —in refusing this amendment is indefensible. Look at Article 2010 and 2011, the nullification clauses. They say that any American company, once this deal is put in place, can come to Canada, lay a complaint about our medicare programs, our unemployment insurance, and demand compensation. Under the nullification clauses we will be required to pay them compensation because of programs that we have established under our social safety network.

When you talk about the over-all objective of harmonization, let us face it, do you think the Americans are going to

introduce medicare to harmonize with us? Who are you kidding? The Canadian system will be harmonized to the U.S. system and we will see a reduction in workers' wages. We will see a reduction in the kinds of social benefits that have characterized a different path for this country. The reason we will see that is because the Government—

Mr. McDermid: The Parliamentary Secretary is back.

Ms. Copps: —is so bent on selling out this country that it will stoop even to the point of setting up commercial blood banks. I do not want my children to have to buy their blood when they grow older. I do not want to have to buy my blood when I am at an age when I might need an operation.

Mr. McDermid: I would not want it either.

Ms. Copps: That is the potential written into this trade deal. Otherwise, why would the Parliamentary Secretary and the Government include commercial blood banks in the annex? It is specified right in the trade deal because the whole mentality of this Government is characterized by the Minister for International Trade who said, what is wrong with selling your blood? If not blood, what is next? Kidneys? Are we going to be selling babies next? Are we going to be selling other organs?

Mr. McDermid: Are there any blood banks in Canada now?

Ms. Copps: As a matter of fact there has been established for the first time under the Conservative Government in 1987 in the City of Montreal a for-profit blood bank. I say shame, and we say shame and we cannot understand—

Mr. McDermid: You mean before the trade deal?

Ms. Copps: —why the Government would want to introduce in the trade deal a specific section dealing with commercial blood banks. It is a hidden agenda and I say to senior citizens, when you hear the Government say your social programs will not be touched, just remember what it said about pensions. The Government cannot be believed and it has to be thrown out, so let's call an election.

• (2110)

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to speak to this very important series of amendments including Motion Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 which call the Government's bluff about the take-over that is provided for in the so-called free trade agreement and in Bill C-130.

The rationale for the free trade agreement is that it will reduce tariffs. In fact, that is a very small part of what the agreement really is about. It is partly about giving American corporations a much freer hand than they now have in taking over Canadian resources and Canadian labour.

With regard to the Bill, these amendments attempt to protect the lands, resources, and waters of the aboriginal peoples from the agreement. They attempt to protect environmental and conservation programs for our own land and water. They attempt to protect the continuation of special adjustment programs for workers or companies which suffer under the agreement. They attempt to protect the establishment or continuation of regional development programs and they attempt to protect the health and social service programs that we have now and the plans and hopes we have for extending them. They attempt to protect our cultural programs, present and future.

It is doubtful, even if these amendments were written in, that that protection would be given because if the free trade deal is finalized the agreement itself would give American corporations claim to all these things. Even if these amendments were written in we would, at the very best, be tied up in long court battles. The Government probably does not want to deal with these amendments because if they are passed it would be caught in contradiction to the agreement it has signed. It does not want to debate the amendments because it knows the amendments expose the take-over provided for by the deal.

I represent a constituency which has at least six hospitals, many nursing homes, and other health institutions, public and private. I want to speak particularly about the amendment which deals with social services. Motion No. 13 would add to the Bill the words:

> "—nothing in this Act shall be interpreted so as to affect the continuation of existing or the establishment of new Canadian social programs, including medicare, unemployment insurance, daycare, pensions, minimum wage laws, labour laws and maternity benefits."

We are being told, of course that these things are not on the table. We were told that by the same Prime Minister who told us that he would never negotiate a free trade deal with the United States. His statement that these are not on the table turns out to be just as true as his promise not to negotiate a free trade deal with the United States.

In fact, under Article 1402 of the agreement any American firm can claim any rights, benefits, and opportunities in Canada which any Canadian firm has under our laws. There can be no preference given to Canadian firms and no preference given to non-profit services over for-profit services.

Under that article these firms will be able to come into Canada much more easily than they now can. The list of nearly 300 services which are expressly opened up includes the management of a series of health services including hospitals, nursing homes, homes for the aged, homes for the retarded, homes for disturbed children, halfway houses, rehabilitation clinics—

Mr. McDermid: What about homes for disturbed MPs?

Mr. Heap: Someone across the way is worried about disturbed Parliamentary Secretaries. To continue, it includes ambulance services, public health clinics, X-ray laboratories, medical laboratories and, of course, blood banks. The Government made sure that blood banks are open to the United States.

This means that as governments deregulate, privatize, and contract out services which are now provided by public servants in a not-for-profit arrangement, they will all become open to takeovers by the American corporations which have established immense financial power and expertise for the purpose of making profit out of people's health. In the United States there are corporations whose large business it is to manage hospitals. They boast that last year and the year before they eliminated 73,000 hospital worker jobs.

In case some naive person on the government side imagines that this is because Americans have become much healthier and do not need hospital care, I will point out that statistics show that many millions of Americans have no hospital care at all, that the time spent by the elderly in particular in these institutions is being reduced, and that the quality of health care in the United States is lower than the quality of health care in Canada, even though the total cost is higher. That is what the Americans get as a result of for-profit hospitals and other services. That is why they want to reduce it here.

Mr. McDermid: That is not allowed.

Mr. Heap: That is why the Parliamentary Secretary keeps on heckling even though he does not like it when we heckle his Minister. The fact is that when any of these institutions are contracted out or opened up for privatization, American firms, without establishing in Canada, according to the agreement, will immediately be able to underbid on those firms because they will be bidding to provide a poorer service at a lower price in order to increase their profits.

People who work at these hospitals, nursing homes, homes for the aged, and other institutions like that now provided as public service under public jurisdiction and control with responsible union relationships among their employees and responsible staffing will be replaced by for-profit groups which in the States, as I have said, have a much lower level of service. There will be wage cuts, staff cuts, service cuts, and profit increases.

If this were not in fact the case, the Government ought to be willing to amend this law in the way this amendment asks. It ought to be willing to renegotiate the agreement with the United States so as to exclude this possibility. It is clear that this amendment calls the Government's bluff and exposes its intention to open our health services to the profiteers from the United States.

• (2120)

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, it is nice to see the Chairman of the Communications and Culture Committee sitting in the Chair. I hope you will transmit to the Minister and the Government the views that are not being presented by a partisan politician, or someone who thinks you have done very dastardly deeds with our communications and cultural policy.

I am going to read for the record the views of the Cultural Industries Alliance which says that the free trade agreement undermines Canadian policy. Those organizations and institutions have the very important responsibility for promoting Canadian sovereignty and cultural industries and the responsibility to portray a view of ourselves so that, as the Minister would say, Canadians can see each other, appreciate and grow with each other. That will not happen as a result of the work the Minister undertook. I suggest that her remarks today were completely irrelevant.

I want to read a statement on the implications of the Canada-U.S. trade agreement for Canada's identity and cultural sovereignty. It was issued in July, 1988, and was prepared by the Cultural Industries Alliance composed of the following groups: Alliance of Canadian Cinema, Television and Radio Artists; Association des Producteurs de Film et Video du Québec; Association of Canadian Film and Television Producers; Association of Canada Film Craftspeople; Association of Canadian Publishers; Canadian Actors' Equity Association; Canadian Association of Motion Picture and Electronic Recording Artists; Canadian Conference of the Arts; Canadian Film and Television Association; Canadian Independent Record Production Association; Canadian Periodical Publishers Association; Directors Guild of Canada; National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians; Periodical Writers Association of Canada; and The Writers Union of Canada.

The Alliance states that publishers and writers have allied with actors and directors, as well as with film, television and record producers, to amplify their opposition to the treatment of culture in the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement. The singular importance of this issue has persuaded them that they must speak out together to voice their serious concern over the long term effects of the agreement. Each member of this alliance is convinced that the agreement's so-called exemption for culture will actually discourage Canadian Governments in future from taking measures to assist the development of independent cultural industries by Canadians for Canadian audiences.

They believe that nurturing of Canadian works, which reflect and inspire uniquely Canadian points of view, is essential to this country's growth as a sovereign nation. Owing to our small population, our geographic proximity to a major power, and the extraordinary dominance of imported cultural goods, Canadians have found it necessary to provide counterbalances by introducing policies and legislation that make it possible for Canadian voices to be heard in our own country. I would like them to read the Minister's remarks about Canadian voices.

They go on to state that measures that might be taken to ensure this growth, however, appear compromised by the agreement, and it is doubtful if measures introduced in the past would be acceptable were they to be proposed in the post free trade Canada; therefore, they say, we are forced to conclude that our sovereignty is jeopardized by the agreement.

They say that in the past 18 months they have already seen evidence of the effect of the agreement on existing policies and policy development, including: The reduction of the capital cost allowance for Canadian films and television programs, which had encouraged production of Canadian films and television programs;

The revision of the Film Products Importation Act, which now substitutes grants for structural change. The Minister thought she could throw money at the problem and it might go away.

Third is the rejection of the Investment Canada guidelines for film distribution proposed by the 1985 film industry task force, recommendations that would ensure the orderly transfer of ownership in film distribution to Canadians which have been ignored;

Failure to apply the 1985 "Baie Comeau" book publishing policy, which promised to see the transfer of ownership in book publishing to Canadians.

Rejection of key recommendations for broadcast policy made by the House of Commons Standing Committee on Communications and Culture. These proposed measures would have significantly enhanced the production of Canadian programs for a Canadian market, and could well have had significant beneficial effects for the recording sector.

They go on to state in their document that it seems clear that the free trade agreement will alter not only the course of our economy, but by inhibiting our freedom to strengthen vulnerable yet essential cultural industries, it will also alter the course of how we define ourselves as Canadians. The agreement recognizes a North American reality, but it leaves little room for a Canadian vision. It is just like the Canadian broadcast Bill introduced by the Minister, which is a sad comment on how she and the Government view the application of a Canadian content policy.

The document states that the Government of Canada has repeatedly offered Canadians the assurance that under the free trade agreement our ability to protect our cultural sovereignty and to provide for the expression of our identity has been protected. For example, in a speech given on April 7, 1988, the Minister of Communications (Miss MacDonald) stated:

> "We have a free trade agreement because this Prime Minister, this Minister of Communications and this Government promised one thing: that Canada's right to determine our own culture would be respected in every degree. Without that promise . . . a deal simply was not possible."

It is a shame that they did not mean what they said.

The Alliance goes on to say that the organizations which have signed this brief share fully the view expressed by the Minister that no trade agreement is acceptable which does not retain fully Canada's right in the future to take the kinds of measures it has taken in the past to develop its culture. However, they state, all of them have been forced to the conclusion that the free trade agreement of January, 1988, does not meet that test. Instead, the agreement sharply and unacceptably constrains Canada's ability to take the necessary measures in the future to provide fully for the expression of the values, creativity, ideas and talent of Canadians throughout the country and for such activities to occur under the control of Canadians.

We have concluded as well, they say, based on decisions taken recently by the Government that the Government itself understands that its right of action is substantially limited by the agreement and has been prepared to accept those limits as a cost of the agreement.

What is the evidence on which we base these conclusions? First, we base them on the somewhat convoluted but increasingly understandable formal provisions of the agreement itself.

The key provisions of the Bill are in Article 2005. Rather than repeat those provisions, we simply note that we share the view expressed by Canada's Trade Ambassador and Chief Negotiator, Simon Reisman, that "it is rather impenetrable language". However, in a June 17 speech to the Canadian Film and Television Association, Ambassador Reisman provided considerable help in clarifying what Article 2005 means. He explained that it means:

> "... new measures affecting cultural industries would be scrutinized by both sides to determine whether they were consistent or inconsistent with the agreement."

Let us remember that American law is still American law. We did not change that.

They go on to say that Ambassador Reisman went on to state that if new measures were not consistent with the trade agreement then retaliation of "equivalent commercial value" was provided for. He expressed the opinion that: "There are many things we can do to support the cultural industries without being inconsistent".

Ambassador Reisman's view is clearly different from that of the Minister of Communications, they say. What he is saying, and what we believe the agreement says, is that actions taken in the past are exempt from the agreement, but any new initiatives are not. As a result, all of the provisions in the U.S.-Canada trade agreement which apply to the economy in general apply to the cultural industries as well, insofar as new measures are concerned.

The result is to limit drastically our ability to build our own domestic Canadian-owned and controlled companies in the cultural industries and to further enhance the development of Canadian cultural products. The one area that remains clearly open for government policy is that of direct subsidies. However, we note that the issue of subsidies is itself the subject of a series of negotiations flowing out of the U.S.-Canada trade talks and that, as as result, there is no final resolution of the subsidy issues.

Moreover, there is a need for serious legislative and structural initiatives in the cultural industries, and not just for financial assistance. They go on to state in the document that if we look at the actions the Government has taken in the recent past we see a consistent and profoundly disturbing pattern. The following examples can be cited:

First, the reduction of the capital cost allowance for Canadian films and television programs. In June, 1987, the Government announced a major reduction in the special capital cost allowance for investment in the production of Canadian films and television programs. While that reduction was announced in the context of tax reform, it reduced substantially an irritant in Canada-U.S. relations, since the capital cost allowance had always been regarded in the United States as an unfair stimulus to Canadian production. Coming at a crucial stage in the Canada-U.S. trade negotiations, this decision can only have been seen as reassuring by the United States. The second example is the revision of the Film Products Importation Act.

• (2130)

The third example is the rejection of the Investment Canada guidelines for film distribution proposed by the 1985 film industry task force. Fourth, a backing away from the 1985 "Baie Comeau" policy on Canadian ownership in book publishing and distribution, which has never been put into effect. Five, the rejection of key recommendations made by the House of Commons Standing Committee on Communications and Culture in the recently announced broadcasting policy and the proposed new broadcasting Bill—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret that the Hon. Member's time is more than expired. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Ms. Dewar).

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should say I am pleased to rise to speak in support of these amendments, but I am also sad to think that we are having this kind of debate and the Government has gone so far as to sell out this country the way it has.

We have heard a lot about the Auto Pact. The Government talks about the Auto Pact as free trade. Anyone who knows anything about trade knows it is very managed trade. In the Auto Pact what we have discussed is the ability to have Canadian content. The Government has eroded that, and the threat to the auto industry is very serious.

We did have a free trade agreement in 1944. It was with the agricultural manufacturing industry entered into with the United States of America. It resulted in a huge deficit in trade and farm machinery. Canada is one of the world's greatest agricultural countries yet we do not manufacture any of our own tractors. That is a specific example of the industrial end of Canada in the future.

More important, I would like to take a few moments to speak about the social policies which the Government is so anxious to say are not in the agreement and have not been touched. We have to look very seriously at the implications. We know that the Government would not get into any kind of discussions about what subsidies are. I am mortified to think that Canadians have negotiated an agreement which leaves everything until later on, later on, later on. I would not want the negotiators negotiating anything else for me because they have not defined what a subsidy is. They say we will get around to it in the next five to seven years. If the United States will have the kind of clout with the government negotiators in the future, we will not have very much say. When we look at what it is costing us in Canada as far as delivering our comprehensive health care system is concerned, which has all sorts of warts in it which need to be improved, we must realize that it happens to be one of the best health systems in the western world and is something of which we should be proud.

The biggest cost per car of General Motors in Detroit is not the steel costs nor the labour costs but the cost of Blue Shield and Blue Cross. It costs General Motors $650 per car in health care delivery.

We know in this country that our labour unit costs have been low because health care costs are built into what it is to be a Canadian and to live in this country. Certainly there is absolutely no reason that cannot be identified as a subsidy when we are talking to industries in the next five to seven years. The insidious part of this is that it is not clear. It is left ambiguous so that we are left as victims with no guarantee about our social policies.

What happens to our unemployment insurance, Mr. Speaker? This is something we thought was a reasonably good program. Again it has its problems. It needs improvements and constantly in this House we review it and try to make it better. We know that people are kept at work and not allowed time off because companies keep trained staff on call while cutting payroll costs. In Canada, 80 per cent of unemployed workers receive unemployment insurance up to 60 per cent of their wages. In the United States only one-quarter of the unemployed receive such benefits, generally at less than 40 per cent of their earnings. Those are the kinds of comparisons we are talking about.

For the Government to say that our social policies are not involved is a lot of nonsense. It says very clearly that we have to harmonize our programs and harmonization means to make things the same. If we are going to make them the same, we have to look at what that means. The greatest treasure we have in Canada is our children. When we talk about their future we have to think about their education. It is very clear that we in Canada have chosen to spend more on elementary and secondary school education per child than in the United States. Is that considered a subsidy?

Mr. McDermid: No.

Ms. Dewar: It is not defined. You do not know. The Parliamentary Secretary seems to think he knows but at the same time he has been unable to write that into the agreement. The Tories are not honest enough to let the Canadian people know how they are eroding the whole society. It would not be bad if it were just their own lives they are hurting, but they are

hurting the lives of future generations of this country and that is totally unacceptable.

Mr. McDermid: You do not know what you are talking about. You have not a clue.

Ms. Dewar: The Parliamentary Secretary likes to think it is nonsense.

Mr. McDermid: Show me.

Ms. Dewar: We know that we have to harmonize. We know that we spend more on education. As a matter of fact, the only way we have been unable to get Canadian texts and programs into our education system has been by nationalist regulations. It was nationalist regulations that forced large companies like Prentice-Hall to set up branch plants in Canada so that Canadians were finally able to interest these companies in creating distinctly Canadian products especially designed for Canadian educational systems. It seems to me that that does affect our children. We know from now on what we will have to do is to treat the Canadian and American companies—

Mr. McDermid: Who purchases those things?

Ms. Dewar: Those books are purchased by the Canadian book companies because they are forced to print in Canada. That will no longer be possible. That is the kind of thing about which we are very concerned. I do not think a Government that only looks at the bottom line and profit really cares what happens to children or social programs. It does not really care about the resources, the future and the environment of this country. But a lot of people in the House, people in the gallery, care very much and that is why they are here.

We are not going to stand for this. We know this Government will not get re-elected. We recognize that we will be able to stand proud and tall as Canadians. I said at the committee today that we would never see this agreement implemented. I firmly believe that from the bottom of my heart. I know the people in this country will not stand for it. Our fathers, mothers and ancestors have worked too hard to give us a value system, a society and a country of which we can be really proud. We are probably looking at the meanest and cheapest social network in the whole western world south of the border, and yet we say we want to harmonize our programs with it?

Mr. McDermid: Where does it say that in here? That is poppycock.

Ms. Dewar: We will not do that.

Let me quote someone who was a Member of Parliament here to whom I always looked up and I think many Canadians did also. Tommy Douglas used to say:

> "The measure of a nation's greatness does not lie in its Gross National Product, in the size of its gold reserve, or the height of its skyscrapers. The real measure of a nation is the quality of its national life . . . what it does for the least fortunate of its citizens, and the opportunities it provides for its youth to live useful and meaningful lives."

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. How is it that several times you called people to order when they interrupted the Minister but you never call people to order when they interrupt opposition Members?

• (2140)

Mr. Holtmann: Because they are not important.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Chair recognizes the Hon. Member for Richmond—Wolfe.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Tardif (Richmond—Wolfe): Mr. Speaker, I also welcome this opportunity to speak in this important debate concerning motions numbered 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14.

My remarks will more specifically concern motions 12 and 13, and especially Motion No. 12, which reads as follows:

> "For greater certainty, nothing in this Act shall be interpreted so as to affect or preclude the continuation of existing or the establishment of new regional development programs."

. . . and now for Motion No. 13, which reads as follows:

> "For greater certainty, nothing in this Act shall be interpreted so as to affect the continuation of existing or the establishment of new Canadian social programs, including medicare, unemployment insurance, daycare, pensions, minimum wage laws, labour laws and maternity benefits."

Mr. Speaker, I listened to all the previous speakers, and I think it is rather astonishing that what we propose in the way of amendments is relatively simple, in the circumstances. The Government is saying: There is no problem, there will be no consequences. What the FTA will do is create jobs and boost growth in this country, and there will be no consequences of any kind.

What we want to do in the House today is improve the Bill by adding a few simple sentences. These additions would provide guarantees that in the circumstances I think are altogether essential, reasonable and indispensable.

We are told that the FTA will have no impact on job creation or regional economic development . . . so they say! But if they are so sure and spend so much time saying they are so sure, I wonder what their motives are. Why not include guarantees in the FTA so that Canadians know what to expect?

Mr. Speaker, in a survey, American manufacturers were asked what they felt were the ideal conditions for setting up a company. According to the findings of this survey, a good business climate in the various States depended on the following conditions, ranked as follows: low taxes; low union membership; low insurance rates for work-related accidents; low unemployment insurance benefits; low energy costs; and fewer days lost as a result of work stoppages.

Mr. Speaker, if the same survey, evaluation or analysis were made in Canada, the conclusions would obviously be the same.

I think this is the kind of language we can expect from entrepreneurs, from industry, from those who create the jobs. It is quite normal and quite reasonable for a company to want to cut costs. So what will happen when the FTA is implemented? There will be three consequences, Mr. Speaker. There will be howls of "unfair" from the Americans because our conditions will not be the same as theirs. This could affect us in various ways. There might be demands that we "harmonize", over time, various programs that are characteristic of our way of doing things, as opposed to the U.S.

However, there is also another possibility, and frankly it worries me, Mr. Speaker, because I talked to various business people, to the people who create jobs, and they often tell us that their American competitors pay an hourly wage of $3, $4, $5 to produce exactly the same goods they are making in Canada. Secondly, he tells us that the labour component of products made in Canada is 30, 35, 40 or 50 per cent of the total.

Mr. Speaker, you have to put yourself in this businessman's place. Obviously, if he cannot have conditions similar to those in the United States, he will be very tempted, very interested, to simply liquidate his business and take an option on some land in the United States, so as to benefit from the almost total lack of social measures on the American side. Who will pick up the tab, Mr. Speaker?

Unfortunately, I have a riding whose survival depends on regional economic development. Before the redistribution of the electoral map, I had 60,000 people in my riding, in 60 municipalities. The largest town had a population of 6,500. Fortunately, with redistribution, I will have 67 municipalities, of which the largest has a population of barely 13,000. Given that, the economic survival of my riding depends on regional development policies and is directly related to them.

In the past, we have seen the benefits—the tremendously positive and essential results—of a regional development policy. In 1982-83, we Liberals put forward a program called Canadian Industrial Renewal Board. It enabled us to develop the Sherbrooke region. This program made it possible to create thousands of jobs, which obviously had a beneficial impact on a riding like mine.

With the treaty before us, Mr. Speaker, we risk losing any regional economic development program.

I think it is interesting and very important as well to recall some figures that I think speak for themselves. You will allow me, Mr. Speaker, to refer, for example, to some self-explanatory numerical data.

We are told that only 25 per cent of the unemployed in the United States receive benefits under all the government and federal programs, as well as supplementary and expanded benefit plans . . . Only 25 per cent! The corresponding figure for Canada is 85 per cent. In the United States, our southern neighbour, unemployment insurance benefits amount on average to 8 per cent of the average wage. In Canada, this average is 40 per cent and even exceeds it in some circumstances. Here we have figures, and I think that to make a case, nothing beats having figures to refer to, real, concrete, actual statistical data.

I think this is a good example of what distinguishes us from our American neighbours. And I also think it is a very good indication of the potential risk of this kind of agreement as a result of transfers of labour and companies that will tend to follow the laws of the market place and set up operations in those states across the border where the minimum wage is much lower and social benefits are far fewer, thus creating an incredible situation in this country. We will lose dozens of companies that will move to the United States, because of the markets and because of the fact that our production costs are much higher, so that companies that stay in Canada will see their premiums for social benefit increase considerably, and so forth. There will be a time when thousands of people are laid off.

Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect I find very significant, and that is the minimum wage. I think the following figures speak for themselves. In Canada, all provinces have a minimum wage policy. When we compare the situation in the United States, we find that nine states have no minimum wage policy; twelve states have a minimum wage of less than $3; and Texas, with the third highest population in the Union, has a minimum wage of $1.40. In Canada, only Alberta has a minimum wage of less than $3. In all other provinces, the minimum wage exceeds $3.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a businessman but, on the basis of this information, if I had to start a business in which the wage component was at all significant, I would be very interested in setting up operations in the United States. The minimum wage is half what it is in this country, there are no social programs, and I am close to my markets. Mr. Speaker, what happens to Canadians who are looking for a job, especially in disadvantaged regions like mine?

• (2150)

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, what we are debating tonight is a series of amendments which, if the Government believes what it is saying about the agreement and is not actively misleading the Canadian people, it should be willing to accept by virtue of the same logic used by the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) when he justified bringing in an amendment with respect to water exports. He said that the agreement did not affect water exports, and because it did not affect water exports he wanted to make that absolutely clear against what he called "false opposition charges" by bringing in an amendment to the legislation to make it clear that it did not affect water exports.

We continue to believe that it does affect water exports because we know that, in spite of whatever amendments might be moved here, it is the agreement itself which will be the final determiner of what is contained in the agreement and what is not contained in the agreement. But by using the same logic used by the Minister for International Trade with respect to the amendment concerning water exports, I see no reason why the Government could not have risen tonight, in the form of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade (Mr. McDermid), to accept these amendments. I am sure the Parliamentary Secretary was not rising to accept these amendments.

Mr. McDermid: You will never know.

Mr. Blaikie: The Parliamentary Secretary says that we will never know. I would be very surprised. He spent the evening heckling people who spoke in favour of these amendments. Surely if the Government were going to accept these amendments then we might have expected a little more courtesy from the other side than we have received.

Mr. McDermid: Just keeping you honest, Bill.

Mr. Blaikie: What are these amendments, Mr. Speaker? They are amendments that have to do with aboriginal land claims, that would provide that the deal does not affect the special relationship that aboriginal peoples have with the Crown and the federal Government. It seems to me to be a reasonable amendment, not only in terms of the logic of the Government's arguments with respect to amendments, but also with respect to the fact that the Government, in my judgment and in the judgment of aboriginal peoples, has no right to enter into a treaty with another nation that would abrogate rights which they have by virtue of their treaties with the Crown. Surely we would want to make that absolutely clear. Surely it would be an elemental principle of justice in terms of the relationship between native peoples and the Canadian Government that we would want to see enshrined in the legislation implementing the free trade agreement.

Another amendment has to do with the whole question of environmental or conservation programs. If the Government insists, as it does, that this amendment does not affect environmental or conservation programs, what on earth could be wrong with an amendment that says so? What could be wrong with an amendment that makes explicit what the Government itself argues is already the case, unless what the Government argues is the case is a matter of interpretation, or a matter of trying to sell the agreement politically when the Government knows full well that many of these types of programs could come to be the object of negotiation between Canada and the United States.

Mr. McDermid: It is protected under the GATT. It is in the GATT and these are GATT rules.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary is foaming at the mouth again.

Mr. McDermid: It is already there.

Mr. Blaikie: If it is already in the GATT why not reinforce it by having it in this agreement? I do not see any problem with that, but obviously the Government does because it does not want to offend what the United States obviously understands to be a different interpretation than what the Government is attempting to lead the Canadian people to believe with respect to this agreement.

Motion No. 11 states that the deal does not stop the establishment of special adjustment programs to help victims of the deal. There is confusion on this. At one point the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said that there would be massive adjustment programs. Then almost the next day the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) stated that this would be handled by ordinary adjustment programs, programs that are already in place. One begins to wonder whether the massive adjustment programs talked about by the Prime Minister, and it is interesting that he thinks there will have to be massive adjustment programs, are actually possible within the agreement, or whether they would not violate the spirit of the agreement itself. The agreement states: "Let the market-place decide". We over here state: "Let the people decide", but over there they say: "Let the market-place decide". If the market-place decides, a great many people will lose the jobs they now have. That is what the agreement states. Perhaps that is why the Government will not accept this amendment that would make it clear that adjustment programs are permissible within the context of the agreement.

Another amendment that the Government refuses to accept has to do with making it clear that regional development programs are not affected by the deal. How many times have we risen in the House and asked the Government about the effect of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement on regional development programs and government Members have stood there, full of sound and fury signifying nothing and stating that the agreement does not affect regional development programs? If it does not affect regional development programs, what on earth is wrong with an amendment that explicitly states that this legislation and the agreement which it implements do not affect regional development programs?

Finally, with respect to the whole question of social programs, the sleeper in this agreement, and it is too bad that not very many Canadians understand as yet what I call the "sleeper" in this agreement, is the commitment to negotiate over the next five to seven years what constitutes an unfair trade practice and what constitutes a direct subsidy. This is a real danger in this agreement. It is in that process, a process which has yet to unfold, and a process which can only be judged in terms of the negotiations which have gone on so far, and in which negotiations Canada has emerged as the loser, that we will lose the social programs that we have now.

The Parliamentary Secretary and others say that this is hysteria and fearmongering, but there is a logic to this fear. One is only paranoid when he or she is afraid of something that is not there. We are trying to say that there is a real danger to Canadian social programs as a result of the commitment to negotiate over the next five to seven years what constitutes an unfair trade practice. There was plenty of testimony before the Standing Committee on External Affairs

and International Trade to that effect by businessmen themselves. Regardless of how the Parliamentary Secretary and I may disagree on the eventual outcome, nevertheless business people appeared before the committee and said that whether or not one had to pay health care insurance for one's employees was a factor in deciding competitiveness.

That is all one needs to know. One does not need to be able to predict accurately whether or not that will result in specific changes to our programs or to American programs. The point is that what was formerly our business, and our business alone, what kind of health care system we have, will become the business of the negotiations between Canada and the United States, and that is unacceptable.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being 10 p.m., pursuant to Order made June 20, 1988, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, August 17, 1988

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*Translation*]

CHILDREN

RETURN OF *GARBAGE PAIL KIDS* CARDS—REQUEST THAT CRIMINAL CODE BE AMENDED

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to protest vigorously against the distribution of Garbage Pail Kids cards in Montreal. These cards, inserted in chewing gum packages, show absolutely disgusting and unacceptable pictures of children. For example, one card shows a baby with its elbow in its behind and its umbilical cord plugged into an electric outlet. Another shows a small boy scalding his hands under a hot water tap and the skin literally melting away. The cards also give reprehensible advice, such as eating until you vomit and watching what has happened to the food consumed.

Mr. Speaker, who has responsibility? According to a Montreal Urban Community police officer, nothing can be done about it. Unfortunately, the prosecutors he consulted told him that there is no legal recourse to stop the distribution of these cards.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing a serious problem. We must put on pressure to stop the distribution of these cards. It is true that children's education plays an important role, but if our laws are powerless to stop the social abuse I described, it is time to change them.

I ask the Conservative Government to investigate the possibility of amending the Criminal Code to prevent the distribution of such material, to stop the abuse of children's rights in the media and to put an end to such disgusting and abusive material.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PAKISTAN—DEATH OF PRESIDENT IN PLANE CRASH

Mr. Reginald Stackhouse (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, word has been received that this morning the President of Pakistan, the United States Ambassador to Pakistan, and 35 other civilians died in a plane crash over Pakistan. Apart from any other consideration, the manner of their deaths must impress all Members of this House and law-abiding and peace loving citizens of this country. We must ask ourselves, in view of the possible assassination, what manner of world this is becoming when any person in a position of public leadership faces the risk that any leader faces today. It causes us to make note of the need for greater security for leaders and to value the peace that is part of this country.

I know that, apart from any political considerations, the sympathies of this country will go to the families concerned.

* * *

BANKRUPTCIES

BANK'S SEIZURE OF COMPANY ASSETS—LOSS OF WORKERS' WAGES

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago Best Outer Wear Limited in Spadina went out of business, stopped making ladies coats, and dismissed 20 workers, owing each an average of $1,000 in back wages. The workers cannot collect their pay because the Bank of Montreal, being the secured creditor, has claimed the company's assets, leaving nothing to pay the workers. This is outrageous because this same Bank of Montreal in 1982 made $239 million profit but paid no taxes at all. In fact, it received a $22 million tax rebate.

This year, according to the Canadian Bankers' Association, none of our banks expects to pay tax. It is unconscionable that workers must pay taxes on their wages to subsidize banks that pay no taxes but the banks then have the power to seize the workers' wages. Canadian banks do the same to the peoples of Latin America where workers and peasants must watch their children suffer malnutrition and disease so that billions of dollars in external debt can be repaid to Canadian banks.

The people of Canada must organize to end these unjust Canadian laws made by the bankers' friends in the House of Commons and the Senate.

S. O. 21

NATIONAL PARKS

BANFF NATIONAL PARK—THREATENED CLOSURE OF ROAD TO SHADOW LAKE

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, the view from the Shadow Lake area, about 11 miles up a mountain in Banff National Park, is magnificent and glorious. For years Bud Brewster has been taking Canadians seven miles up the mountain in a vehicle on a fire road, and then even a man on crutches can go the rest of the way. Thus, scores of seniors have been able to visit Shadow Lake and marvel in ecstasy at this handiwork of God. However, this fall Parks Canada threatens to close the fire road which means that no aged or crippled Canadian will ever again visit Shadow Lake.

In 1979 Parks Canada was stopped by the then Minister of Parks, the Hon. John Fraser, from closing this road. Our national parks are not just for the young and the strong. I plead with the Minister and the Government of Canada to keep this road open so all Canadians, including the aged, the weak, and the crippled, can enjoy our national parks.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ENTREPRENEURSHIP

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR ENTREPRENEURSHIP—REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard—Anjou): Mr. Speaker, yesterday we attended a press conference that was a real farce. There were the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson), the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology (Mr. de Cotret) and the Minister of State for Small Businesses and Tourism (Mr. Valcourt). The three were all there to announce the idea of an entrepreneurship institute.

When journalists asked them about its mandate and budget and what they would do, the Minister of State for Small Businesses and Tourism said, "I will get back to you in a month to make an announcement about that." A real farce!

Today, small business is stuck with bank charges, people have to pay twice for a returned cheque, and the Government is dragging its feet. Why don't they announce really necessary things that help small business instead of electioneering, as they did yesterday?

• (1410)

[*English*]

ABORTION

ATTEMPT TO SECURE POSTPONEMENT OF SUPREME COURT HEARING

Mr. Jim Jepson (London East): Mr. Speaker, I read with regret in *The Ottawa Citizen*, and had it confirmed by the Justice Department, that Justice officials are continuing to try to deny Joe Borowski his day in court. It is regrettable that the obvious bias of some Justice Department officials is continuing to prejudice Mr. Borowski's case which is to come before the Supreme Court in October.

I call on the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) to allow due process of law to be carried out in a free and democratic way. I get the distinct impression that Justice officials are afraid of the possible outcome of the Borowski trial and that, indeed, the life of the unborn might be protected under the Charter as Mr. Borowski claims in his submission.

* * *

APARTHEID

SOUTH AFRICA—CALL FOR RELEASE FROM PRISON OF NELSON MANDELLA

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, yesterday we heard the tragic news that Nelson Mandela has been transferred to a hospital and is seriously ill with tuberculosis, a disease produced by cramped and inhumane prison conditions. The white South African Government still refuses to release him, even on humanitarian grounds. It insists he is a criminal and a terrorist.

The crime for which he has spent the last 25 years in prison was refusing to accept the South African Government's view that blacks are less than equal. Nelson Mandela is a political prisoner. Anyone with a conscience knows that, just as people know who the real criminal and terrorist is in South Africa.

More important, Mandela is a symbol of black South Africans' struggle for justice. His refusal to bend to the racist regime or to be robbed of his human dignity is nothing less than a fiery demand by all black South Africans for full and complete equality, socially, politically, and economically.

The South African Government must release Nelson Mandela, not because he is sick but for the same reason it should free all black South Africans, because it is right. Canada and the world should insist upon it.

AIRPORTS

PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—DISPOSAL OF GARBAGE

Mr. Bob Pennock (Etobicoke North): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform the people of Canada that irresponsible municipal government action has created a potential health hazard at Pearson International Airport.

On a daily basis Pearson is producing 40 tonnes of waste. The compactors at the airport can handle only 21 tonnes. It does not take a mathematical genius to conclude that Pearson has 19 tonnes of excess garbage to dispose of each day, every day.

Mounds of garbage already surround the planes and the disposal site. Flies and rats are infesting this refuse. These known carriers of disease pose a grave health hazard to the people working at the airport and in the surrounding area.

A new disposal system is being put in place at Pearson but, temporarily, the garbage must go somewhere. Toronto has an incinerator on Commissioner Street. Despite requests from Pearson Airport, Toronto closed this incinerator.

Hamilton has an incinerator running at 50 per cent capacity only. Why? Because they do not have enough garbage. Yet they refuse to take the garbage from Pearson until they get planes from Pearson.

Toronto and Hamilton's self-serving interests are holding the country to ransom. Their narrow-minded attitude is endangering the health of airport personnel, citizens of Canada, and the agriculture industry at large. Something must be done.

* * *

TAX REFORM

PROPOSED NATIONAL SALES TAX

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, when the Conservative Government raised taxes on families in 1984 average Canadians asked—

Some Hon. Members: Where was Brian?

Mr. Riis: When taxes were raised in 1985—

Some Hon. Members: Where was Brian?

Mr. Riis: When taxes were raised in 1986—

Some Hon. Members: Where was Brian?

Mr. Riis: When taxes were raised in 1987—

Some Hon. Members: Where was Brian?

Mr. Riis: Now the Government intends to add insult to injury by introducing a new everything-included national sales tax. What will this mean for the average Canadian taxpayer?

When you get a haircut, you will pay the new tax. When you buy school supplies for your children, you will pay the new tax. When you go to see a movie or rent a video, you will pay the new tax. When you go to McDonald's, you will pay the new tax. When you buy insurance, you will pay the new tax.

As more and more average Canadians find out about this new Conservative sales tax they are asking—

Some Hon. Members: Where is Brian?

* * *

POLITICAL PARTIES

NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY—CANDIDACY OF FORMER MANITOBA PREMIER

Mr. Felix Holtmann (Selkirk—Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Leader of the New Democratic Party for his astuteness in encouraging the former Premier of Manitoba, Mr. Howard Pawley of Selkirk, to run in the next federal election. Apparently the NDP consider Mr. Pawley to be a bright light. As the federal MP for that area I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and this House, that the constituents know it is nothing more than low voltage and a dead fuse.

In the last provincial election Manitobans passed judgment on Pawley's NDP Government. At the same time they also passed judgment on one Mr. Sargent—remember?—who was defeated in Pawley's own riding.

In the next federal election Manitobans will have an opportunity to pass judgment on the man whose Party and leadership are sinking dramatically. Please, Mr. B., tell Mr. Pawley to run against me.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

CALL FOR PROGRAMS FOR YOUNG AND OLDER WORKERS

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, unemployment manifests itself in different forms and hits different people in different regions of our country. In Toronto, and in my riding of York West, for instance, I am encountering an alarming number of younger Canadians, fresh from high school, college, or university, who are unable to find job opportunities that suit their academic training and will provide them with the all important on-the-job experience in their chosen profession.

This phenomenon is coupled with the experience of older workers who are being dismissed by employers despite their

long years of service and experience and now face horrendous difficulties in convincing new firms to invest in their talents.

Their dilemmas are not easy ones. Older workers still have mortgages to pay and families to maintain. The morale and self esteem of young graduates are being shattered every day.

The Government has failed to address these two solitudes in our society. Through innovative employment programs we simply must combat this two-pronged employment malaise so that young Canadians are not denied a place to stand and older workers are not forgotten or abandoned.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

FREE TRADE

CLOSURE OF SIMONDS PLANT IN GRANBY—REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Right Hon. Prime Minister. Last Friday employees at Simonds Saw in Granby read on the bulletin board next to the "punch" that their employment with the company would end on November 11 this year, because of the company's decision to transfer its operations back to Massachusetts and cover the North American market from its plant in the United States, thus adding 131 Canadians to the ranks of the unemployed.

I sent a telex to the Prime Minister the same day, and I therefore want to ask the Prime Minister: Has he had a chance to look at the possibility of adjustment programs for these workers, a pre-retirement program or even a program to reopen the business with Canadian backing?

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, we have dealt with this matter on two occasions this week. I believe the hon. gentleman is referring to the plant in Granby which he falsely stated was to be closed because of the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement. Of course, he has now had to drop those allegations.

All government programs in connection with situations where plants close, for retraining or assistance for workers who are laid off, are in effect under the Department of Employment and Immigration and others. Everything will be done to assist them, as is always the case whenever a plant closes in Canada for whatever reason.

In this case two of the company's four plants are being closed, one in the United States and one in Canada, for reasons, the company says, of economy and greater productivity.

[*Translation*]

LOSS OF NUMERONS JOBS IN GRANBY—REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT ACCEPT ITS RESPONSIBILITY

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I would really like to have the Prime Minister's attention in this matter which is vitally important, since the 131 victims of free trade down in Granby are in their fifties. There is no pre-retirement progam for these people. As for the programs referred to by the Minister for International Trade, the only programs available are unemployment insurance for 52 weeks and welfare up to 65. I hope the Minister doesn't think these programs are designed to deal with the problems of these people.

Mr. Speaker, the workers at Simonds Saw are not looking for handouts. They didn't ask to have their jobs taken away and transferred to the United States. The workers at Simonds Saw want some consideration from the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am not the only one who thinks this is a consequence of free trade. Even a supporter of free trade, the PQ MNA for Shefford, wrote to Premier Bourassa saying that manufacturing of knives and saws will be transferred to Fitchburg, Massachusetts, in accordance with the principles of free trade.

Consequently, I want to ask the Government to act responsibly and ask the Prime Minister what he has to say to 131 people who just lost their jobs and who will be out on the street as of November 11.

• (1420)

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I am sure I can speak on behalf of the Prime Minister and the Government to these 131 persons to say that we very much regret the fact that they will be unemployed as a result of the decision of this company to close its plant, which has no connection at all to the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement. This was confirmed by Simonds official J. D. Patry who said there was no connection between the plant closing and the trade deal. He is a native of Granby. He has been laid off himself as the plant comptroller. He said he had no stake in protecting the company, but the position is that there was no connection between the plant closing and the trade deal.

I commiserate with these employees at that plant too because their representative appears to be interested in nothing but attempting to score political points out of their misfortune.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT INTEREST ITSELF IN SITUATION OF WORKERS

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, once again I ask the Prime Minister to show some sympathy and understanding for what happens to ordinary workers.

I ask him to remember his own background, because these people could be one of his relatives. They could be from the North Shore.

At this very moment, we have 131 workers in their fifties who were machinists. We know that digital control machines are the way of the future, and that these workers will not be able to work with these new machines.

I want to ask the Prime Minister what he has to say to 131 heads of families who are going to lose their jobs. Will he just continue to ignore them as he did during my first two questions?

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I will once again point out that the company in question is closing its Portland, Oregon, plant, with western production being consolidated in the company's plant in Vancouver, while in the east it made a decision to continue a plant it has in Massachusetts while closing the plant in Granby.

Everyone in the House can sympathize with the 131 people who will be laid off. I personally sympathize with them, and all government programs will be available to them in securing and helping them in the transition period to other employment. Unfortunately, every year hundreds of thousands of people are laid off. They go on to obtain other jobs. In fact, the figures total several million a year.

In this particular case it is unfortunate that the company decided for economic and overhead reasons to do this, and unfortunate that the Hon. Member is attempting to twist this around for partisan political purposes.

* * *

REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

ALUMINUM SMELTER PROJECTS—DEPARTMENT'S POSITION

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion. Yesterday, when answering a question posed to him concerning the strong bias that was built in against the Province of Manitoba when the Prime Minister announced a guarantee for an aluminum smelter in his riding, the Minister said that the Government was prepared to provide a level playing field, equal treatment for all in order to attract investors.

On the very day that he was making that statement the Minister signed a document from his Department, an industry profile on the aluminum industry, in which he says: "The prospects of expanding ABI's Bécancour facility and of constructing a world-scale aluminum plant elsewhere in Québec are promising. Prospects for new aluminum smelters in Manitoba and British Columbia are less attractive".

Is that a level playing field when his own Department signs a report designed to give direct instructions to the industry as to where and how it should be investing, and talking about one being promising and the other less attractive? Does that not give total lie and distortion to the commitment and guarantee given by the Minister, that in fact the Province of Manitoba is not being discriminated against? Is this not a clear distortion of the meaning of a level playing field?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I noted that my hon. friend said in his prefatory remarks that: "The Prime Minister announced a guarantee for an aluminum industry in Quebec". That statement is false from beginning to end.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mulroney: I made no such statement. My statement is on the record.

What is also on the record in regard to the smelter issue is a statement from Manitoba by Peter MacGuire, Alumax's manager of corporate development. He is promoting the idea of a smelter in Manitoba and says: "I do not think it has an effect one way or the other. We were aware as a company of Sept-Iles and thought it would go ahead regardless of our decision".

These are two different projects, both of which appear to have support and value. One is more further along than the other. One is in the process of submitting a request to provincial and federal Governments. Premier Bourassa and I indicated that among the series of choices in the Province of Quebec which the private consortium was interested in, we indicated our support for Sept-Iles which has some 27 per cent unemployment and has endured very difficult and tough moments.

This in no way precludes the possibility of another group, whose spokesman says that the Sept-Iles decision has no impact on them, coming forward with plans for Manitoba which the Government of Canada, when these plans are brought forward, would look at with consideration and concern and would make sure that the same kinds of programs that were made available to Quebec or British Columbia are made available to the developers in the Province of Manitoba.

MANITOBA PROJECT—REQUEST FOR GUARANTEE OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, it will come as some surprise to the people of Sept-Iles whose expectations were raised by the Prime Minister's statement, that the Prime Minister is now retracting the promise and the guarantee he gave in his own riding. If there was ever a clear example of the Prime Minister doing a flip-flop and a changeover, boy do we have it now.

Mr. Mazankowski: Tell the truth. It is time to tell the truth.

Mr. Axworthy: It is not I, it is the Prime Minister who just changed his mind.

Mr. Dick: Tell the truth.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member will put his question.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, let us put the Prime Minister's commitment to the test. A federal official has said that some $82 million would be guaranteed for the aluminum smelter in Quebec. That is fine with us, and a good commitment. Is the Prime Minister prepared today to give exactly the same kind of commitment for financial assistance to build transportation facilities to support the building and development of an aluminum smelter in Manitoba? Will he give the same kind of guarantee in Manitoba that he gave to the Premier of Quebec and his constituents last weekend?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, again I have to tell my hon. friend that his statement is in complete error from beginning to end in regard to—

Mr. Axworthy: Let us get the transcript.

Mr. Mulroney: You mean you are speaking without the transcript?

Mr. Axworthy: Why do you not read it?

Mr. Mulroney: I have it here and I can assure you that what you just implied about Premier Bourassa and me is completely and flatly wrong.

Mr. Speaker: I know Hon. Members will want to put their questions and their responses through the Chair. The Right Hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. Mulroney: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend referred to the transcript. I will give him the transcript. It said: "Yesterday in Montreal I met with Premier Bourassa and we discussed the proposal to build an aluminum smelter that is now under study by an international consortium. Of course, the final decision will be made by the investors, but the Premier and I agreed to promote Sept-Iles as the site of the proposed smelter".

Mr. Axworthy: Let us give the same guarantee to Manitoba.

Some Hon. Members: Keep going.

Mr. Mulroney: I will be delighted to continue: "The federal Government is monitoring this project's progress with interest. This project being studied by international investors of solid reputation would create many jobs and have a considerable economic impact on Sept-Iles, on the North Shore and all of Quebec. This is another example of how a stable political climate and open markets attract private investment".

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: We do not have before the Cabinet or the Government of Canada a request from the Government of Manitoba or the private developers in Manitoba seeking to develop a smelter in Manitoba. As soon as those plans are forthcoming they will be carefully considered and favourably considered, if the objective criteria are met, by the Government of Canada. We are very much interested in the approach that Premier Filmon is bringing to industrial development and clearly it will have very beneficial effect for Manitoba.

My hon. friend refers to the surprise of the people of Sept-Iles.

Mr. Axworthy: That is right.

Mr. Mulroney: They will be surprised in hearing a Liberal spokesman today denigrating a legitimate—

Mr. Axworthy: You retracted your guarantee.

Mr. Mulroney: —attempt by the Government of Canada to try to get rid of some of the high unemployment. My hon. friend's slogan is "Let the people decide". The *Winnipeg Free Press* suggests your slogan should be: "Tell the people the truth".

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Axworthy: Why do you not tell the people in your riding the truth?

• (1430)

REQUEST THAT PRIME MINISTER PROMOTE MANITOBA SITE FOR SMELTER

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister for the most part was careful in what he had to say about this. One of the things that it appears he was careful not to say was that he would be promoting Manitoba as a site for an aluminum smelter. I am not so sure we have the flip-flop here that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry says we have, unless of course we can get the Prime Minister to his feet to say that, indeed, he will be promoting Manitoba as a site for an aluminum smelter.

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in fairness, usually a politician does get blamed for what he says. My hon. friend says: "I am now blaming the Prime Minister for what he has been careful not to say".

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mulroney: We have a proposal from the Government of Quebec. As the gentleman from Manitoba indicated, they have been aware of the Quebec proposal for many years. It has not been a secret. The private sector representing people from Japan, Europe, the United States, and *La Société générale d'investissements du Quebec*, has put together a consortium which proposes to build an aluminum smelter some place in the Province of Quebec. That is one of the proposals.

There is another proposal that had been unsuccessful over some years with the previous Government and which Premier

Filmon is now seeking to resurrect and bring to fruition, which involves the establishment of an aluminum smelter in Manitoba which looks to entirely different markets and entirely different financing—an entirely different approach—both of which are sustainable in a country such as Canada.

My hon. friend asks me to be careful about what not to say. I will tell him what I told Premier Filmon when he raised the matter in a private meeting with me a week ago. It was that when the Government of Manitoba had all the facts and was ready to proceed with some recommendations, the Government of Canada would be delighted to sit down with him as Premier of Manitoba, with his colleagues, to make sure that if they thought this was a deal that would fly in Manitoba the Government of Canada would be there to help them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

WESTERN DIVERSIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was careful once again not to say that he would promote the Province of Manitoba as a site for an aluminum smelter.

The Prime Minister continues to maintain, as the Minister did yesterday, that there has been no proposal from Manitoba. This is not a proposal that Premier Filmon has to resurrect. It is a proposal that was made to the Government in the form of the Manitoba Government's submission with respect to the Western Diversification Program, for instance, within the last year, and no answer was ever received from this Government with respect to that proposal until we heard from the Prime Minister in Quebec just the other day.

Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Minister for Western Economic Diversification): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to be given an opportunity to correct the record. As the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Birds Hill points out, it was a proposal that was put forward by the previous New Democratic Government of Manitoba. It was one line on a 19-page document that totalled over a $1 billion request to the Government of Canada for assistance to that provincial Government at that time, including municipal roads, support for all university programs, as well as almost every election commitment made by the New Democrats and unfulfilled over the last elections.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

PRIME MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, we have heard that line before. However, Manitobans know and statistics prove that we have been getting the short end of the stick with respect to the Western Diversification Program for a long time. It has not changed under the current Progressive Conservative Government of Manitoba. Manitoba continues to be done in by this Government.

I go back to the Prime Minister because I notice he was reluctant to get up a second time. We still have not a commitment from the Prime Minister with respect to the so-called level playing field. We have not a commitment from the Minister or an explanation as to why, on the same day he talked about a level playing field, he released a report which states that the prospects in Manitoba are not as good as they are in Quebec, with no explanation. What was the intention of this, to reinforce the Prime Minister's already predetermined political decision that Quebec and not Manitoba would be favoured for such a smelter?

[*Translation*]

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we are hearing increasingly disturbing statements by the New Democrats and the Liberal Party critic. I have just come back from a disadvantaged region. Premier Bourassa and myself, reacting to a proposal by an international consortium, quite simply indicated that we favoured Sept-Îles as a potential site for the new plant. Now the Liberals and the New Democrats in the House of Commons apparently want to raise all kinds of concerns about the nature of the project, thereby harming not only Quebec's interests but also the interests of Manitobans. There is no connection between the proposal for Quebec and the project being proposed for Manitoba. The New Democrats and the Liberals seem to think we have to choose between the two, and that if there is one in Quebec, we can't have another one in Manitoba. That is absolutely false. We can have both a fair deal for Quebecers and a fair deal for Manitobans. That is something the Liberals have never understood!

* * *

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—NEWSPAPER ADVERTISEMENT

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Prime Minister. It concerns the Government's futile and expensive advertising campaign to con Canadian taxpayers into supporting the free trade deal.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Boudria: I have in hand a copy of a newspaper advertisement in which a Winnipeg business woman, Ms. Meghan Grey, is depicted as supporting the Prime Minister's trade deal.

Given that Ms. Grey said in an interview, and I quote: "I still haven't made up my mind. But people who see the ad might think I'm pro free trade, and that isn't the case". Will the Prime Minister immediately order a withdrawal of this ad? Will he apologize to Ms. Grey and to all Canadians who have

been so misled? Will he do what he suggested himself a while ago, tell the truth to Canadians?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the ad in question is an ad that does not advocate free trade. It is an ad that states: "Free trade. We're getting ready now."

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: The person in the ad describes how they are getting ready for free trade. Then, in the advertisement, more information is available on the free trade agreement, and it gives where one can call toll-free. It is an ad of the Government of Canada.

With respect to the young business woman in question, she has not said that she is displeased with this ad. She has confirmed that she has agreed to further use of the same ad featuring her in other publications. She was never asked to endorse the free trade agreement. She was asked to tell other Canadians how her firm was preparing to take advantage of the opportunities created by the FTA. She knew in advance that the ads were sponsored by the Government. She approved the copy of the ad before it appeared.

We are very happy with the publicity we are getting from this because the truth is coming out, despite the best efforts of the hon. gentleman in the Official Opposition and his Leader who had to be admonished by the *Winnipeg Free Press* to occasionally tell the truth, and the NDP.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, the Minister says that this ad is not designed to promote free trade. It states: "Canadians are getting ready for free trade. The Government of Canada is there to help."

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boudria: What is that if it is not promotion?

[*Translation*]

REQUEST FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): I would like to put my supplementary to the Prime Minister. Mr. Speaker, this is the second time in two days that the Government has been caught with its pants down. Yesterday, $6.3 million were spent to influence public opinion after a negative poll, and today we have advertisements that are completely false. I want to ask the Conservative Government when the Prime Minister and his Govennment will be frank and honest with Canadians on this issue. When will he call an election?

• (1440)

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the advertisement in question states: "Free trade. We're getting ready now". The Canadian business community, small, medium, and larger businesses, are trying to get ready for the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement which holds out great possibilities for them, for those who work for them, and for their suppliers. However, they are prevented from getting ready by the Leader of the Opposition and his threat to use the Senate, and by the obstructive tactics of the opposition Parties.

Finally, with respect to this Member, let me just tell him that truth does not lurk in rat holes.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BANKS AND BANKING

INCREASED MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Does the Minister realize that the chartered banks have just raised their mortgage rate to 12 per cent, following an increase in the bank rate set by the Bank of Canada last week, which means it is getting harder for average Canadians to buy their own home? Does the Minister and does the Government support the Bank of Canada's policy to keep interest rates high and thus increase our mortgage rates?

[*English*]

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have commented on a number of occasions on the reason for the monetary policy of the Bank of Canada, which is supported by the Government of Canada, and that is to avoid the very difficult times we had during the 1970s and early 1980s when the previous Government ignored the pressures of inflation that were building at that time which led to 13 per cent inflation rates, and 23 to 25 per cent interest rates. That brought the unemployment rate up to 13 per cent.

I think that we can be judged on the record of our economic policy over the past four years. We have brought the unemployment rate down from 11.7 per cent to 7.9 per cent. We have managed in the broadest sense the economic policy in a way that has resulted in Canada being the number one country of the G-7 countries in economic growth during this period.

POLICY OF BANK OF CANADA

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, the interest rate increase by the Bank of Canada last week, which has led to 12 per cent interest rates on mortgages for Canadians across the country, touches people who are trying to buy a house in Kamloops, in Alberta, in Chicoutimi, in Moncton, and not only in the area of southern Ontario.

Does the Minister endorse the central bank for Canada becoming the central bank for central Canada, which is what is happening now because the Bank of Canada seems to be directing its policies only to what is happening in southern Ontario.

Can the Minister say how high interest rates will go before the Government is prepared to intervene?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows that last question is an impossible one to answer. Even he, with his utmost ability and full knowledge of everything that is going to happen in the future, cannot predict what is going to happen to inflation and interest rates, and that goes without saying.

The Hon. Member also knows, and he has discussed this with the Governor of the Bank of Canada, that there cannot be an interest rate policy that is different in different parts of the country. We have a monetary policy which is a national policy. We have regional policies which are devoted to regional concerns. That has been the policy of this Government.

* * *

HOUSING

USE OF FEDERAL LAND IN METROPOLITAN TORONTO

Mr. Reginald Stackhouse (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State for the Treasury Board. Rumours have been flying around Parliament Hill that the Government may make some federal land in Metro available for affordable housing, but rumours are not homes. When will the Government move us from rumours to action?

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, as I have told the House on various occasions, we are looking at the federally owned lands in the Metropolitan Toronto area. We appreciate that there is a problem. Under those circumstances, we have asked the various agencies to review their present situations and needs.

I can assure my colleague that when that policy is ready to be divulged we will certainly bring that announcement to the House.

* * *

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

INTRODUCTION OF OWNERSHIP LEGISLATION

Miss Aideen Nicholson (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State for Finance. Since December, 1986, the position of the Government has been that banks and trust companies should not be owned by large commercial interests because of the potential for conflict.

In June the Minister signalled a retreat from that, but did not say exactly what he had in mind, or when he would introduce legislation. Although this is not a politically glamorous issue, it is of vital importance to the Canadian economy. Will the Minister tell us today exactly what he has in mind?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Speaker, the policy of the Government was announced with a draft Bill on trust and loan companies on December 22, 1987. We have also elaborated on it since in a press release in June, to which the Hon. Member refers.

Through Bills C-42 and C-56 we have accomplished excellent protection for depositors, and policy holders. We have improved the supervisory system for our financial institutions. We have put in place a draft Bill on ownership and powers. It is pretty well all completed, and in very short order we hope to have the Bill itself before the House.

TIMING OF INTRODUCTION

Miss Aideen Nicholson (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that the draft legislation is there, but draft legislation is not a Bill.

Since the predecessor of the Minister described this matter as urgent about four years ago, I would like to ask the Minister exactly when he will introduce the Bill.

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Speaker, as I have said, it should be appearing very soon. The structure we have in place now protects depositors, protects policy holders, and improves the supervisory system. What we have left to do is to change investment rules and the control and ownership provisions, and that is what we will reveal very shortly.

* * *

CORPORATE AFFAIRS

REAL ESTATE INDUSTRY—CODE OF ETHICS

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Would the Minister advise the House whether or not his Department has agreed not to press charges of price-fixing against a number of real estate boards, provided that the industry as a whole adopted a code of ethics?

Could the Minister also tell us whether or not his Department threatened to investigate an additional five real estate boards if the Canadian Association did not accept that code? If the officials of the Minister's Department did, will he tell us whether or not he supported that decision?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first question of the Hon. Member, there was no selective agreement for part of the boards. The new Competition Act passed by this Parliament requires that there be competition in providing real estate brokerage services.

The director is enforcing that, seeking compliance, and doing it through the Canadian Real Estate Association. He will proceed to the point to ensure that that compliance is achieved right across the country, as required by law.

PRICE-FIXING—REQUEST THAT CHARGES BE PRESSED

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, the Minister must be aware that a number of boards have stated that they will not comply with the agreement that was worked out last week between department officials and the real estate board.

Could the Minister tell us whether, as a result of the investigations by the RCMP and other officials, there was indeed price-fixing in a number of local real estate boards? Would the Minister advise the House whether he will indeed press charges against those who were guilty of violating the Competition Act, and prosecute them?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, because of the confidentiality provisions contained in the Act I am unable to advise the Hon. Member on specific details of whether there might or might not have been compliance with the Act.

The law is there and the law will be enforced. We are seeking compliance rather than necessarily trying to get convictions. However, the law will be complied with, and the director will ensure that happens.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PURCHASE OF TROOP CARRIERS—INFLATION AND EXCHANGE RATE COSTS

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. On July 26 in answer to a question about the proposed purchase of 820 Swedish design all-terrain troop carriers at a cost of $421 million the Minister told the House that the vehicles would cost approximately $170,000 each.

On this basis the actual cost of the vehicles would be approximately $144 million, which leaves $277 million unaccounted for. The Minister had an explanation for this. He stated: "The difference is the difference in exchange rates and the inflation rates during that period," 1993 to 1997.

What type of inflation and exchange rates was the Minister of National Defence predicting for Canada when he told us that $277 million of a $420 million order would be eaten up with inflation and exchange rates?

Hon. Paul Dick (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member will have to talk to the person who made those utterances. All I can tell the Hon. Member is that the contract in question was costed in the dollars of 1992 at the beginning of the contract, and spare parts and other costing figures have to be included.

Mr. Hopkins: At this time we would expect him to know that.

• (1450)

TECHNICAL DATA PACKAGE

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): The Minister stated that the Canadian Forces already had 100 of these vehicles. He said that if we were to ask that some be designed, we would have to start from scratch at considerably greater cost. We now learn that the motor is going to be changed because it lacks power and many other adjustments are going to be made to this vehicle. Why did the Minister not tell us about that when we asked about the extra costs?

Why did the Minister not admit that the technical data package is in the Swedish contractor's office and the Minister's own departmental officials must visit the Swedish firm's consultant to get information and look at the plans because these things do not exist in his own Department? Will the Associate Minister now admit that his own Minister did not know what he was talking about when he gave that information to the House?

Hon. Paul Dick (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Hon. Member that the northern all-terrain vehicle is the only one in existence and it is the one manufactured by Sweden. There happens to be a similar prototype on which the Finns are working, but the only one we in Canada have is a Swedish one. The only one in existence is the Swedish one. Four other NATO countries have that same vehicle. It is a very good all-purpose vehicle.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

SASKATCHEWAN—RAFFERTY AND ALAMEDA DAM—REPORT OF U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of the Environment. The Minister might note that a recent report issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers raises very serious concerns about the building of the Rafferty and Alameda Dam and its effects on water quality. In its report, the Corps of Engineers has rejected the study of the Saskatchewan Government on water quality for being highly simplified, lacking in credibility, and for drawing the wrong conclusions. Why did the Minister issue the licence so that the Saskatchewan Government could start building the dam before the report of the Corps of Engineers was released?

I understand the Minister knew this report was in the making. How can the Minister now trust the Saskatchewan

Government to uphold the water quality conditions of the licence?

Hon. Tom McMillan (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I should point out to the Hon. Member that my decision to approve the permit under the International River Improvements Act was not based on the study with which the Corps of Engineers has taken issue. Very stringent environmental conditions were attached to the permit. There were 13 in all. If any one of those conditions is not met by the Province of Saskatchewan, the permit will be revoked and the power plant will be brought to an end.

Mr. Benjamin: Do you want to bet?

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, that is the very question I was posing. The report of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers shows that the Saskatchewan Government's work in the area in terms of water quality is lacking. How can the Minister trust the Saskatchewan Government to live up to the conditions of the licence when it cannot even produce an honest, unbiased report?

PRESERVATION OF WATER QUALITY IN SOURIS RIVER

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, in the same report, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has determined that water quality in the Souris River will be severely affected by building the Rafferty-Alameda Dam and the reservoir. The report states that the final concern expressed is the effect of the project on the water quality leaving the U.S. for Manitoba.

Some Hon. Members: Speech!

Mr. de Jong: The Boundary Waters Treaty calls for non-degradation of water passed to Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Mr. de Jong: This requirement may not be satisfied with the decreased flow regimes. Again, it appears this project will break the Boundary Waters Treaty. How can the Minister allow the Province of Saskatchewan to proceed when the study shows that the water quality indeed will be lowered? Why does he not refer the question of water quality to the—

Mr. Speaker: I think the question has been quite extensive.

Hon. Tom McMillan (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, obviously the Hon. Member did not listen to my first response. I told him that my decision to issue the permit was not based exclusively on the report he says is flawed. My own Department found the report flawed. We identified some 19 major omissions or problems with the study. On the basis of those 19 flaws, if you will, we specified 13 stringent environmental conditions that would have to be met. If they are not met, the permit will be revoked and the project will be terminated.

ABORTION

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. I want to ask him what his Government's policy is on abortion. After the Supreme Court of Canada struck down the old law almost seven months ago, the Minister of Justice said that legislation would be brought in regulating abortion on an urgent basis and that it would respect the Charter of Rights and Freedoms as defined by the Supreme Court of Canada. Since then there have been two wasteful and misguided government initiatives which have failed to produce anything. The Prime Minister now says that legislation will be brought in at an appropriate time.

After seven months of abortion on demand, thanks to this Government, isn't now an appropriate time? When is the Government going to bring in its legislation?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that a former Solicitor General would ask a question like that, notwithstanding certain important developments before the Supreme Court of Canada in what is a most serious and sensitive issue that has important moral and religious implications for Canadians as a whole and, if I may so, in a very special way for the women of Canada. It is an extremely challenging issue where we would all seek to bring together a position that can be supported by the largest number of people, given the pluralistic society in which we live.

My hon. friend appears to be berating me somewhat for not being more precise than that. I regret that, except to express surprise that he would say that of me when his own Leader indicated that his, his leader's views on this issue were irrelevant.

BOROWSKI HEARING BEFORE SUPREME COURT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): The Prime Minister, I think, is responsible for the Government of Canada and for legislation that is needed on this subject, and the Leader of the Official Opposition did take a position on the resolutions that were brought forward.

Mr. Crosbie: Yes, he ran. He wasn't here.

Mr. Kaplan: I have the communiqué here. He did take a position on the resolutions. It was the Prime Minister who said he had no position on those resolutions. Then he said he would bring forward legislation. I would like to ask him about the Borowski matter. If the Government has not taken a position, why, with no position, does the Government feel justified in going back to the Supreme Court of Canada a second time to try to prevent a private citizen from having a case heard before the Supreme Court of Canada?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Borowski case, the Chief Law Officer of the Crown, the Attorney General of Canada, has

filed, as he must do, a brief in that case setting forth a factum, setting forth the law which the law officers of the Crown feel to be pertinent to the questions in the appeal. His document is a legal submission, Mr. Speaker, not a statement of government policy. It sets forth an analysis of the current state of the law rather than being a statement of what the law might be or should be. That is the position taken by the Attorney General, who, in these matters, must operate independently of the Government. The Government cannot direct the Attorney General, nor the law officers of the Crown, as to what legal opinions they must produce.

They must give their unvarnished legal opinions, undeterred by government policy and separate altogether from any directives or directions of the Government. The Attorney General asked the court to postpone the appeal until Parliament had dealt with the matter so that the questions could be heard in a legislative context. That was his request which the court turned down. The matter is now going forward.

* * *

• (1500)

CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

FRASER VALLEY CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES

Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Communications.

Cable television companies in the Fraser Valley have recently notified their subscribers that they are about to receive additional services. Rates will be increased to cover the cost of three new channels which will be arbitrarily added to the cable service.

In light of the fact that many of my own constituents, especially seniors in the Fraser Valley and I am sure others across the country, do not want the additional channels, could the Minister request the CRTC to re-examine these proposed changes immediately?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, the decision to award licences for new specialty services was taken by the CRTC last November. It included in those series of decisions a structure for the imposition of new tariffs regarding the services.

The CRTC also indicated at that time that the carriage of these services would be by cable but it would not be mandatory. In other words, the services would be carried by the cable distributors based on the requirements of the local market.

The CRTC also at that time did a study indicating that it felt that the over-all rate of the increase of the new tariffs would not be excessive, and the Government in responding to those services and to the appeals therefrom last January did not see fit to vary that decision.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Prince Albert, a single question please.

* * *

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

FUTURE OF REGIONAL OFFICES IN SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, the Government is continuing to reduce services to remote and rural areas of Canada.

Mr. Crosbie: What nonsense.

Mr. Hovdebo: My question is for the Minister of Regional and Industrial Expansion. We have seen a cut in postal and transportation services. Now it has come to light that the Department of Regional and Industrial Expansion intends to close its offices in Prince Albert and La Ronge, Saskatchewan, and in Prince George, British Columbia. These DRIE offices administer the special ARDA and the Regional Economic and Development subsidiary agreements.

Instead of forcing northerners to travel many miles to reach other offices and take advantage of the services there, will the Minister make a commitment today that these three offices will remain open as long as these programs are in effect?

Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I would only like to reassure my hon. colleague that the whole thrust of what this Government is doing in the area of regional development is to decentralize the decision-making process so that regions can make their own decisions that have an effect in those regions.

We have done that with the Western Diversification Office, we have done that with the Atlantic agency, we have done that with Northern Ontario, and we have done it with Quebec. That is the spirit in which the whole program is working.

I will be happy to look into those three specific cases, but let me assure my colleague that decentralization on local decision-making fits perfectly well with the whole thrust of what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker: I want to advise the House there will be a single question from the Hon. Member for Etobicoke North. Then before going into Routine Proceedings, as I think has been arranged among Members, there will be a statement by the Minister for International Trade. The Hon. Member for Etobicoke North.

AIRPORTS

PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—DISPOSAL OF GARBAGE

Mr. Bob Pennock (Etobicoke North): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture. It is my understanding that today Agriculture Canada was going to announce if it would approve the trucking of excess garbage from Pearson Airport to another province for incineration. Every day 19 tonnes of excess garbage builds up at Pearson Airport. Can the Minister tell us whether permission was granted?

Since Hamilton has the capacity to deal with our waste because its incinerator is running at only 50 per cent capacity, can the Minister assure this House that something will be done to prevent Hamilton from holding the safety of this country for ransom by refusing to alleviate this serious, critical health condition?

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, it is true that the airlines have requested permission of the Department of Agriculture to transport the garbage, both compacted and uncompacted, out of the area.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, it is the primary responsibility of the Department of Agriculture to ensure that garbage coming in from international flights is handled in such a way that we can ensure there is no danger of any disease being introduced into Canada which could be a threat to the Canadian agricultural community.

I am advised that the Department this afternoon has requested additional information from the airlines with respect to the proposal. If, indeed, that information is provided and is complete and there is a possibility of the garbage being moved out, and assurance that it will be moved out without any risk to the Canadian agricultural community, then a decision will be announced by the end of the week.

I might also note that the federal Minister of Agriculture, according to my understanding, does not have the power to compel the Hamilton community or any other community to accept that garbage. It may be, however, that Premier Peterson and his colleagues have that responsibility should they choose to exercise it.

Mr. Speaker: As I mentioned, I will recognize the Hon. Minister for International Trade. I think the distinguished spokespersons from the other two Parties will also want to make some remarks. The Hon. Minister.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

TRAGIC DEATH OF PRESIDENT OF PAKISTAN

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, as the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs, I want to say on behalf of the Government and the people of Canada that we are deeply shocked by the news of the tragic death of the President of Pakistan, Zia-ul-Haq and others in an aircraft disaster this morning in Pakistan.

The Government extends its condolences to the people of Pakistan on this sad occasion. Our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) has sent a message of condolence to the Acting President, Ghulam Ishaq Khan. President Zia has had a long and distinguished career in the service of his country. He was deeply committed to the social and economic development of the people of Pakistan and to bringing peace to that troubled area of the world. He will be long remembered for the leadership he provided in assisting the people of Afghanistan in their efforts to restore independence.

His loss comes at a critical time in the history of Pakistan. The Government and people of Canada hope that this tragedy will not affect the further restoration of democracy to Pakistan.

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Official Opposition, I would like to join in the expression of condolence and sympathy on the death of President Zia of Pakistan.

President Zia was known not only for his commitment to his own country and to the establishment of a better life for the people of that country but also for his efforts on the international stage, particularly in that troubled area of the world in Afghanistan where his efforts contributed to the re-establishment of the independence of that country.

It is ironic that this tragedy occurred just at the end of the week of celebration of the independence of Pakistan. I was myself with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) in the City of Toronto where we celebrated the independence in City Hall Square, Toronto, in the presence of Mayor Art Eggleton. On that occasion the Minister and myself saw a wonderful demonstration of the loyalty to Canada and of the dedication to peace and security in Pakistan of the thousands and thousands of Torontonians and Canadians who have come to our country from Pakistan and who now make Canada their homeland.

On their behalf and on behalf of other Canadians and in particular of the Official Opposition, I extend our sympathy and condolence.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the New Democratic Party, I would like to join with the Government in its regret at the news of the violent death of the President of Pakistan, President Zia, and others such as the U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan in the aircraft disaster this morning.

Tabling of Documents

We extend our condolences to the bereaved families involved and to the people of Pakistan. Our thoughts and prayers will be with them in the obviously difficult days which lie ahead. We share the hope, as the Minister himself said, that the road to full restoration of democracy in Pakistan will not be negatively affected by this event.

• (1510)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Government's response to Petitions Nos. 332-4940 to 332-4956 inclusive.

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

* * *

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

TABLING OF INTERIM REPORT OF SUPERINTENDENT OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Speaker, on June 30, I announced in this place that the major banks had decided to act voluntarily to improve their service to customers. It is with great pleasure that I rise today to present an interim report from the Superintendent of Financial Institutions on the compliance of the six major banks with this policy.

Hon. Members will be pleased to note that the sincere efforts being made by financial institutions to enhance their service have also been affected in the last two months. In addition to eliminating certain charges, the banks are providing enhanced disclosure, notifications, and a complaints mechanism to customers. They are in fact acting in advance of the legislation that I have introduced for this purpose.

I would also like to point out that while trust companies have not been surveyed for this report, the major federally regulated trust companies are taking similar actions to those of the banks, and their compliance with the measures will be examined in short order.

POINTS OF ORDER

WITHDRAWAL OF BILL C-292

Mr. W. Paul McCrossan (York-Scarborough): Mr. Speaker, I introduced a Bill to force banks and other financial institutions to institute certain reforms, such as reducing certain charges, providing increased disclosure and providing an effective consumer complaint mechanism. Since my own surveys in the last week and discussions with all the banks have indicated that all six major banks are now fully in compliance with my Bill, I seek unanimous consent of the House to withdraw my Bill from the private members' list which is third in order of precedence.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for York—Scarborough has risen seeking unanimous consent of the House to withdraw his Bill. The Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the request of the Hon. Member. I simply want to make the observation that I feel the initiative he took as a private Member actually put teeth into the committee report. While he might be convinced that the banks have indicated that they have backed off sufficiently, I must say that I reluctantly take his word. I do not have the kind of enthusiastic endorsement for that position as he might have. I have some suspicions that we still have some way to go.

He has requested that the Private Member's Bill be withdrawn, since he is the private Member who sponsored the Bill. We will certainly support his request.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the request. Is there unanimous consent that the Bill be withdrawn?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

ORDER OF PRECEDENCE OF BILL C-264

Mr. Bob Horner (Mississauga North): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Bill C-292 has been withdrawn by unanimous consent of the House, I would like to ask you to seek unanimous consent of the House that Bill C-264, which is presently No. 10 on the private members' list of precedence, be moved up to No. 3 and debated on Monday, August 22 at third reading.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say on behalf of the New Democratic Party, now that there is an opportunity with the withdrawal of the Private Member's Bill regarding bank charges to facilitate the processing of this Bill and to participate in the final debate at third reading, that we are prepared to support this request.

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Liberal Party I wish to add our support to the final debate of this particular initiative by the Hon. Member.

We have indicated throughout that we are prepared to co-operate with respect to this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the request of the Hon. Member for Mississauga North. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

PRESENTATION OF SECOND REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Reginald Stackhouse (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on Human Rights entitled "Human Rights and Aging in Canada".

In accordance with Standing Order 99(2), the committee requests that the Government table a comprehensive response. This report on human rights and aging in Canada shows that Canadians suffer age discrimination in spite of the Charter and the Canadian Human Rights Act forbidding it. This discrimination is felt in the job market where middle aged and older people find that they are an invisible minority denied opportunity because of prejudice based on age.

The report also focuses on how other human rights are denied older people. It includes 17 recommendations to which the Government is asked to respond.

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

* * *

INDIAN ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-150, an Act to amend the Indian Act (death rules).

Mr. Speaker: Shall the Hon. Minister have leave to introduce the said Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

[*Translation*]

RADIO ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications) asked for leave to introduce Bill C-151, An Act to amend the Radio Act and certain other Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to give the Minister leave to introduce the Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Speaker: When shall this Bill be read the second time? At the next sitting of the House?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ALLOTTED DAYS TO CONSIDER REPORT STAGE OF BILL C-130

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the Parties, and I would now indicate to the House something that I usually indicate on Thursdays. It would be the intention of the Government to call day one of the time allocation debate at report stage on Bill C-130 tomorrow, Thursday, and to call day two on Monday of next week. Under those circumstances that would mean that any required divisions and the concurrence motion under the Order passed yesterday would be at 9.45 p.m. on Monday.

However, there have been discussions among the Parties, and I think Your Honour would find unanimous consent for the following motion:

> That further to the Order made on Tuesday, August 16, 1988, relating to the report stage of Bill C-130, an Act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States of America, at no later than 10:00 p.m. on Monday, August 22, 1988, all questions necessary to dispose of the remaining report stage motions shall be put to the House and any demanded divisions, along with divisions already deferred, shall stand deferred until 6:00 p.m. Tuesday, August 23, 1988.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the proposition put forward by the Hon. Minister of State. Is there agreement?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap.

Mr. Riis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Deputy Government House Leader that one appreciates this type of Order to enable us to make the necessary planning, because various Members are in other places other than in the House today.

I wonder if we could make the same request of the Deputy Government House Leader, that he indicate as early as possible when the days for the third reading will also take place, particularly the vote at third reading, again to enable Members of the House of Commons to have ample notification to ensure that they are able to be in Ottawa for that important vote.

Mr. Speaker: Before the Hon. Minister of State deals with the second matter that has been raised, I think I should take the disposition of the House. I gather there was agreement to the suggestion made by the Hon. Minister of State as expressed by the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap.

On the second question, the Hon. Minister of State may wish to comment.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, very much so, Mr. Speaker. In order to enable Members to plan their schedules, we will be coming back to the House—if not tomorrow, perhaps early next week—to advise as to when the final two days of debate would take place. I am open to suggestions on how we can accommodate Members voting at that time.

* * *

• (1520)

PETITIONS

REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF PROPOSED CANADA CHILD CARE ACT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to have the opportunity to present a petition pursuant to Standing Order 106 on behalf of a number of constituents who feel that Canada needs high quality, accessible, and affordable child care services.

They believe that the Child Care Act presently before the House, which we will be debating later today, contains neither national objectives nor the necessary funding arrangements. It will not ensure that families have access to high quality child care. They also feel that the proposed Act is not in the best interests of young children, women, or families and therefore they humbly pray and call upon Parliament to withdraw the Child Care Act forthwith.

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, it happens that I have a petition from a number of residents of Spadina and other constituencies in Toronto who are concerned about the trade deal negotiated between the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the President of the United States. They point out that it threatens the fabric of Canadian sovereignty and that the Prime Minister had no mandate to negotiate it in the first place. It would reduce Canada's ability to plan our economic, social, and cultural programs and integrate Canada further into the North American defence industrial base.

For those reasons they ask Parliament to ensure that a national debate takes place on the Mulroney-Reagan trade deal and that the debate result in a national general election before such an agreement is finalized.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On a point of order, the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap.

Mr. Riis: It is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have a different petition to present. I should have done it at the same time as the previous one, but if I can be recognized I will simply present it now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We can do that by unanimous consent.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, again pursuant to Standing Order 106, I am pleased to present a petition on behalf of a number of petitioners who believe that the fabric of our society is being threatened by the proposed trade deal. They believe that the Government lacks a mandate to negotiate this trade deal with the U.S. and that the deal will reduce our country's ability to plan our economic, social and cultural future.

There are a number of other concerns, but I will simply summarize their final point by saying that they ask for a national debate to take place on the trade deal and that it result in a national general election before the agreement is finalized.

OPPOSITION TO CANADA POST PLANNED ACTION

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I also have the honour to present a petition from a number of people in Canada who have expressed concern with the Government's cut-backs in Canada Post services. They believe that these cut-backs have been detrimental to the service and will consequently be at the expense of consumers. They also believe that many rural post offices are being closed as a result of this policy, cancellation of routes in rural communities have been effected, and there has been a drastic reduction in service for many Canadians.

Therefore, the petitioners humbly call upon Parliament to instruct the Government to make improved services the highest priority of the Canada Post Corporation and abandon the policy of closing rural post offices and urban postal stations.

RESEARCH INTO PREVENTION AND CURE OF SCHIZOPHRENIA

Mr. Ken James (Sarnia—Lambton): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and privilege to present three petitions from persons in my constituency of Sarnia—Lambton. Schizophrenia is a major illness in Canada, affecting about 1 per cent of the population, causing severe mental anguish and suffering to patients and their relatives. It costs Canadian society more than $3 billion annually in direct health care and other support costs.

Schizophrenia patients, their relatives, and friends desperately hope that a cure and method of prevention can be found as soon as possible through larger research efforts dedicated to schizophrenia. The petitioners ask that Parliament ensure that such research efforts reflect the very serious nature of this disease in the future.

REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF PROPOSED CANADA CHILD CARE ACT

Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have the responsibility and privilege of tabling a petition from many citizens in Toronto and district. They say that whereas the Child Care Act proposed by the Government of Canada contains neither national objectives nor necessary funding arrangements, will not ensure that families have access to high quality child care, and whereas the Act is not in the best interests of young children, women, or families, therefore the undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to withdraw the Child Care Act forthwith.

OPPOSITION TO TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OVER IRRIGATION PROJECTS

Mr. Geoff Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and duty to present a petition signed by over 300 residents of southwestern Saskatchewan who express concern over any possible transfer of jurisdiction over irrigation projects in that area from the PFRA to the Saskatchewan Water Corporation. The petitioners point out that this area of southwestern Saskatchewan is drought prone. It is a dry and arid area within the Palliser Triangle, and the management of water is especially important.

They note that the PFRA, for over 50 years, has maintained and operated the irrigation projects in the area in a very satisfactory manner. Accordingly they point out that it is not in the best interests of farm families, small businesses, or rural communities to transfer the administration of and responsibility for irrigation projects in the area from the PFRA to the Saskatchewan Water Corporation.

The petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to retain the PFRA in its present form.

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions to present to the House, comprising approximately 1,500 names from the Province of Nova Scotia primarily, dealing with the trade deal which the Government signed with the U.S.

The petitioners indicate their view that when an issue of such fundamental importance to the future of Canada, as is this proposed trade pact with the U.S., comes before the House of Commons it deserves the fullest possible examination and should not be put into effect before an election permits the people to have a say on the subject.

I also have a petition in a different form from, again, mostly people in Nova Scotia but some in Ottawa as well, perhaps another 250 people who make the point that this proposed trade deal would deny Canada the policy freedom to determine its own economic future and would deny Canadians the secure access which was sought to the U.S. market. Therefore the petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to permit the people of Canada the opportunity to accept or reject the trade agreement.

RESEARCH INTO PREVENTION AND CURE OF SCHIZOPHRENIA

Mr. Anthony Roman (York North): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition on behalf of the York Region Friends of Schizophrenia. They wish to remind Members that schizophrenia is a major illness in Canada, affecting about 1 per cent of the population, causing severe mental anguish and suffering to the patients and their relatives, and costing Canadian society more than $3 billion annually in direct health care and other support costs. They specifically request that research efforts related to schizophrenia be commensurate with the seriousness of the illness.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, Question No. 384 will be answered today.

[*Text*]

FUEL TAX REBATE PROGRAM

Question No. 384—**Mr. Malone:**

Since the 80-20 formula under the Fuel Tax Rebate Program was implemented on June 26, 1986, has the government (*a*) received any revenue from farm fuel taxes and, if so, in what amount (*b*) incurred costs for auditing and administering the taxable portion of farm fuels and, if so, in what amount?

Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of National Revenue): The guidelines for use of the 80-20 formula which the Minister of National Revenue issued on June 26, 1986, simplified claim procedures and the paper burden for farmers who are eligible for the federal fuel tax rebate program. It is not the policy of the department to assess farmers on the basis of the 80-20

formula where farmers have documentation to substantiate the fuel used on highway which is not eligible for the fuel tax rebate. The formula is used for audit only in those instances where farmers use fuel which is eligible for the fuel tax rebate in vehicles licenced for highway use and have no documentation of such highway use of fuel.

Assessments and reductions in amounts claimed by farmers including field audit costs for fiscal years 1986-87 and 1987-88 were as follows:

Fiscal Year	Assessment/Reduction	Field Audit Costs
1986-87	$1,142,747.13	$183,495
1987-88	$1,209,029.19	$169,381
Total	$2,351,776.32	$352,876

[*Translation*]

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the other questions be allowed to stand.

• (1530)

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary will know, as does the Deputy Government House Leader, that Question No. 289 standing in my name has been on the Order Paper since March 15, 1988. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Standing Orders of this House permit the Government only 45 days to respond to a question asked by an Hon. Member. I know that the question I have asked is a terrible embarrassment to the Government, but there is no provision in the rules to allow the Government a greater length of time to answer embarrassing questions.

Why is it that by strange coincidence this very embarrassing question has not been responded to? Why are the rules of the House being breached in such a cavalier manner by the Tories?

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member's behaviour is consistent. He has classified the answer as embarrassing to the Government at the same time as saying that he has not seen the answer. He does not have it because the Government has not provided it. That is consistent with his behaviour over four years. I have watched it time and time again. The Member reaches conclusions on the absence of information, the fabrication of information, and the total creation of information.

In that the Member has the right to ask about the answer to that question-

Mr. Boudria: I have a right to a response.

Mr. Hawkes: —I will undertake to find out exactly what the problem is in terms of answering Question No. 289. I point out that as of August 12 we had answered 93.1 per cent of the questions presented to us. That is a much better record, indeed a fabulous record compared to the record of his Government when it was in control of this Chamber. However, I do not accept the notion that he can classify an answer he has not received as embarrassing to the Government. That is a total fabrication which should be brought to the attention of the Canadian people right now.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, the question to which I am referring is about Mr. Jean Sirois of Quebec. All Canadians will understand that Mr. Jean Sirois is a political embarrassment to the Government. That is not a secret from anyone, regardless of what the answer will contain.

I will agree to allow the questions to stand, provided that the Government respects the rules adopted unanimously by the House wherein there is no provision not to respond to questions within 45 days. It is not good enough to say that the Government is only delinquent seven times out of ten or six times out of ten, or whatever it is. It should observe the rules all the time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary would like to make a short comment to end this matter.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I will try to bring it to a conclusion. I have stood in this Chamber before and answered the inquiries of opposition Members about questions which were slow to be answered. I have told this Chamber, and that Member in particular, that when questions are asked which involve inquiries of every single Department of the Government and every single budget of the Government, it is going to take longer to get an answer. If a series of questions were asked with respect to one Department at a time, we would be in a position to answer more quickly. When the question is asked with regard to every single Department of the Government, we cannot answer the question until we have all the answers back from all the Departments.

Without even making inquiries, I know that part of the problem was created by the form of the question, and the Member has been warned about using that form of question.

Mr. Boudria: You have been warned to respect the rules.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sure the Parliamentary Secretary will do his best to provide the answer as soon as possible.

[*Translation*]

The question enumerated by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary has been answered. Shall the other questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[*English*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall all Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

OFFICIAL REPORT

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw your attention to page 18401 of *Hansard* which reports the speech I made in this Chamber yesterday. During the course of that speech I said that the Opposition, through its dilatory tactics, was wasting the time of this Chamber at about the rate of a half million dollars a day.

When I read *Hansard* this morning I saw that it says "$500 million a day". That is a bit of an exaggeration. If it cost $500 million a day to run this Chamber throughout the sitting days in a normal year that would be very close to the total federal Budget. That is a bit extravagant even for the Parliament of Canada. I listened to the tape and I did say "half a million dollars a day". I suggest that the *Hansard* staff might correct that to read "$500,000 a day" in both the French and English *Hansard*.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary has done some calculations on what our efforts to stop the jamming of this trade legislation through the House of Commons has cost. Has he calculated what it cost the taxpayers of Canada when the Conservative Party of Canada closed down the House of Commons for 16 days and made it impossible for the House of Commons to run day after day after day? Has he made that calculation yet?

Mr. Boudria: What about when they stormed the Speaker's chair? What did that cost?

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADA CHILD CARE ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Thursday, August 11, consideration of the motion of Mr. Epp (Provencher) that Bill C-144, an Act to authorize payments by Canada toward the provision of child care services, and to amend the Canada Assistance Plan in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee; and the amendment of Mrs. Martin:

That this question be now put.

Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to speak in favour of Bill C-144, the Canada child care Bill. It is a double pleasure in that I was part of the special committee which was formed in 1986 and travelled the country to study this very important question and that I took part in the deliberations and putting together of a report for the Minister. While it was not a unanimous report it was, nonetheless, a majority report which has met with very favourable comment from practically all the provinces. The provinces are responding very favourably to the negotiations which are being undertaken by the Minister.

I would like to outline briefly some of the main parts of this Bill. Some $2.3 billion of tax benefits will be spread over one million families. There is a $100 million child care initiatives fund to support applied research and innovation of Canadian child care. There is also $60 million to stimulate the development of accredited on reserve day care for Indian children.

Within the system itself is contained 50 per cent of the provincial and territorial operating costs of their non-profit and commercial services, as well as 75 per cent of the capital costs for non-profit day care services, in other words, to grow more spaces. There is also a special provision for the topping up of this 75 per cent to as high as 90 per cent for those provinces which are not up to speed on child care due to their inability to fund. This will enable those provinces to catch up on their child care expenditures.

In a national child care strategy there is no one single facet with meets the needs of every person. In the final decision child care must rest with parents, and it behoves governments to support parents in their choices.

This afternoon I would like to speak in terms of the criticism which has been brought before the Canadian public of the national child care strategy. It has been argued that more could have been achieved for child care by simply making changes to the Canada Assistance Plan, better known as CAP. This view is far too simplistic.

• (1540)

As we studied the needs of Canadians and looked at all the presentations that came before us, one could rationalize how to assist and make more happen by using the CAP system. When one delves into it, one has to consider why CAP was established and what was its purpose. CAP is a generic act in the sense that its provisions cover the full range of social assistance and welfare service costs which the federal Government shares with the provinces and the territories. To begin to introduce into CAP the new provisions found in the Canada Child Care Act would have resulted in radical changes to the tried and

true provisions of CAP. It was wiser and more responsible to create a new instrument to share in the costs of provincial day care services.

The flexibility and benefits afforded provinces and territories are clearer and greater. We are very cognizant of the fact that the application of child care is a provincial matter. It behoves us as the federal Government not to impinge on the responsibilities of the provinces. I am sure the provinces would not have thanked us if we tried to introduce a measure that would dictate to them something under their jurisdiction.

Consider the benefits which this new Act offers. Sharing in day care services under CAP is limited mainly to the cost of non-profit agencies. Services purchased from the commercial sector can be shared only on behalf of families who qualify for social assistance. Forty per cent of Canadian day care spaces are provided by the commercial sector. Under the Canada child care Bill the federal Government will now share in the cost of provincial operating subsidies to both commercial and non-profit agencies. It does not tell the provinces that they cannot share in profit and non-profit. It leaves the option open to them.

CAP sharing is restricted to subsidies to low income families and those who qualify for social assistance. Under the Canada child care Bill, all children under the age of 15 years are eligible clients. There is no requirement for provinces to needs test or income test the parents of these children. It will be up to parents whether they want to avail themselves of it. The choice is up to the province as well. Our Government believes in people making choices. It is not up to the Government to dictate what these choices should be.

Except in a limited way, CAP does not share in provincial capital expenditures to create and renovate day care spaces. Under the Canada Child Care Act, the federal Government will share 75 per cent of provincial and territorial capital grants and subsidies to their non-profit sectors.

Some provinces have not been able to keep pace with other provinces in their expenditures per child on the creation and maintenance of their child care systems. CAP cannot help them catch up. The Canada child care Bill contains provisions whereby such provinces may qualify for enhanced levels of cost sharing as they catch up. Indeed, they may qualify for a maximum federal contribution to their eligible expenditures of 90 per cent. Under such an agreement, a province would only have to put up one dime for every dollar spent on child care within its borders.

As I noted earlier, CAP shares in a range of services. Additional services under the Canada child care Bill shall be resource and referral services to assist parents so that they can find and obtain quality day care for their children. Also included are public education programs so that parents can be informed of what to look for in a child care agency. Such services will assist parents to be better consumers and to be more demanding of the quality of care for their children.

There has been much discussion of child care standards. There should be consideration of this important matter, but there is no requirement of or reference to standards under CAP. The Canada child care Bill clearly requires as a condition of cost sharing that provinces and territories establish a statutory basis for standards of care in their legislation or regulations, that their standards be publicized and enforced, and that they provide evidence that those standards are being enforced.

Finally, the financial benefits to provinces and territories of the Canada child care Bill are important. Under CAP the federal Government presently shares about 35 per cent of national expenditures on child care, largely because there are limits on the kind of costs which can be shared with the provinces. Through the first seven years under the new Act the federal Government will share in more than 50 per cent of those expenditures and at least 50 per cent in subsequent years.

The federal contributions to provincial and territorial day care costs will increase about twofold in the first year under the new Act and will increase about fivefold in the seventh year.

Finally, it has been repeatedly argued in the House that more new spaces would have been created under CAP than under the new Act. Those who have advanced this argument have obviously not spoken to provincial and territorial Governments.

It is true that the number of day care spaces has increased markedly in recent years. Governments can be proud of this growth and how it reflects their commitment to child care. However, the provinces and territories told us that they could not continue to support recent rates of growth unless new money was injected into the child care sector.

In other words, the growth of day care under CAP had about reached its limits. That is why the Canada child care Bill is before us, to provide the kind of funding that CAP could not. It is to enhance the capacity of provinces to maintain and in some cases accelerate the rates of growth of child care.

In my estimation the advantages of the Canada child care Bill are clear. It will produce more and better day care for Canadian children than could have been achieved under CAP. It has taken us some 15 years to create the first 200,000 subsidized day care spaces in Canada. Under this new Bill it will only take seven years to double the number of spaces.

We also discovered as we travelled across the country that there was not a consensus on to how a solution should be brought about. People suggested that they wanted to be able to have assistance with what would happen to their children. This Bill allows people to have that input. It also takes into consideration the responsibility of the provinces and asks for the co-operation of the provinces.

It is with pleasure that I heartily endorse the Bill before us today and ask the House to send it to committee so that we can ensure that the legislation is finalized and put into law.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, this Conservative Bill and this Conservative child care program will not meet the needs for accessible quality child care in Canada. We have heard a lot of rhetoric by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) exaggerating the benefits of this Bill. However it is mostly just that, rhetoric and window-dressing.

There is no doubt that this Bill will make some slight improvement in child care in Canada, but on the whole the policy is wrong and the program is inadequate. This Bill will not do the job.

The House may ask why this Bill will not do the job. In a nutshell, the Bill provides for 200,000 new subsidized child care spaces in Canada over a period of seven years. However, there is a need in Canada for two million spaces. There are presently over two million Canadian women in the workforce with children under 16 years. Almost one-half are mothers of pre-schoolers who require all-day care. That is why so many day care associations and day care groups in this group have criticized the program. I have here several telegrams and letters from day care groups all across the country asking us not to pass this legislation. In fact, about 30 minutes ago, various Members of this House introduced petitions asking that this House not pass this Bill.

• (1550)

While the Government will be spending $6.4 billion on this program over seven years—not in one year—$2.3 billion of that amount will go to tax assistance, not to increasing child care spaces which is the greatest need. There are presently about 240,000 subsidized child care spaces in Canada. This Bill would provide another 200,000 over seven years, but there is a need for two billion spaces. More seriously, the $2.3 billion in tax assistance will give greater benefit to rich mothers rather than to poor mothers. Again, the greatest need is being ignored. At the present time child care money is being provided through the Canada Assistance Plan. While that system is obviously inadequate, it at least ensures that the money goes to those in greatest need. Under the Canada Assistance Plan the money goes to those Canadian mothers and families with the greatest need, but under the new program there is no such assurance.

The Prime Minister and his Ministers brag about this program, claiming what a great improvement it is because of the provision of $6.4 billion over seven years. It sounds like a lot of money, but when this Government will spend over $8 billion on 10 nuclear submarines, we can obviously see it is not very much. It shows where this Government's priorities are. It is proposing to spend over $8 billion on 10 nuclear submarines and only $6.4 billion over seven years on child care. That will not do the job. It will only provide for 200,000 spaces. If the Government is going to do a job for day care, one would think it would do it right.

We had a task force on child care which was appointed by the Trudeau Government during the last Parliament and headed by Katie Cooke. The task force reported to the new Conservative Government in 1986. Its report recommended that we have a national, fully publicly funded, provincially run child care system taking the present health care and education systems as a model. I ask Members of this House and the public to think about that for a moment.

We have had public education in Canada going back to the early 1920s, and in some provinces before that. At one time, I suppose before the First World War, most education was private. People had to pay. However Canadians decided that public universal education was necessary, and now all children aged five years or over go to public schools free of charge and those schools are paid for by tax money. We would not for one moment think of doing away with that system. I ask Canadians and Members of this House to think of day care in those terms. What we can do is extend that principle whereby we will have facilities for children less than five years of age who do not go to school. We will have facilities and personnel to take care of them while their mothers and fathers are at work, because most of them have to work, and these children can be taken care of in a proper environment.

We accept public education for children from about five years to twenty years, and I think public day care should be an extension of that concept. In this respect, it is rather upsetting to me when I see schools being boarded up or torn down because they are no longer necessary. It would seem to me that we could put those older schools to good use as child care centres and other community organizations. I know that is done in some places, but I still see too many schools which no longer serve a large enough child population being boarded up. Of course, I would also like to see our churches, shopping centres, and so on providing child care centres.

Some Conservative Members in this debate have asked how the Liberals can criticize this program, that when they were in office they did not do as much. In fact, one or two Members have wrongly said that we were in office for 20 years and did nothing. When I came to this House 23 years ago, child care was not an issue. There was not the demand of the 1980s. In the late 1950s and early 1960s there were larger families, fewer single mothers, and fewer mothers in the workforce. In fact, in the 1950s and early 1960s, a greater percentage of mothers stayed at home with their children. However, as we went into the 1970s, there were major social, demographic, and economic changes. Women entered the workforce in greater and greater numbers. Liberal Governments which were faced with that situation responded with tax breaks for child care, first deductions and then tax credits. Then the regulations for the Canada Assistance Plan were amended so that child care centres could be funded under the Canada Assistance Plan.

Finally, the Liberal Government undertook a program of encouraging child care in places of work, including work places under the federal Government. As we came into the election of 1984, that is what was being done. We had a program of tax breaks for child care. We had child care centres financed through the Canada Assistance Plan and we had certain policies for encouraging child care centres in work places and commercial centres.

As we went into the 1980s, it became obvious that this sort of program was not adequate. That is why former Prime Minister Trudeau appointed Katie Cooke to head up a task force to examine how we might put in place a national day care program. In the 1984 election campaign, in that famous women's debate, all Parties promised improvements in dealing with the day care situation. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives won that election with an overwhelming majority, and since 1984 we have been waiting for them to carry out the promises they made in that election campaign. Four years went by and we did not get a Bill on this issue until July 25, 1988, just about a month ago. Perhaps negotiations and some spade work was going on behind the scenes, but in fact we had no new programs put into effect until this Bill on July 25, one month ago.

The Conservatives have spent almost four years preparing a program they promised in 1984, and it ends up being a half measure, a measure which will not do the job adequately. When Liberal Governments brought in medicare in 1966 they did it right. They did not bring in a half measure. They brought in a program that has turned out to be one of the best medicare programs in the world. It is a universal, comprehensive, portable, publicly funded program.

• (1600)

While those four principles are laid down in the federal legislation, and the federal Government funds the provincial programs up to 50 per cent, medicare is administered by the provinces. Medical health care is principally a provincial area of jurisdiction, but nevertheless the federal Government is funding medicare and stimulates the creation of the medicare program through that federal legislation and provides the four principles in the legislation which the provinces had to meet in order to get the federal money.

Beyond that, when certain Tory Governments in the 1980s tried to circumvent those principles by permitting extra billing and user fees in the last Parliament, a Liberal Government stopped that to keep the program public and universal. I simply refer to the medicare program to point out that that is the way we did it on medicare. We would approach day care in the same way.

As I said, this Bill is a half measure. It only provides for about 10 per cent of the spaces that are required. It does not help those who need help most. It contains no national objectives or guiding principles to assure equality of treatment in all provinces. It does not deal at all with the problem of latchkey children, that is, younger children who go to school in the daytime but must go home to an empty house where there is no mother and father because the mother and father are working, usually because they have to work to make ends meet. These children are left alone from 3 p.m. or 3.30 p.m. until the parents come home. There is no provision in the Bill for that, although it was recommended that something be done.

Finally, this Bill contains a ceiling on what can be spent for child care centres, a ceiling which did not exist before.

We have had a great deal of Tory rhetoric during this debate about this Bill. But when all is said and done, if the Bill is passed there will still be a crying need for quality child care in Canada. There will still be a crying need for child care in Canada because it will only deal with about 10 per cent of the problem. This Bill will not do the job.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there questions or comments? The Chair recognizes the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley East.

Mr. Belsher: Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East (Mr. Allmand). I was quite intrigued with his conclusion that two million spaces are needed. He is assuming that everyone who works wants to have their children in a day care program. That is not the case.

He also went on at great lengths about the Katie Cooke task force and its report. Yet I find it ironic in that he forgot to mention the dollar figure that is attached to that report. The report recommended that a universal system be put into place which would cost up to $8 billion per year for the two senior levels of government. I guess this is the irresponsibility of the Liberal Party that it does not matter how much one spends and how big the deficit grows. However, we are trying to work within fiscal responsibility. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) whom we have had for this past four years has hit his targets every time he has put before this House his Budget in terms of the amount of reduction of the growth of the deficit. The deficit is still with us and still growing. We have brought forward a Bill which deals within the fiscal framework of what we have in our country.

Are the Liberals not aware that the Hon. Member mentioned a good suggestion which I might point out about the schools that are closed and which could be converted to day care centres? I see nothing in this legislation that would not permit a non-profit organization from putting the capital costs it is eligible to receive through its provincial system for renovating schools into this system. I would like to ask the Hon. Member if Liberals are not aware that that provision is there. Churches can do it. Any non-profit organization can take advantage of the capital costs that are available to them.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, yes, I was aware of that. In my remarks I was simply deploring the fact that too often school buildings are closed and are not used for community purposes.

With respect to the main point in the Hon. Member's question concerning the cost of the program, my understanding is that the Katie Cooke program—and she mentioned the figure herself—would cost about $9 billion. While I think the principal recommendations in the Katie Cooke report are worth while to consider, we in the Liberal Party have not accepted the total proposal of that report. We believe in our alternative plan, a plan that was put out by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Outremont (Mrs. Pépin) entitled "Choices for child care now and in the future, a Liberal minority report on child care". We propose that people in the upper income brackets pay up to at least 50 per cent of the costs out of their own pockets. We also suggest that there should be refundable tax credits in place of tax deductions. This is one of my criticisms of the Bill before us.

In the Bill before us we are concerned about the money being spent. Part of the money, as I pointed out, is about $2.3 billion which is through tax deductions and tax credits. We do not believe that tax deductions are a proper way to go because tax deductions help those in the upper income brackets rather than those in the lower income brackets. Our plan would be restricted to tax credits, refundable tax credits which would help those in the lower income brackets rather than those in the upper income brackets.

It becomes not simply a question of spending large sums of money, but it becomes a question of how we spend the limited amount of money we have so that we best meet the needs of the Canadian population. The principal need right now is to increase the number of spaces and to help those on lower and middle incomes. A lot of the need is with respect to single mothers who must go out to work if they are going to stay off welfare. I think we would all encourage that they work rather than stay on welfare. Their incomes on the whole are much lower than those of men and other women. Thus, if we are to use the money available in the best possible way, then we should not have tax deductions. We should have a full tax credit system combined with moneys that will increase the number of spaces.

I just want to make clear that therefore our alternative is partially based on Katie Cooke's report but not totally.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member has a credibility problem. In the old days he had his interests in the manpower policy. We had 10 per cent of the unemployed people in the country living in the Province of Alberta, and he supported a Government that gave us 1 per cent of the funds. That was his view of what was best for all Canadians.

He made clear to this Chamber today that he thought what this Government was doing was not sufficient and that it should spend better. Child tax credits are better than deductions.

When this system is in place, child tax credits will double for lower income Canadians. Those with young children will get double what the Hon. Member's Government made available. Child services in the next six years will be better than double what was provided in the last six years of his Government. How can the Hon. Member stand in this Chamber and tell us we are not doing enough without providing this Chamber with solid evidence that he severely condemns the Liberal Government in terms of child care? If doubling is not enough on the two things the Hon. Member thinks are more important, how could he have stayed in the Chamber over 15 or 20 years and supported the previous Government and what it was doing for children?

• (1610)

The Hon. Member states that it is not enough and that we need two million new places. I challenge him to stand in the Chamber and tell us what is his schedule for providing two million new spaces, and then tell us the cost. Is the money to be borrowed in order that future generations, those same children, have to pay the interest on the public debt, or will some other services be cut in the system? Will the Hon. Member tell us what the cost will be for the two million new spaces, how the money will be found, and what the schedule will be to produce those spaces?

Mr. Allmand: In my remarks I explained that the whole problem of child care has been a developing question. When I first came to Parliament in 1965 it was not an issue. It became an issue through the 1970s, and it became more acute in the 1980s because there were more single mothers, smaller families, and more mothers were working. As a result, in the last Parliament the Liberal Government, recognizing that what was in place was not adequate, appointed the Katie Cooke task force. There was a clear recognition that what we had tried up to that time was not adequate. First, we met the problem with tax deductions and tax credits, and then we moved to the Canada Assistance Plan. I was in the House and there was not a hue and cry from Conservative Members at that time to go much beyond that because the demand was developing. However, in the 1980s it became pretty clear that the demographics and social situation in Canada had changed. That is why the previous Government appointed the Katie Cooke task force. I do not favour all her recommendations, as I said to the Hon. Member on the last question. As the problem became more acute what we tried before was not adequate.

In the federal election in 1984, in the famous women's debate, all Parties promised to deal with this growing problem in a more responsible and adequate manner. We have an alternative program. Anyone can have a copy of the Liberal Party policy on child care by contacting our Party or the Hon. Member for Outremont. When we did our calculations it came to approximately $5 billion, but that has to be updated.

I find it amusing that the Parliamentary Secretary asks that question, because with all the resources of the Government it took it four years to put in place its policy after negotiating with the provinces. When the Minister first announced the policy in January, the provinces told him that was not enough,

so he had to amend his proposals and add more money. Obviously it is not easy to cost these proposals. I want to assure the Hon. Member that we will update our costing on this proposal shortly, and when we go into an election it will be very specific with respect to costing.

The program being put forward by the Conservative Government is a half measure and it will not do the job. If it is passed as it is, there will still be a hue and cry in the country for something more adequate. We are committed to filling that need over a period of time. The Government is taking seven years in this particular program and I presume that that would be a first stage. Obviously it has to be staged, and even the new New Democratic proposal is over a four-year period. It is obvious that this cannot be done overnight.

Mr. Epp (Provencher): I would like to ask the Hon. Member one question. In the minority report of the Liberal Party on child care, the Party committed itself to expansion of child care in those years where the federal deficit would go down. That is contained in the report. Since 1969, when the Liberals have been in office, the deficit has gone up every year except in 1979 when they were in office for three months of those twelve months. Could the Member explain how the Liberal Party intends to expand child care if those conditions prevail?

Mr. Allmand: I agree with the Hon. Member that it could not be expanded very much under those conditions. There has been an update and in the update that is not contained, and this is made even more specific. The minority report was published in March, 1987, following the report of the Martin committee. It is fairly obvious, if there is going to be a national program with so many unforeseen emergencies, that it cannot be expanded under those conditions. I would agree with the Minister on that point.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Suzanne Duplessis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Science and Technology)): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take part in this debate, since I support wholeheartedly what the Government is trying to accomplish with its national strategy on child care and the instrument it intends to use, and I am referring to the Canada Child Care Act, to establish terms for co-operation with the provinces.

The whole issue of improving day care will have to be considered in terms of the kind of relations that should exist at various levels. At the most important stage, the actual provision of care to Canadian children, good working relations must exist between parents and day care staff and management. The federal and provincial governments will of course have to work as a team to harmonize their programs and ensure that both intermediate and general objectives are reasonable and realistic. Finally, the Government's policy must take its cue from the needs of parents and families.

Mr. Speaker, the national strategy on child care launched by the federal Government responds to this need for concerted action in a far more satisfactory manner than any of the measures proposed by other levels of government, by pressure groups or by the Hon. Members opposite.

As I see it, our strategy is the most practical response for two reasons. First of all, it meets the needs of children, women, parents and families, which is the guiding principle of the federal Government's commitment. Furthermore, the policy is designed in such a way that all Canadians, in all regions and provinces, are treated equitably.

The issue of what should be done to improve child care services in Canada has been the subject of a great deal of debate, protest and fault finding. However, if we listen very carefully to what is being said by pressure groups and Members of the Opposition, we soon realize it does not reflect the views of the Canadian people and shows utter disregard for the real needs of Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, during the debate on this Bill so far, we have heard the same platitudes, the same erroneous definitions of needs and the same ideological positions that in the past two years have been typical of the Opposition's approach to child care. I think the time has come to stop and reflect on a more realistic perspective for this debate. That being said, I would like to talk about what Canadians are thinking and what parents want, so that we can consider the Government's initiative in its true light.

In Canada, all parents accept responsibility for looking after their children. No Member in this House would deny this fundamental aspect of our family life. Not only do parents accept this responsibility, they are bound to do so. That is the basis of our family law and of much of our penal law in this country.

Although all Canadians have a number of fundamental values in common, their living habits are different, customs vary from region to region, from city to city and even from family to family, and their heritage consists of values and traditions from many countries the world over.

• (1620)

They want to bring up their children their way, without having government bodies telling them what to do and how to behave. Mr. Speaker, we all know the truth of that.

So when it comes to day care services, why would we suppose that this natural tendency does not exist, when indeed it does? Parents want to make their own choice based on their needs and those of their children. They do not want to be told by the Government, and especially a government as remote from them as the federal Government, that there is only one way for child care and one system that the Government is prepared to subsidize.

To say the opposite is sheer idiocy. There is not a single Member in this House who does not remember cases where

previous administrations tried to tell the Canadian people that there was only one way to proceed. Canadians have always rebelled at that because it goes against their will. I am constantly amazed by the people opposite who, on the one hand, spend a great deal of their time promoting the pluralism and multiculturalism of Canadian society and, on the other, require that all Canadians subscribe to a specific, rigid line of conduct.

These Members demand that the federal Government establish a universal, institutionalized child care system without considering the many ways Canadians take care of their children. They are also the ones who say that the Government must not allow parents to stay at home to look after their children, if that is their wish, or to leave their children in the care of an unofficial service, a family member or a neighbour if that works better for them.

The Canadian people also recognize that paying for child care services is first of all the parents' responsibility. Parents want some help, because paying for child care services can be quite a heavy financial burden for a family. But there is no doubt that they want this assistance given to them on their own terms.

Mr. Speaker, most Canadian families would reject government assistance if it meant having to raise their children the way the Government feels they should.

If you look at the Government's child care strategy from this perspective, you will immediately realize how well adapted it is to the way Canadian families live and what they believe in. The strategy supports all child care options, from fully subsidized spaces to parents who choose to pay the total cost of official services in a private setting, and includes those who decide to stay at home because they believe that this is best for their family.

The purpose of the national child care strategy is not to restrict the options available to parents and families; rather, it is meant to help parents choose the solution best suited to their family's needs and to ensure that these options are less costly, whatever the family's financial situation. The tax measures announced as part of the strategy provide tax credits as well as higher deductions for child care expenses as ways to keep parents' child care options open.

Canadians are extremely well disposed to the need for subsidized day care spaces, especially for single-parent families. No parent who has had to look for a quality space for her or his children denies the need for more such spaces, subsidized or not.

In its strategy, the Government is committed to doubling the number of subsidized spaces over the next seven years. This means that if this goal is reached, the number will increase from 200,000 to 400,000 during the period of growth envisaged by the strategy and the Bill now being debated. But hold on, it does not mean that Canada will have only 400,000 day care spaces all told. Indeed these will be the only spaces for which the federal and provincial governments will pay all or most installation costs.

Complementary family day care facilities are not included in these figures, nor are neighbouring services or more formal private services which are now completely paid for by parents. Thanks to higher day care tax deductions, private services will become less of a financial drain on Canadian families. The resulting stronger demand might trigger a virtual explosion of the number of spaces made available this way.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that when consumers pick up the whole tab for a readily available service it has to live up to their expectations. If on top of that you consider the legislative provisions under which the provinces are required to define and implement child care service standards, I would suggest that parents will be surprised to find out how quickly day care services—public and private alike—will meet the requirements of parents, communities, and provincial authorities.

When it comes to child care services, Canadians have taken a pragmatic approach, as they did in connection with a number of other social issue. Canadians do not believe that the problem can be solved overnight, nor that a mere statement of principle by the Government will solve everything. I do not think that people are overly concerned whether a day care service is operated by a non-profit organization or by a commercial undertaking. The bottom line is not who runs the operation but how good are the services available.

Of course if there is one aspect about which all parents see eye to eye it has to be the need to improve the quality of child care services throughout the country. Mr. Speaker, this should not be interpreted to imply that existing services are downright inferior and fail to meet the basic needs of children, quite the contrary. This is just another indication that parents want their children to have the best they can afford, and this includes quality services when they simply cannot personally look after their children.

Under Section 4 of the Bill, the federal Government is firmly committed to improving child care standards in very many respects: child/person ratios, parent participation, health and safety measures, programming, to name only a few. However, a practical and realistic approach had to be designed in relation to child care standards. Canadians don't want arbitrary standards to be forced upon them as if they did not know what is best for their children.

I believe parents want to be sure that child care standards reflect their values as well as those of the communities and the regions where they live and to which they relate. In other words, Mr. Speaker, parents want to have a say in the quality standards which will apply to the care their children will be receiving.

I challenge any Member of this House to say that he or she knows what are the needs and concerns of Canadian parents. Once you have said child care services must conform to the highest quality standards, you can say no more without

infringing on the parents' right to define what they believe to be the best for their children. All Hon. Members with young children know that this is true, no matter what they may claim during this debate.

• (1630)

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Canadians have indicated that they are prepared to support the extension of child care services everywhere in Canada. Recent surveys have shown that even Canadians without children recognize the important social and economic benefits which may result from more accessible and better quality child care services.

They will not really mind if Governments, both federal and provincial, invest large amounts of taxpayers money to enhance the child care system as long as they can ascertain that these expenses will achieve realistic goals and are shared equitably.

Many Canadians feel that subsidized day care government programs meet the needs of low-income families and that higher-income Canadians can provide for their own children. Those who need assistance most are the middle-income Canadian families where both working parents can hardly keep up their standard of living. Anyone who has carefully examined every aspect of the national strategy will clearly realize that the federal Government has not overlooked middle-income Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, we can all recognize that there are many special needs which current child care services cannot fully satisfy now. After all, it is only under this Government that child care was upgraded from a social welfare service to a social service. This Governement has recognized that child care is in a state of infancy as a social service and that in the future there will be a tremendous development and a great many changes similar to those provided to senior citizens.

The Government has shown leadership in these areas, just as it did in the case of the Child Care Special Initiatives Fund, the purpose of which is to support the solutions proposed by various communities to meet special needs. Canada's history is filled with examples of Canadians, working within small communities who have found solutions to many challenging social problems to various Governments.

It seems to me that the people opposite should look up Canada's history before requiring the federal Government to find solutions to meet all the various needs and values of Canadians.

As I pointed out, a feature of the national child care strategy is the good partnership that was made possible thanks to this Government. This is true both in terms of the needs and interests of Canadian families and our relations with provincial authorities, because let us not forget that the latter are responsible for child care services and programs.

Under the legislation, the Canadian Government is taking the initiative to increase and improve child care services. But in so doing it is respecting the roles of provinces, taking into account provincial programs and services, while making it possible to reach realistic goals within a relatively short timeframe. To those who demand a unilateral stand from the Canadian Government, something that flies in the face of established usage, and also centrally imposed criteria, I say: Stand up and explain two things. How will you operate the system, since you do not even have any right to act in that area in the first place? And then, how will you convince the large majority of Canadian families that they should pay for a system they will never use?

Let me make this clear, Mr. Speaker—I am not asking them to come and air their political rhetoric or ideological stands. What I am asking for is that they come up with a workable, affordable and feasible plan Canadian taxpayers and provinces can afford. I have yet to hear something in this debate that will convince me Opposition Members have found solutions that are more logical than the strategy put forward by this administration.

It is not difficult to trumpet that this Government should do this or that. It is not difficult either to glean figures here and there and use them to support a position, even if those figures have little basis in fact. But we must be careful about something. Figures should not be interpreted in a self-serving manner.

The solutions to Canada's social and economic problems lie in a balanced approach; we must be responsive to the needs of the various regions and provinces, and we must have a good partnership I was referring to earlier. This is how this country operates, and this is why this general legislation meets the needs of Canadian families as no other could.

I urge my colleagues in this House to put aside for a moment their political restraints in order to look at our children's genuine needs. In this pre-election period, it is very easy to promise people a cure-all solution. Will that solution however improve the quality of child care services? Will it create one single extra place in our current child care system? No.

I do not even believe, Mr. Speaker, it would bring us one extra vote.

Mr. Kindy: Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Hon. Member for Louis-Hébert (Mrs. Duplessis) on her very good speech. I think she made points that were quite logical and most relevant on the proper way to raise children.

Children, as we know, need love and attention. They can get it in their homes. That is where young children belong. We are well aware of the psychological problems experienced later in life by children who are put under care as soon as they are born. That is why the main objective of a social policy aimed at children must be to keep them with their families. There are exceptional cases where parents must work outside the home. The Government has a responsibility to help them, and that is where a federal public day care policy is required.

In Alberta, for instance, we have an abundance of day care spaces, a matter that comes under provincial jurisdiction. The federal Government must provide help across Canada, in poor regions that are economically unable to set up services. Transfer payments must therefore be made by the Federal Government. That is how we should consider this Bill. The legislation must be balanced and must provide help in those marginal cases where the mother must stay home because she has several children. Tax credits must be added for those families.

Those are the comments I wanted to make. I wanted also to congratulate the Hon. Member for Louis-Hébert on her excellent speech.

[*English*]

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having this opportunity to say a few words on this important issue of child care. I want to begin my remarks by recalling an incident in Kamloops during the 1984 election campaign when the now Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) visited Kamloops. He went on at some length at a public meeting about all of the wonderful initiatives that his Government would take in providing adequate child care to meet the needs of Canadian families and that it was one of his top priorities.

Here we are on the eve of an election call, four years later, and we are now just beginning to talk about legislation. But, this legislation before us is seriously and fundamentally flawed. It is actually a step backward in time. What the Government is providing is a complete and total smoke-screen because what we will get as a result of this so-called child care Bill is something worse than what we have today. Let me outline why I say that.

First I want to prick one big balloon myth that has been floating around. The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) has said on many occasions that this package will add $6.4 billion over seven years to provide child care in Canada.

• (1640)

I want to quote from Marjorie Nichols column in The Ottawa *Citizen* of August 17, 1988. If there is one journalist we all hold in high esteem, it is Marjorie Nichols. If there is one journalist whose work appears in newspapers across the country, who appears on national television regularly as a commentator on the Government's work, it is Marjorie Nichols. She says that the Bill before the Commons would provide for about $2.6 billion in new federal funds for child care. Not $6.4 billion but $2.6 billion. I just wanted to put on the record very clearly that the Minister of National Health and Welfare is not doing what he says he is doing. I would not say he is intentionally misleading Canadians, but I would come awfully close to saying that.

What is the situation? We have a crisis in child care and there is no other word for it. There is not a Member of Parliament who does not have a long list of experiences with constituents who are forced to work and, therefore, know the tragedy of having to leave their young children with baby-sitters and so on. They get up at seven o'clock in the morning only to find their baby-sitter has gone on holidays and forgot to tell them, or is sick and cannot take their young children and they have to find someone else before they can go to work. There are all sorts of absolute horror stories that people are forced to contend with because the Government has not acted.

I have two letters here from constituents, one of which says:

> I am a single mother with two children living in Dallas.

That is a suburb of Kamloops, not Dallas, Texas. It says:

> I have a part-time job working about 30 hours a week and make only $1100 a month, yet I am required to pay out $610 a month for child care for my children. It is good care for my children and I applaud the care givers, but, Mr. Riis, I can hardly afford it. How can I continue? Have you any advice?

I will not read her name because I have not asked her permission to read the letter into the record, but she is a constituent. The other letter says:

> My husband and I own a small cattle ranch and my husband is forced to work out at Tumbler Ridge—

I should say that Tumbler Ridge is a coal mining area in British Columbia which is obviously away from their ranch. It says:

> —due to the bank problems that you are well aware of. The problem is that while I have managed to get a part-time job, there are no daycare facilities for our three children all under the age of seven. I hope in your attempts to get the Government to introduce more support for child care that you remember those of us who live in rural areas or small towns who desperately need daycare if we are to survive.

These letters are typical of the dozens of letters that constituents write to us vividly detailing the crisis they face on a personal basis. This has mushroomed into a national crisis. If you look at the situation in 1988, according to the national day care information centre there are 2,103,450 children whose parents work or study full time. How many licensed child care spaces are there in Canada? Only 243,000. In other words, less than 12 per cent of those who may need licensed child care spaces have them available. The province I am proud to represent from the constituency of Kamloops—Shuswap requires more than 150,000 day care spaces just to meet present needs. There are only 243,000 all across Canada. That is why I call it a crisis. Adequate child care spaces in Canada simply do not exist.

When we talk about child care we are going beyond simply day care spaces. We all recognize that significant numbers of day care spaces are available but there are also other forms of child care, including family home child care which we must develop. We must develop before and after school care. We must develop neighbourhood drop-in child care centres for young children and their parents. We see the development of essentially a resource centre to help people raising their children. We need 24 hour child care for those who have to work shifts or leave home for one or two days a week because of their jobs, such as selling and so on. We need weekend care

facilities, particularly for single parents who on occasion simply must have a break. A weekend child care facility would provide that. We need toy lending libraries. We need part-time care and play groups. I could go on and on.

What is required under the general umbrella of child care is simply much more than day care spaces. I could talk about the need for enhanced maternity and parental benefits in our system or the fact we need paid family responsibility leave under the Canada Labour Code. Obviously the crisis is here. The need for action is now yet the Government is going backward. It is not introducing legislation to advance these services which are so desperately required. I say that in a country which has over 2 million young people in need of some kind of care or other, to have only 243,000 child care spaces obviously means the situation is totally and completely inadequate.

I suppose that is why when the National Action Committee on the Status of Women appeared before Members of Parliament not long ago they had very strong criticisms of the federal Government with respect to the lack of action over the last one, two, three or four years of the federal Government's administration. I remember that day in Kamloops when the Prime Minister said: "We have this at the top of our list of priorities". Even today, nothing has been done and now we are going to start worsening the situation through this legislation. That is why I say at the outset that I oppose the legislation. It is unamendable. You cannot improve it because it is such a disaster. I oppose it and hope the Government will bring in something that will actually begin to meet the crisis. It is not an easy situation to resolve. It will take many years. However, let us start building a good strong base today.

One of the things that the legislation will do is create 200,000 child care spaces over the next seven years. That sounds good to you and I, but under existing programs a lot more than that would be created. For example, in 1980 we had 109,000 child care spaces in Canada. In 1986 it had increased to 220,000. This year it is as high as 243,000. Over seven years, if we are to apply this same increase of 15 per cent each year, we would create over 500,000 spaces seven years from now. Under the government program we will only create an extra 200,000, which means we will have fewer child care spaces than under the present system.

Under the federal Government's program the number of child care spaces over the next seven years would increase at a rate of 10 per cent. Under present conditions, using the Canada Assistance Plan, it would increase at 15 per cent year over year for seven years. That is why I say we are going backward. The federal Government is worsening the situation. In addition, this legislation puts a cap on spending. After seven years, that is it. Of course, we will in no way be meeting the situation with this program, yet the Government says there will be no further expenditure. At least, that is the best information available today.

Another problem is that there will be no national guidelines or objectives. In other words, we will have one day care system in British Columbia, another one in P.E.I., a different one in Alberta, something different in Ontario and something totally different in Nova Scotia. We will have this patchwork of social programs for day care. That is not the way to run a country. That is not the way to provide leadership. Can you imagine if we had different family allowance cheques going out in different amounts in every province? Or, a different pension system in every province? Or, a different medicare system in every province? That is not a country, that is a hodge-podge. In her column a few days ago Marjorie Nichols said that the Government will rip the country apart by allowing different child care systems in each province of Canada.

• (1650)

In some provinces that might not be a bad deal, but I have no faith at all that Bill Vander Zalm in British Columbia will spend the money from the federal Government to enhance child care. As a matter of fact, Mr. Vander Zalm is on record as saying that if he gets the money, he does not know what he is going to spend it on. He has said that he is not going to spend it on operating funds. In other words, he might create a few extra spaces but the provincial Government will not give any money to operate those day care centres. I shudder at the thought of Bill Vander Zalm in charge of child care in British Columbia. Yet, that is what this particular legislation creates. We are obviously not very keen on that.

Let us look at the status quo in British Columbia and Alberta. In British Columbia there presently exist about 10,000 non-profit child care spaces and about 4,500 commercial child care spaces for a total of 14,500 child care spaces. In the Province of Alberta there are 824 public child care spaces, another 7,000 non-profit child care spaces, and an additional nearly 30,000 commercial spaces for a total of nearly 38,000 child care spaces. The Province of Alberta, therefore, has 38,000 child care spaces while over the mountains in a larger province, there are only 14,000 child care spaces. Therefore, even now we have a serious imbalance in what is provided to parents with young families in those two provinces. I could go through the list for every province in Canada.

We presently see two problems. One is the overwhelming lack of spaces for children in need of licensed child care facilities and the lack of federal standards to ensure that children have the same opportunities whether they live in British Columbia, the Northwest Territories, or Prince Edward Island. There is a lack of the federal leadership which is so desperately needed today.

Another problem is that, of the money being provided by the federal Government, $2.4 billion will be used through the tax system. With the way things are in Canada today, a low income family, particularly one headed by a single parent, probably does not pay any income tax. They are not likely to be in a taxable situation. If you do not pay any income tax, a tax break is of no benefit to you. To be fair, the doubling of the

child care expense deduction will ease the situation for middle and upper-income families.

If the $2.4 billion to be used through the tax system, which will obviously benefit the middle and upper-income Canadian family, were used in the development of child care spaces we could develop another 170,000 child care spaces. That is the situation which I believe most Canadians would like to see in order to help the families most in need.

The legislation does provide some money for the low-income family. To help with baby-sitting the Government is going to give them an extra $200 a year. If you have five kids and are trying to find a way to get along, $200 a year for baby-sitting is almost a slap in the face.

However, we should not be surprised at this because it is this Government which brought in deindexing. It deindexed family allowance increases, child tax credit increases, and the child tax credit.

Mr. Kaplan: It's the opposite of Ronald Reagan.

Mr. Riis: My friend says that this is the opposite of Ronald Reagan's action. As a result of the Conservative Government's deindexation, rather than the family allowance going up with the cost of living, the costs go up but the family allowance cheque does not go up by the same amount. As a matter of fact, in 1988 $55 million which would normally go to parents in the form of family allowance cheques will not be paid out. The federal Government will keep it for nuclear submarines or whatever else it may want to use it for. The same is true for millions and millions of dollars under the child tax credit and millions and millions of dollars under the child tax exemption.

When you add up the money which has been taken out of the hands of Canada's children by the Government this year alone, it comes to $900 million. By 1992 that will total $1.7 billion. Thanks to our Prime Minister, $1.7 billion which should be going to the children of Canada is not going to them any longer. We should not be shocked that the Conservative Government does not seem to be making much of a progressive move on child care.

The country obviously needs a comprehensive child care policy which would be the first major national social program since medicare. We must approach child care as a Medicare II. At the urging of the NDP and CCF provincial Governments of the day and NDP and CCF Members of the House of Commons, Canadians took a major leap of faith and said that we should have medicare as other countries had. We finally got that and we should now be doing the same with child care in order that every young boy and girl in this country who requires child care has it available to them.

We need a comprehensive child care policy which will provide federal leadership to the provinces in order to have a uniform system across Canada so that boys and girls in Newfoundland and boys and girls in British Columbia will have the same kinds of opportunities. We need program criteria for funding set by national objectives and national standards to accomplish this.

The Government says that we should leave it to the market-place, that if there is a need it will be filled. Well, there obviously is a need and it is not being filled. The Americans have left it to the market-place, and we know the situation in the United States. There are tens of millions of young children in the United States desperately in need of decent child care. We should look to western Europe where decent child care systems have been in place for many, many years.

To summarize, I suggest that we not leave this to the provinces to decide. The most recent study done on this by the parliamentary sub-committee on child care said that the Government should not be funding new commercial services through capital or operating grants or fee subsidies or any other means. It said that if we are interested in creating a real child care system, the time has come to use this energy within a non-profit structure. I think that should be our model.

I could and should go on much longer, Mr. Speaker, but you are indicating, unfortunately, that my time is up. The Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Ms. Mitchell), a Member of the New Democratic Party, spent her entire lifetime caring for people and developing programs to support children. She represented the New Democrats on the standing committee which examined this issue. She wrote her own report entitled "Caring for Canada's Children" in March of 1987 outlining all the details which the New Democratic Party feels ought to be considered on this issue. If you, Mr. Speaker, or others would like a copy of that report, you can certainly obtain a copy to learn what New Democrats have in mind for a comprehensive first-rate child care policy for Canada in 1988.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order! The Hon. Member for Louis-Hébert (Mrs. Duplessis) has the floor for a question or comment.

Mrs. Duplessis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis), since the New Democratic Party's long term goal is to establish a network of non-profit day care centres that will be fully subsidized by the State and accessible to all.

We looked very carefully at the day-care policy announced by the NDP. The New Democratic Party would establish this network in three stages. The first stage, until 1992, would involve establishing a system of direct operating and capital grants for the provinces and territories, in order to stabilize existing services, promote the development of new services, provide for new or expanded facilities or equipment, promote services for children with special needs, and improve wages and social benefits of care-givers. Grants would be approved only for licensed non-profit day care, and operating subsidies would be structured as follows: $8 per day for a handicapped child, $5 a day for toddlers or children with special needs, $4 per day for a school age child or when there is no school, and

$2 per day for a child who goes to day care after school or for half days. According to the capital grants system recommended by the New Democratic Party, $1,500 would be provided for a handicapped child, $1,000 for a pre-schooler, $500 for a school age child and $500 for a child in home day-care.

What bothers us a little is that the budget for the first year would provide $247 million in operating grants and $21 million in capital grants.

If the average operating grant is $4 per day and the average capital grant is $1,000, the budget for the first year would subsidize 237,000 licensed spaces and create only 21,000 new spaces.

In March of this year, we had 243,545 licensed day care spaces in this country, of which 153,159 were spaces in non-profit day care or home day care. Between March 1986 and March 1987, the number of licensed spaces increased by 23,000, and the number of spaces in non-profit day care and home day care increased by 12,334 spaces.

If the budget for the first year is maintained in constant dollars for five years, by the end of 1992 only 105,000 new spaces in non-profit day care would be created under the NDP plan.

My question for the Hon. Member is this: If, as his Party claims, we urgently need 1.8 million additional licensed day care spaces, why does the New Democratic Party plan to fill only 1.2 per cent of this requirement during the first year of its program?

• (1700)

[*English*]

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the serious question by the Hon. Member. She outlined some areas that I did not have a chance to pursue.

Of course one of our top priorities would be to improve the wages for care givers, the people employed in child care facilities who provide the support systems for children. They are presently grossly underpaid. I think the average industrial wage in Canada today is about $14,000 a year and the average child care worker makes at least 30 per cent less than that. In the commercial venture, child care for profit venture, which I personally do not support in principle, the pay is even less. That is a situation which we must improve quickly.

Obviously the kind of facilities that are run by communities and non-profit organizations are the best because parents play a direct role in the kind of care being given to their children. They do not have much say in a commercial or profit oriented venture because the reason that child care centre exists is to make money, not necessarily to care for children, while that is obviously a by-product of that initiative.

Community based, co-operative or non-profit organizations are ones in which the parents set the criteria for the curriculum and schedules. That is the kind of child care I think we want to see in this country.

The Hon. Member has raised an interesting question and one that I look forward to discussing, particularly in the upcoming election campaign. It is the legitimate question of how we pay for all of this. Where does the money come from?

The people of Canada will have an interesting opportunity to make some choices. If the people of Canada really want nuclear powered attack hunter submarines that will cost billions of dollars, then they should vote for the Conservatives because that is one of their high priorities. If they want decent child care facilities, they should vote for the New Democrats because that will be on the top of our priority list.

The people of Canada will have a choice to make, and that is what elections are all about. Do they want nuclear submarines or child care facilities? Do you want a variety and comprehensive set of child care opportunities for your children or do you want a fleet of nuclear attack hunter submarines on our east and west coasts? That is the choice. Those are the choices Canadians will have to make. If they want the nuclear fleet for Canada, they should vote for the Conservative Member in that constituency. If they want decent child care on the corner, a decent after-school care facility for their children, or a resource centre for families with spouses who remain at home to raise their children but want to have better books and toys, vote for the New Democrats. That is what elections and politics are all about. I look forward, as I suppose many of us do, to getting out in the election campaign and giving those choices to the people, to let the people decide.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, during the Hon. Member's speech I interjected a point to which I want his reaction. He was criticizing the Government for reducing the indexing and in some cases eliminating the indexing on taxation and some social benefit programs. Did the Hon. Member watch the Ronald Reagan event at the Republic Convention in the last few days? The President of the United States, a very Conservative President who, in some ways, is an extreme right-winger, took great pride in the fact that he introduced indexation into the taxation system in the United States, copying an idea that was brought into the Canadian system by the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Turner) when he was Minister of Finance many years ago. Is the Hon. Member aware that that right-winger, Ronald Reagan, is less harsh on the poor and ordinary citizens in his country than the Government has been toward poor and middle-income Canadians?

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to that interjection by my hon. friend. I suppose there are only two pages from the Ronald Reagan book that I would like to apply to Canada. One is the imposition of a minimum corporate tax that I believe was another progressive item which the President and others have mentioned at the Republican Convention.

As the Hon. Member stated, in the past Canada has introduced a mechanism to combat inflation eating away at something like the family allowance. The value of the family allowance cheque would diminish year after year as inflation grows. I think all of us were pleased at the progressive initiative taken by the Minister of Finance some years ago with that indexation.

One of the very first actions of the Conservative Government was to grab money from the children of Canada by taking money from the family allowance cheque and the child tax deduction. It grabbed money from the child tax credit. I do not know if Canadians really appreciate the fact that it was one of the very first things the Conservative Government did.

Even Ronald Reagan commented that this indexation was one of the ways governments can provide better levels of financial support in order to provide for children in our countries. I thank my hon. colleague for his interjection and reminder of the fact that even right-wingers in the United States index these critical programs so that their young children will not be severely handicapped in the amount of money that will justly go to them from federal fiscal payments.

As I indicated earlier, I look forward to the campaign when Canadians can decide whether they want a nuclear submarine or a set of decent child care facilities.

• (1710)

Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to participate in the debate today on Bill C-144 with respect to Canada's Child Care Act. First, I would like to congratulate the chairman of the child care task force, the Hon. Member for Lincoln (Mrs. Martin) and her colleagues, the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Belsher), the Hon. Member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Nicholson) and the Hon. Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Duguay). They certainly gave a great deal of their time and energy as they travelled across this country hearing from many groups and individuals. It was very interesting to read the report of the task force and note there were people who supported non-profit child care as well as people who supported commercial day care. They all gave extremely good representations. There were a number of people who appeared before the task force who felt very strongly that children should first be at home and gave some excellent reasons why they felt women should be supported in the home so they could take care of their families.

Members of the Opposition Parties, as well as some of the media, have criticized the Government's child care program because it has not imposed national standards. They claim that strong national leadership is not possible without national standards and that we will have a balkanization of day care across Canada with widely varying standards. Such criticism misses on two fronts. It misunderstands the nature of Canada and it misunderstands the fundamental role of standards. Canada is not a small, unified, monolithic country. A number of visitors from European countries with expertise in child care have expressed admiration for the multifaceted, pluralistic nature of Canada. They have expressed the sentiment that they would like to be in such a position where they could in fact observe and benefit from a variety of approaches and models which address regional differences rather than being hindered by an inability to allow creative and innovative approaches without having to make changes in their monolithic standards.

Child care in Canada is, in many ways, in its early formative stages. To prejudice the ultimate or final form and shape of child care services is to prematurely cut off the normal experimental path that developmental professions have to be free to follow in order to find a more efficient and effective approach. Just stop and think for a moment, Mr. Speaker. The realities facing Canadian families in downtown Toronto or Vancouver are vastly different from those which face families in Labrador City, Berin's River or Fort Simpson. What possible standard appropriate for Toronto would make equal sense to a remote village without indoor plumbing? Implementing standards to ensure quality of care in Toronto may well leave large parts of the country without the capacity to provide day care services at all.

This is not to imply that such standards would result in good care in Toronto while other sections of the country without identical standards would be offering inferior services. What it means is that situations differ widely and call for a clustering of approaches which meet the needs of specific situations.

This brings me to what I mentioned earlier, the misunderstanding of the nature and objective of standards. Licensing standards, which are of utmost importance to safeguard the well-being of children, should not be confused with quality issues. Licensing represents the minimum standard that a Government thinks is permissible in order to operate equally. It is not the same thing as a Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval. It is only indirectly related to quality day care. Quality care comes from individuals and groups who do their very best to offer the most nurturing and favourable care possible.

The federal Government recognizes the need for experimentation and fuller information as to what constitutes quality care and through its child care initiative fund supports efforts in this direction. This Government's approach is to work with the provinces. We recognize that there are certain areas in standards that do relate directly to good care and insist that in order for the provinces to enter into the cost sharing provisions of this Act, the provinces must address in regulation the various areas. However, the provinces, being closer to the unique situation of parents in their region, can develop specific standards in each of these identified areas that best meet the situation in those areas. I might add that standards are a matter directly under provincial jurisdiction.

I would also stress that given the tremendous differences which exist across Canada, licensing standards are remarkably similar. Who among the Opposition would think that, sitting in

Ottawa, they could design more appropriate standards and enforce the standards better than can be done at the provincial level?

I would like to draw to the attention of members of the Opposition that some of the leading day care advocates have taken similar approaches to the federal Government on the question of national standards. On July 14, 1988, on the *CBC Morningside* program, Mr. Jack London, a member of the Katie Cooke task force, said:

> Now there is no way and our report found this in 1986. There is no way that Ottawa can tell a region somewhere in a remote area what ratios of children to supervisors there ought to be in a particular space.
>
> That's ridiculous. Ottawa can't control in that way. However, the federal Government has to ensure a number of basic standards right across the country and there are three of them. One is that money flow only into licensed, that is regulated and supervised care spaces, not into unsupervised and, therefore, inadequate spaces. Secondly, that moneys given to the provinces, and that's really what's happening here, moneys shared with the provinces, ought to be properly distributed so that the requisite number of spaces are available for infants, for preschool children, for school-aged children in the urban and rural areas. There's to be a proper distribution. And thirdly that the money be used to support public child care and not anything else.

On the CBC program, *As It Happens*, on August 11, Ms. P. Coates, Vice-President of the Canadian Day Care Advocacy Association was asked:

> Wouldn't the provinces object to having standards imposed on them?

Ms. Coates responded:

> We hadn't asked for specific standards to be imposed. What we had asked for was some global statements about the importance of standards, the importance of staff training, the importance of enriched staff child ratios without actually attaching detailed numbers to them. But if the criteria had been in there then there would have been pressure on the provinces to look at their standards, really review them and be accountable for the money that they spent on the types of programs.

The reporter asked her: "So all you want is a statement?" She replied: "We wanted some initial statements to begin with, national objectives and some criteria". So it is clear that those who have studied the question agree that our approach to quality and standards is sound.

• (1720)

I would like to go back to the February, 1988 Budget which stated that the child tax credit would be $559 for the 1988 tax year. Under this child care legislation the tax credit will be topped up by $100 per child under 18 years in 1988 and by another $100 per child in 1989. That is a $200 increase in the child tax credit.

On the deduction side in this legislation, parents with children under the age of six and with receipts from a child care facility will be able to deduct up to $4,000 per child. The lower income of a two-parent income family must be used.

Both of these assets, the child tax credit and the child deduction, represent $2.3 billion in this new program. Of the $2.3 billion about $2 billion goes to top up the child care tax credit. Thus out of every additional dollar of tax assistance in this program, 88 per cent is going to go to top up the child tax credit. That is good.

I want to talk about children here because topping up the child tax credit really assists children. Children have to come first. I know today that all across Canada in various regions and areas there are many parents who need child care assistance and child care facilities. I am willing to help those in need. We are a caring government. We will certainly assist those people in need, especially single parent women. But I feel that if there is a way to keep a family together, to keep children at home, especially in the very young years, then let us do it. I feel that parents have the responsibility to look after their children. I say let us try to encourage that.

I was very fortunate to be in a position to stay at home and look after my children. I recognize that. I strongly emphasize that I am willing to help those people in need. But if we can do anything, and do anything more to assist mothers or, indeed, fathers to stay at home and bring their children up in the home, I would certainly encourage it.

The Bill before us is the beginning of a new program. It is good. There are some inequities in it. I hope that we can resolve them in order to encourage moms or dads to stay at home. Child care is the responsibility of the parents. They should make the decision.

Within the Bill before us today there is flexibility. We have a great deal of flexibility that allows parents to choose between staying at home and receiving a child tax credit or sending their children to a commercial or non-profit child care facility with respect to which they will be allowed the tax deduction, as I said, with receipts up to $4,000 per child under the age of six. We have to work this child care program through. As I said, it is a beginning.

I know people have difficulties. I recognize that there are a great many ways to improve the situation. This is a beginning. There will be 200,000 new spaces created over the course of seven years. I welcome that. I welcome the fact that the provinces will be setting the standards. I welcome the fact that we will be working with each and every province to ensure that our moneys are well spent.

I am glad that 50 per cent of the provincial and territorial operating costs of non-profit commercial services will be paid for under the new legislation. Some 75 per cent of the capital costs for non-profit day care centres and services will be paid for. This is a step in the right direction. We have a long way to go. I am pleased to speak, but I must reiterate that kids come first. I would like to see kids come first at home.

I commend the Minister on his job well done, as well as the task force, and say that I look forward to implementing this new Canada Child Care Act. Canada can have the best child care system perhaps in the world if not, indeed, in North America.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there questions or comments? The Chair recognizes the Hon. Member for Calgary East.

Mr. Kindy: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment. I listened with a great deal of attention to what the Hon. Member for Calgary South (Mrs. Sparrow) had to say. I wonder what her feeling is about the tax credit. It is only $100 in the first year and $200 in the next. For the mother who has to stay at home, I wonder if the Hon. Member would like to see this tax credit increased in order that more mothers can stay at home and so that they receive real justice for taking care of their children. Personally, I do not believe that day care is the solution to rearing a child. The Hon. Member is a nurse by training and has probably seen children who were abandoned, who have been in hospital and who did not get attention and love. This creates problems later in life.

I was surprised to hear the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) say that he wanted two million day care spaces in Canada. As a physician, I know that people who put children in day care come to the medical office and quite often the children are sick because they are in contact with other children in the day care centre. They get infections. This creates a problem for certain mothers and fathers because certain children cannot stay in day care because of this problem. They are too easily infected with disease. The best solution to this problem is to have the child at home with a caring mother or father, grandmother or grandfather taking care of the child. I think we should look at this solution. For this reason we should give child tax credits in a larger amount so that people who stay home can benefit not only from tax credits but from being with their children.

Mrs. Sparrow: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the Hon. Member for Calgary East (Mr. Kindy) for his question. I have to agree with some of the statements he has made. When we compare the child tax credit to the tax deduction, I think there is an inequity. I would like to see more encouragement given to keeping a parent, whether it be the male or female parent, at home with the youngsters.

The child tax credit for the tax year 1988 is $559. The Bill which is before us will increase that tax credit by $100 per child under 18 years of age this year and by another $100 next year so that there will be a $200 increase, which will bring the tax credit up to $759. Each person will have to equate this within their own tax bracket. I have to check the figures, but for an income of $46,000 to $48,000, or perhaps into the $50,000 range, the child tax credit would be totally phased out. That compared to $4,000 per child with receipts is what is unfair in here.

• (1730)

I have to say to my colleague that this is a start. Even the Minister has recognized that there are some areas where perhaps there is not fairness. I look forward to reviewing it once the program is implemented, and seeing if by raising the child tax credit we could keep more moms and dads at home for their kids.

There are people who need child care facilities, and we know this. There are many single parents and many two-parent families who need double incomes to exist today, and we recognize that. The cost of raising children and the cost of housing is expensive. The inflation rate is between 3.9 and 4.1 per cent, depending on where one lives in the country. Therefore, it is very costly. The care of youngsters is up to the parents. I am quite willing to help those in need.

My colleague, the Hon. Member for Calgary East referred to the New Democratic Party comparing the national defence policy and the $8 billion for submarines and stating that that money should be spent on child care. It is very interesting that one compares eight to ten submarines with a child care program. If the truth were known, and as I understand it, the policy of the New Democratic Party with regard to defence is to scrap the eight to ten nuclear propelled submarines and build twelve conventional submarines. The New Democratic Party would also add an additional fleet of six frigates.

Members of the New Democratic Party have also stated publicly that they would discontinue defence cost sharing programs in order to design and build the defence equipment here in Canada. Their defence program will probably cost $3 to $6 billion more than ours. We are talking about $8 billion over 25 years. It represents $300,000 per year. This is not new money, and it is already budgeted for in the Budgets of the Government. I cannot believe how anyone can compare nuclear propelled submarines to a child care program.

This Government does not have tunnel vision. We do not look at one area, we look across Canada. We not only look at child care, but at post-secondary education, the agricultural department. Over the last four years we have spent $8 billion in the area of agriculture. Look what we have done in the energy sector. If we do not have agriculture healthy, energy healthy, and manufacturing healthy, we will not be able to pay for anybody's program. We need a balanced government, and that is exactly what we have done. We have helped the energy sector, the agricultural sector, and we are moving in to help the people in Newfoundland to create more jobs. The Government believes in a whole and total Canada and every person that we can get out there working will be able to support our social programs.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I may be in a somewhat unique position in the House since I am a day care parent. I hope the Member for Calgary East (Mr. Kindy) might listen to what I have to say because I heard him make some disparaging remarks about children who are in day care. I consider it a rare privilege that my little boy is in day care on the Hill. He receives incredibly good care and has had a great educational opportunity. I wish to pay tribute to the professional staff of the day care that operates here, and also to pay tribute to a former Speaker, the Right Hon. Jeanne Sauvé, who was the initiator of that program. It demonstrates

the type of silly mythology and somewhat disparaging commentary that we heard from the Member for Calgary East.

Child care is a reality for 60 per cent of Canadian families. Let me make it very clear that, when one has direct experience, one speaks to the parents of other children, or is on the board as I am, or in my own riding where I have several day care centres, one finds out what people are talking about. It might help some Members opposite to spend a little more time talking to people who have a direct interest and involvement, which happens to be the majority of Canadian families.

Mrs. Sparrow: You bet we talk to them.

Mr. Axworthy: From what I have heard in the speeches, I do not think anybody from the Conservative caucus has talked to people whose children need day care. I listened to the Hon. Member for Calgary South (Mrs. Sparrow), who attempted to explain away the lack of standards. Has that Member ever talked to a parent with a deep concern about who is looking after their child, and what type of facilities the child will be in? What is the most important responsibility is that question of one's young child, who is going to look after him or her and how, and to have the assurances that are needed that there is proper teaching, proper care, proper surveillance, proper quality toys, and proper quality health facilities.

That should not be divided town by town, region by region, and province by province. We should not have a checkerboard Canada. There should not be discrimination in the quality of services because one happens to live in a rural area versus an urban area. By practice and experience we have learned since the 1960s that the only way to ensure that there is proper quality of social services is to ensure that the federal Government takes the lead and the responsibility for that insurance and does not surrender it.

I wish to take you back four or five years, Mr. Speaker, and discuss the medicare system, perhaps the most important and useful social program in this country. What was happening back in 1983 in Alberta, Ontario, and the Atlantic provinces? Provincial governments were undermining the standard of care under the medicare system. It was only when the national government brought in the Canada Health Act to establish national standards to ensure that funding was related to quality and services were we able to correct the downward decline of the medicare system.

Mr. Halliday: There is no relation at all.

Mr. Axworthy: There is a relationship. For anyone to argue that, argues against the history of the last 60 years. This is the first major social program we have talked about where the federal Government is abdicating its responsibility to ensure that there are national equitable standards for all children regardless of where they live. Flexible experimentation I believe were the words used by the Hon. Member for Calgary South. Does the Hon. Member know what that translates into? It translates into hodge-podge, substandard care and inequality. Those are the real words that should be used. I bring that back to the living reality of the parents I see every day when I take my own child to day care, or the people in my own riding who I talked to when I visited every single day care centre. It is a very important concern because it relates to the next one. The next concern is that so many parents in Canada today are accepting that substandard care because there is no other alternative. They do not know who is looking after their child because they have to go into the private market-place to find care.

Mr. Thacker: Why is a rich man like you being subsidized?

Mr. Axworthy: I am not being subsidized. We pay our full share. What a silly, stupid, reactionary attitude from the Member for Lethbridge—Foothills (Mr. Thacker). The fact of the matter is that he is talking about 60 or 70 per cent of the parents in this country. The Tories do not recognize because of their tax policies in other areas that one has to be part of a two-income family to survive in this country today.

Mr. Thacker: It was your policy which did that. There was 22 per cent interest while you were the Government.

Mr. Axworthy: If decent and proper care is not provided for children, the economy will fall to the bottom. This is a bad program. It is not designed for the care and concern of our children. It may be designed to fit the mythology and the ideology of the Member for Calgary East. However, it has nothing to do with what is required and what people want. I will give you an example, Mr. Speaker.

• (1740)

In 1985, I sat down with the churches and social service groups in my constituency, and organized what I think is probably the most extensive family study ever undertaken in Canada. We contacted every single household in my riding to ask about family related issues. We had close to 10,000 responses in a riding where there are 45,000 households. Close to 10,000 responses. I suggest that that is probably the most singular largest study of family concerns ever undertaken in Canada at a local community level.

What did we find? In my constituency, which goes from a downtown area where there is a high predominance of single-parent families to suburban areas with middle, upper middle-class families, upwards of anywhere from 58 per cent to 75 per cent of those in the area said that the number one concern was proper, decent child care. It had nothing to do with just those on the lowest income. This kind of Florence Nightingale, *noblesse oblige* kind of attitude that we hear that somehow we are going to help those only in need flies in the face of the fact that there is 60 or 70 per cent. I will give an example. In the Fort Richmond, Waverley Heights, South Fort Garry part of my riding, an area of middle, lower-middle-class, working class families, some upper-class families, 71 per cent of the parents say that additional child care programs are needed.

That compares to the fact that in that same area at the present time there is a grand total of 166 spaces for children, an area which includes close to 5,000 households. A hundred and sixty-six.

Do you know what the additional increment of the new Tory program will bring about in that area if you add it up? It is about six new spaces over that time.

Mr. Boudria: Great stuff.

Mr. Axworthy: I have to tell you that the people of South Richmond, South Fort Garry, Waverley Heights are not going to be dancing in the streets because they are going to get six additional spaces because of this new program.

Mr. Boudria: Such largess.

Mr. Axworthy: If anything points to the dramatic disparity between the rhetoric and the reality, it is that figure.

Mr. Riis: Are you sure about that figure?

Mr. Axworthy: I am positive about that figure. There are 166. If you add up the increment, they are going to get maybe an additional six spaces.

How can anyone stand up in this House and say that we have now met the problem? For those families, you have not begun to meet the problem. You have not begun to scratch the surface of the problem. You have not even got close to the problem.

When I hear, "Well, it is a beginning", it is a beginning and it is also the end. Once you entrench this program and turn it into one in which the provinces have complete control with no requirement for standard, you will never retrieve it again in order to establish a national program with national standards. You will never be able to undo the bad work that is being done. You will never be able to correct the major flaw that is being built into that program.

I can testify from my experience in my own community. That question of standards is absolutely essential. I have had parents come into my office and I have talked to them on the streets and in the day care centres. They have described to me the experiences of what it is like, the panic of when you have two parents working because they have to keep up mortgage payments or whatever it may be, trying to live in this high-cost economy, and all of a sudden they realize that there is no place for their child. They put an advertisement in the newspaper. Someone walks the street and says: "I may or may not be qualified", and they find out two or three weeks later that the baby-sitter, that private entrepreneur, is spending all afternoon with the TV set on, or is in some way ignoring the kid. We are dealing with that indifference, or even worse.

Ms. Dewar: With no background in child care.

Mr. Axworthy: With no background in child care training for families. I agree that there are some good private facilities. I have no argument about that. In fact, my mother was responsible for a day care centre for 15 years. She provided good treatment. They recognize that there had to be the essential question of standards there, because there are so many bad operators. There are so many corporate operators who simply see child care as a way of making a buck.

Mr. Riis: Shame.

Mr. Axworthy: There are too many chains being established across Canada with the idea of making a profit on children by providing the service; not providing the best service—

Ms. Dewar: With day care workers.

Mr. Axworthy: —to make sure that the day care workers get the minimum payment. How about the question of after school? Is there anything in this Bill that will provide for after-school care for the children? There is not one thing. I can tell you from a discussion that I had last weekend with some co-parents at the day care centre whose kids are about to graduate, recognizing that there is no provision for after-school programs, that they are now trying to rearrange their schedules and so on. We are not talking about people with big incomes. We are talking about secretaries working on this Hill who are making $14,000 a year, faced with the enormous question of "What do I do when my child has to go to kindergarten and is only there for three hours a day? Do I leave work?" All of a sudden the standard of living of the members of the family collapses.

That is the reality that we are talking about, not some document drafted by some bureaucrat in the Department of National Health and Welfare that is being read out by Members opposite. I am talking about something that is real, something you touch every day, something you understand by dealing with the people who are deeply involved in the issue.

I do not buy the argument that this is just the beginning and that all along the way we will tinker here or there. If you are going to do it, do it right. Get it right the first time. Do not put into place the kind of expectations that are out there in the public. They talk about $6 billion or $7 billion when in fact it is $2.3 billion, as we well know, for the actual additions of new spaces and for the support of families who need it going into child care services. How do you get that back? To go back in time and to rework it in a major way will occupy the next Government's time and energy.

I say to myself, when you have the Katie Cooke study and the House of Commons meeting for two years, how did you get it so bad, how did you get it so wrong? Why did you put together a Rube Goldberg machine? It is unquestionably the number one concern of the majority of families in Canada, and this Government missed the target by a mile.

I have heard the Member for Calgary South say: "Well, after a lot of pressure we have now increased the child tax credit". It is now $759 for those in the lowest income level. Do you know what the average cost is of a day care space, even

those that are subsidized? It ranges from $450 to $900 a month. It may get your child one month's care. You have to compare that against the provision of the service and the space itself, geared to income. That is the real question. How much are you misallocating the resources by doing it that way as opposed to making sure that the space is there? It is not a 4 per cent increment a year. It is also to ensure that it is geared to income so that it can be properly monitored and managed. That is what the families are asking for, those with the lowest income; the single-parent families in my riding. That is what they want.

The middle class families also need the space. If there is a proper day care system with proper standards, set by a program that recognizes the importance of teaching and quality facilities, they are prepared to pay what it costs for their children if they can find the space. Yet, both those criteria have been missed in this program. They are not there.

No one here is arguing against the objective of a new child care program. The problem is that this is not the right program. It does not come in any way, shape or form close to meeting the real issue that is out there, street by street.

I have talked about the South Winnipeg family study, and the close to 10,000 people who responded to it. It was not just a statistical study. It was done house by house, with household interviews, being with groups in neighbourhoods. We had close to 300 or 400 volunteers, working over a year, giving up their time to undertake this kind of a program. I had the opportunity to join them in many of the discussions, to meet with the parents and with the organizations being called.

I only wish that Members of the House had gone through a similar kind of experience to realize that it is not an abstraction, it is not something that is for partisan dispute. It is something that is close to the real, basic concern. There can be nothing deeper and sweeter than the feeling of a parent for their child, and the yearning, the demand, the appetite for some support out there to meet that need.

• (1750)

The disappointment that comes with this program, Mr. Speaker, is crushing. It goes beyond just the sheer provision of child care. I suppose if I had my way—I am not the critic for my Party—I would revamp our entire family program structure. As you go through the other studies, you find that there is a desperate need for support for the latchkey kids and the roofless teenagers.

In my riding, the South Winnipeg Family Services said there were 1,200 teenage kids who are what they call foot loose kids who for all kinds of reasons have left home at 14 or 15 years of age and are living with friends or kicking around the streets. We have close to 800 or 900 homeless children in downtown Winnipeg. I do not want to be dramatic, Mr. Speaker, but there is a crisis out there when it comes to these family concerns, whether in housing, proper support, or counselling. The third highest priority is psychological and mental counselling. Many families want someone to talk to in order to deal with problems with their children or aging parents. People go through a terrific emotional upheaval trying to cope with these sorts of things. There have been breakdowns in church support. I regret that, but it has happened. In modern urban and rural society that support is no longer there.

We find the kind of family support which governments provide is sometimes wrongly targeted. I spoke to a family in my riding a couple of weeks back who had found that one of their children had a learning disability. This was an average family, but no place was prepared to help them deal with this child's learning disability. The parents will have to wait until the child gets to the public school system where there might be some help, but it could be too late. They told me the family allowance was not enough to cope with it, and they were unable to go on social welfare. There was no one to help them deal with their child who every day they could see was falling backward. The family will sacrifice, maybe sell the family car or even the family home to get that kid into a proper rehabilitation program. It seems to me we should have a better concept of the family and reorganize the way in which we deliver our income programs so that families as they meet crises can apply resources where they are most needed at the appropriate time. We have to get rid of the rigidities in the system.

The problem with this program before us is it will compound the problem. It will not help. It adds one more series of tortuous networks to go through rather than providing a greater facility and ability for families to meet their needs. I am not saying the state is the sole responsibility. Of course it is not. In our child care policy we said that it has to be a partnership between the parents, primarily supported by their governments, and the private sector. That is the basis of our policy, that sharing partnership principle, whereby we can employ the full resources.

People took leadership here several years ago to put a day care centre on the Hill, not just for Members of Parliament but for secretaries' and clerks' families and for the 5,000 people who work on the Hill. Those things should be done in work places around the country.

Ms. Dewar: There is a two-year waiting list.

Mr. Axworthy: Yes, there is a two-year waiting list. My wife and I got down on our knees and lit a candle when we got Stevie into that day care program because we were really up against it and we did not know what we were going to do.

From a personal point of view, I think I can say something in the House. I do not like to argue from a singular experience because as Members of Parliament we are supposed to represent the broad view. I think I can represent that because I have this study, but from the point of view of someone who is living the problem and able to share it with some other parents, I can tell Tory Members that they have this wrong. This program is not a good one. It will not work the way they

want it to. They will waste a lot of resources, raise a lot of expectations and they will not get the kinds of answers they need. I suppose it will be up to another Government to go back to the drawing board.

Mrs. Sparrow: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I may have misled the House when I spoke about 20 minutes ago. I want to clarify what I said about the child tax credit.

The top-up for the child tax credit which is $100 in 1988 and another $100 in 1989 is for children six years and under. I mention that so as not to mislead the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Louis-Hébert (Mrs. Duplessis) for a question or comment.

Mrs. Duplessis: Mr. Speaker, I followed closely the speech made by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) and I would like to reiterate to him that the strategy we want to put in place is aimed first at honouring a commitment to significantly improve the child care situation, and it is a flexible, humane policy that respects the rights of parents as far as the care of their children is concerned, that respects the provinces' jurisdiction and that ensures the quality standards we want to put in place.

We carefully studied the child care policy put forward by the Liberal Party, as well as liberal propositions on child care services, and we find they include no objectives, no time table for increasing approved places. Also, they include less tax support than this Government's proposals or the existing system, and they venture into dangerous constitutional ground by proposing direct federal intervention through an appointed board and through involvement in the program's administration and the setting up of program administration standards, and they make the system's expansion conditional on the reduction of the deficit, something no Liberal Government has accomplished since 1969.

And when the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry stated earlier, and gave as example their national health system, that they could set up one system across the country, there is nothing in the Canada Health Act that says how many hospitals there should be *per capita*, in all provinces, and when earlier he also gave as an example post-secondary education, there is nothing in the Act that says how many professors there should be per university, nor what qualifications professors should have.

I feel the Hon. Member is venturing into highly dangerous ground, and I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what Premiers such as Mr. Bourassa, Mr. McKenna, Mr. Ghiz, Mr. Peterson could say if ever the Government came up with very specific standards it wanted to have.

Therefore, I think this would intrude upon provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Hon. Member, I accept the good intentions of the parliamentary task force chaired by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works (Mrs. Martin) which developed a day care program, but I said it was not a good program, for the reasons I mentioned, particularly the lack of national standards to establish whether the program would be the same throughout the country. When it comes to the rights of children it is very important that they be given similar treatment under similar circumstances, region by region and province by province. That is the responsibility of the national Government, and as far as I am concerned this Government did forget all about its responsibility, more specifically as it relates to such an important program as child care services. This is my opportunity to point out that our national Government is responsible for this service, but unfortunately you forgot that responsibility. Besides, parents and children in Canada have no guarantee that comparable services will be available everywhere.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being 6 p.m., pursuant to order adopted on Monday, June 27, 1988, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.